United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2015 No. 148

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 8, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

MEDICARE PART B PREMIUM INCREASE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we take to the floor to deal with the daily reminders of turmoil around the world: the unrest in the Middle East, especially in Syria and ISIS; the sad reality of an unending string of events regarding gun violence.

There is a certain amount of unrest here in the House, as our Republican colleagues right now are trying to chart a path forward to reconcile differences of opinion within their own ranks that have some spillover effects for us. But in the background, there is a critical issue that we should be focused on that may not command the headlines; but it is, nonetheless, a critically important item.

We are faced with arcane formulas that govern dealing with Medicare—the rates that recipients pay for their services—that have a perverse impact on some of the lowest income seniors. Through no fault of their own, 7.7 million senior citizens are going to be treated very unfairly. These are the 30 percent of Medicare recipients who are going to pay the burden for all Medicare recipients for the cost increases.

We have a provision in place that holds harmless people who get no increase in their Social Security payments, and they are immune from premium increases. But that is not so for the other 30 percent. These are the people who are facing a 52 percent increase in that part B premium, over $54 a month.

Now, remember, nobody gets an increase in their Social Security, and there is going to be about a $76 increase per month in the deductible.

A typical Medicare beneficiary pays almost $5,000 per year for premiums, cost sharing, and other services that aren't covered by insurance. For many, that is not an unreasonable contribution for their health care, but not for everyone.

More than half the beneficiaries have incomes of $24,150. These 30 percent, the 7.7 million who will pick up the slack for everyone else, are going to be facing a significant impact, given their low incomes. It doesn't actually have to be this way.

There are proposals that are available for Congress to deal with. Representative DINA TITUS, Representative JAN SCHAKOWSKY, and Senator RON WYDEN all have proposals that would eliminate or minimize the impact on these vulnerable senior citizens.

And, bear in mind, it will also impact the States $2.3 billion in terms of Medicaid programs, which inevitably will translate into service reductions, again, for some of our most vulnerable.

It is time for Congress to empower negotiators in both parties, in both Chambers to act now. If we get involved with these potential solutions, the costs are going to be far less than if we wait until the next year, and we will be shielding some of our most vulnerable citizens from significant increases at a time when they can ill afford it. This is one area where there is overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle.

I would call upon my friends in the Republican leadership to take a break from this strange process they are going through and debate in the acrimony and the churn. Let's take a break and empower people to solve these problems now. Our senior citizens deserve no less.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind us of the importance of the month of October as Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

Like any disease that affects people regardless of race, color, creed, or their status in society, cancer not only tests the mental and physical strength of the person fighting the disease, it has a deep and lasting impact on family, friends, and communities.

Currently, more than 100 different types of cancer exist, but, in my humble opinion, none is more wicked than breast cancer. This is most likely because breast cancer is one of the most common and deadly cancers among women.

Printed on recycled paper.

In fact, one in eight women in America will be diagnosed with breast cancer in her lifetime. Breast cancer can be a cruel disease. It tears mothers from their children, wives from their husbands, and daughters from their parents.

In 2015, it is anticipated that, in our country alone, more than 40,000 women will die from breast cancer. While women are most at risk, we must remember that this disease does not just affect women; while less common in the United States, 2,350 men are diagnosed with breast cancer each year.

In the past 20 years, there have been incredible advances in the research and medicine surrounding breast cancer, but there is much left to be done. We can't rest until we can prevent or cure this horrible disease.

Again, we have already made huge strides in the fight against breast cancer. Death rates due to breast cancer have been declining since 1989, and women younger than 50 are now less likely to get breast cancer than ever before. This is largely due to the awareness that has been raised on the importance of self-exams and yearly doctor physicals.

However, currently, 29 percent of insured women are still not receiving mammograms; and for women without health insurance, the percentage is even higher, with 68 percent not receiving mammograms.

It is extremely important that we continue to place an emphasis on early detection so that we can catch this disease as early as possible and have the best shot at beating it.

While there are factors like genetics and age that can make someone more susceptible to the disease, breast cancer does not discriminate against education, upbringing, or wealth. From CEOs in New York City to a stay-at-home mom in small town Minnesota, this disease knows no bounds.

I expect that just about everyone who walks these halls and too many to count across our country have been impacted by breast cancer in some way. I am no exception. Fifteen years ago, I lost my sister, Bridget, to breast cancer. Bridget was only 38 years old when she left us. She left behind two beautiful daughters and a husband who loved her.

While her life was a lesson on how to get the most out of each second of every minute of every hour and every day, there is not a day that goes by when I don't wish there could have been a cure for her.

For those who have experienced personal loss and pain from breast cancer, and for everyone who is fighting this disease, we join with you this month not only to raise awareness about breast cancer but to sound a call to action, to strengthen our resolve, and to eradicate this disease once and for all.

In Congress, we can absolutely play a role in this effort. To the extent possible within our constitutional authority, we can and should encourage further advancement of medical research.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act of 2015, which will establish a commission to work to defeat this disease. The commission will consist of experts in cancer research who will work to identify opportunities and ideas to advance our quest to prevent and cure breast cancer for future generations.

October is a month to raise awareness. We have made progress, and we are making progress in our fight against this unforgiving disease. Let us use this month to rededicate ourselves to our shared goal of eradicating breast cancer once and for all.

WASHINGTON IS OUT OF STEP WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, as Donald Trump and Ben Carson have turned up the volume with more and more outrageous statements and policy proposals, Members of Congress have been trying to keep up.

Now, Republicans in the House not only have to play to the small, but extremely vocal, segment of the electorate that feels Washington is ''out of step with the American people,'' but they have another audience to woo—each other—because a lot of our colleagues are currently running for leadership positions.

But is it really Washington that is out of step with America or is it the most vocal, most active, and most vitriolic elements of the Republican base that are out of step with America?

Last week's NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll was pretty startling. It shows in issue after issue that on the positions adopted by the leading GOP candidates, vast majorities of Americans disagree with Republicans. On abortion restrictions, immigration, LGBT equality, racial diversity, and reproductive health, some in the Republican base demand we go back to the Dark Ages. But it is not, in fact, the direction that most Americans want to go.

For most Americans, ''Mad Men'' was a good TV drama set before racial integration, before the women's movement really took hold, before gays and lesbians dared come out of the closet, and before we removed racial quotas from immigration. But some in the Republican Party aspire to turn it into a reality TV show.

The latest throw-down from the right has been over Planned Parenthood and reimbursing this respected organization for health services it provides to women across the country.

In many cases, Planned Parenthood is the only source of affordable and accessible reproductive health care, contraception, HIV and STD testing, cancer screenings, and basic health care for women.

Under Federal law, our tax dollars cannot pay for abortions, and there are no credible claims that this is being violated. Under law, abortion is legal in the United States, despite all of the restrictions imposed and proposed by my Republican colleagues. But this goes further than abortion rights and a woman's right to control her own health care and reproduction.

Some Americans here and around the country are, frankly, not too comfortable with the whole family planning thing. In my family, I have two daughters who are brilliant and whom I trust to make decisions for themselves. They were born 8 years apart and not by accident.

My wife and I planned her pregnancies around her career as an investment banker and had our children when we were ready. That is an option that opened the world of opportunity and self-determination to my wife that my mother never had. Puerto Rican women in this country in my mother's day had one thing forced on them by the government, and that was sterilization, period.

So when I hear talk about shutting down the government to appease the far right on Planned Parenthood, I think of the progress we have made from my mother's generation to my wife's generation and now to the world in which my daughters live.

It seems to me that we should not be looking for ways to limit choices women have, to force them into back alleys or across State lines for health care or to treat them as if only wise men in Washington can make decisions for the women of America.

But that desire to turn the clock backwards, to undo the progress of our lifetimes, and to punish America for evolving over time is basically at the heart of the Republican agenda, as driven by their most active and vocal base. Republicans run for office and legislate as if they want gay people back in the closet, as if they want Latinos and Asians to become invisible, as if they wish women were just in the kitchen or in the bedroom, as if we could go back to those golden days before the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act, Brown v. Board of Education, when everything was separate and some people were more equal than others.

Well, with all due respect to Mr. Carson and Emperor Trump, every poll indicates that the American people are not with them, and that is especially true of young people in America. Dr. Carson must be nostalgic for the anti-Catholic days before John Kennedy was elected because he is now raising doubts that people of certain religions are qualified to serve their country as President.

Senator CRUZ must look at the old days when we turned away refugees from Europe because of their religion, as we did in the 1930s and 1940s when anti-Semitism gripped this country. Now he wants to send Muslims back to die in Syria.

And now there is Donald Trump. He wants to deport about a quarter of the

50 million Latinos in the United States. If mass deportation was good enough for President Eisenhower, he feels it should be good enough for America today.

□ 1015

I will agree with one leading candidate, Jeb Bush, who recently said that ''stuff happens.'' Stuff does happen. A lot of stuff has happened since the 1950s when I was born and the 1960s when I grew up in America.

Our laws and our culture have evolved to become more inclusive, and we have a more diverse and egalitarian society because of it. Many Republicans call that stuff the problem. I call that stuff progress.

LOSING A GENERATION TO GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am tired. I am tired of, once again, being asked to rise to honor the victims of gun violence.

Not even a month ago, I stood at this very podium on behalf of gun violence victims. With nearly 300 mass shootings in less than 300 days, this Congress has proven that there is no appetite to end gun violence.

I am tired because we will have more moments of silence in honor of gun victims, and then we will have moments of action from leaders working to stop gun violence.

To my colleagues who came here on the platform of caring about children, to my colleagues who came here for peace, to my friends on the left and right of the aisle, can't we own up to our responsibility to stop this violence? Can't we own the fact that we are losing a generation of Americans to gun violence?

Every year, over 100,000 people are shot in America, more than 30,000 of them fatally. This is a crisis that demands more than a moment of silence from Congress.

With every mass shooting, we hear every excuse in the book for inaction: it is a family problem; it is a mental health issue; it is a people problem. Apparently, it is everything but a gun problem. At this point, even our excuses are tired.

Let me share some headlines from my hometown this week:

From Sunday's Chicago Tribune, ''Man Killed, 4 Injured in Shootings'';

Monday, CBS Chicago, ''One Dead, 11 Wounded in Weekend Shootings Across Chicago'';

Tuesday, Chicago Sun Times, ''Man and Woman Shot Near Douglas Park on West Side'';

Wednesday, Chicago Tribune, ''One Dead, Eight Wounded in Shootings in Chicago.''

These aren't just headlines. They are deferred dreams and altered realities for countless families. This isn't a Chicago problem, a Newtown problem, or an Oregon problem; it is an American problem.

Today, gun deaths are on pace to be the leading cause of death for Americans aged 15 through 24, not because our kids are leaving the home front for war, but because the home front is becoming a war zone. It is because military-style weapons are flooding our streets. It is because Hadiya Pendleton was in the wrong place at the wrong time, even though she had the right to be in the park. It is because Reverend Pinckney held Bible study, and a journalist and cameraman in Virginia woke up and did their job. It is because a couple of teens wanted to see an Amy Schumer movie.

We have had no votes on legislation to stop this. Mr. Speaker, for all the talk about needing to improve our mental health system, we have yet to take a single vote on a comprehensive mental health bill.

I have had multiple bills that will reduce gun violence; but the simplest one, H.R. 224, will require the Surgeon General to submit to Congress a report on the public health impact of gun violence.

Simple, right? After all, we can't have a conversation about gun violence without data on the death and disability it causes, its mental health effects, its community impact, and its economic costs. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has no appetite for conversations about gun violence. After all, there are A ratings to protect.

The American people are tired, tired of their representatives paying lip-service to tragedies they were elected to help prevent. They are tired of their peace of mind being held hostage by those we should be preventing from ever getting their hands on a gun in the first place.

I am calling everyone out here today. You have talked the talk; it is time to walk the walk. You say that you want to save lives, then do it.

Where is the background check legislation that 90 percent of Americans support, including NRA members?

Bring my bill, H.R. 224, up for a vote, and let the Surgeon General see if gun violence is a threat to public health, which I know it is. Show that you care. Stop pivoting. Stop punting. Start leading.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION ACT

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a lighter note, a very positive note because I represent a very beautiful and positive part of the United States: the central coast of California. This is a place where you hear the towns of Santa Cruz, Monterey, Pacific Grove, the beautiful fertile Salinas Valley, and the magnificent Big Sur coastline, which this poster here shows a photograph of.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the House of Representatives, 50 years ago, passed marvelous legislation called the Highway Beautification Act, and that act came about because the States were ruining the aesthetics of America. It was a bill that First Lady Lady Bird Johnson so much supported. In fact, it became known as Lady Bird's bill.

So 50 years ago, this House of Representatives took a bold move to protect and improve our scenic highways. Why are those important?

We sell scenery where I live. This is another picture of a scenic highway in the South, in the Southern States. When you drive through these, you don't see any billboards, you don't see the urban clutter, or, as my friend Ansel Adams said: ''You don't see the urban acne that is covering our roads.''

It is Big Business that we are fighting, because the billboard lobby in the United States is very powerful. It was powerful then, but the First Lady was more powerful.

I have a personal story in that because my father, who was in the California State Senate, authored the first legislation to create the California Scenic Highway Program. In 1966, this time of the year, Lady Bird Johnson came all the way to California, not to campaign for a Governor or United States Senator, but to recognize the work that my father, State Senator Fred Farr, had done by dedicating Highway 1 in California, the Big Sur highway, as California's first State scenic highway and perhaps the first State scenic highway in the United States. It was a great day.

What Congress did is they ensured that States would be able to have money to enforce this billboard ban. They would give them more money if they would incorporate in their State, county, and city laws billboard bans.

Now, we have a $7 billion industry out there, the outdoor advertising industry, and it has been fighting highway beautification for over 50 years. They have been unsuccessful at repealing the Federal law, but they have made incredible progress in being able to find exemptions for it.

They have prevented the 10 percent penalty that States would receive for not adopting highway beautification. They have encouraged localities to change zoning laws in rural areas, calling them commercial or industrial or anything to bypass the act. And they have been able to loosen the rules on repairing old signs, allowing them to remain forever rather than being torn down.

We now have approximately 700,000 billboards in the United States, and yet this is a country that will be celebrating its 100th anniversary of our National Park System. We advertise around the world: ''Come to beautiful America. See the scenery of America.'' In many places in America, all you see is billboard scenery.

So as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of this act—which is not well

known in Congress, nor in the country, yet is a very significant act because of what it did to empower States and local communities to have the ability to prevent billboards from going up and giving them funds for taking them down and to make sure that people are sensitive to why this is important for our scenery—let's recommit to strengthening the program.

As I said, we sell scenery. We sell watchable wildlife. The economy of the central coast depends on the beauty. As long as the beauty is there, people are going to come to the Carmels and Pacific Groves and Montereys, where California history began.

People are spending more money on watchable wildlife. More people are watching wildlife in America than watch all of the sports combined. It is an unbelievable figure: of all the sports, all the football, all the baseball, all the hockey, basketball, you name it, more people look at wildlife.

So let's protect what is really unique to America, something that God gave us and only we can destroy. These hundreds of thousands of signs are robbing America of its scenic view, of its iconic images that once defined the open road.

I would like to quote Ogden Nash, who summed it up wonderfully in a poem, ''Song of the Open Road'':

I think that I shall never see,
A billboard as lovely as a tree.
Indeed, unless the billboards fall,
I will never see a tree at all.

Let's help protect America's beauty. Let's ban billboards.

GTMO TRANSFERS TO COLORADO

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Obama administration's announcement last week that the President is considering transferring detainees held at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, into my home State of Colorado.

Closing Guantanamo Bay was an ill-advised campaign promise in 2007 made by the President, a promise made before he began receiving classified intelligence updates.

In fact, as of March 2015, the Director of National Intelligence reported that 29 percent of detainees released from Guantanamo have engaged in or were suspected of engaging in terrorist or insurgent activity. Those who remain in Guantanamo are ''worst of the worst.'' So it is safe to presume that, if released, an even higher percentage of them will remain a threat to our national security.

I struggle to understand why we would close the Guantanamo Bay detention camp only to finance the incarceration of enemy combatants within the United States.

Ever since 2012, Congress has passed and President Obama has signed annual restrictions against the transfer of prisoners at GTMO to the United States. The same restrictions are found in the FY 2016 National Defense Authorization Act passed by the House last week, despite President Obama's promise to veto that bill.

There is broad bipartisan opposition to President Obama's plans to transfer GTMO prisoners into the United States, both among Members of Congress and the American people.

For our Nation's security, I implore President Obama to sign the National Defense Authorization Act when it reaches his desk and halt his reckless plan to place many of the world's worst terrorists on U.S. soil, where they will have all of the due process protections provided to the American people and, thus, could be released through our court system.

CRISPUS ATTUCKS MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the 1955 Crispus Attucks men's basketball team, the first all-African American high school athletic team to win a championship, not only in the great Hoosier State, but in the United States.

Although the school was initially constructed out of pressure to segregate Indianapolis high schools, Crispus Attucks High School quickly became a source of pride for the African American community in Indianapolis and across the great Hoosier State.

However, despite its historic championship victory, the Crispus Attucks High School basketball team did not receive the praise and recognition traditionally bestowed upon previous State champions.

After its win, the team took the traditional ride on a fire truck from Butler Fieldhouse to Monument Circle in downtown Indianapolis, but the team was not allowed to get off the truck at the Circle for the traditional photo sessions. Instead, the fire truck took one more lap and then headed back into the city's Black neighborhood.

□ 1030

Now, Mr. Speaker, 60 years later I stand along all Hoosiers to recognize these men for their trailblazing efforts in bringing our city together through high school sports. Their win was a major first step for African American athletes across our country, breaking the barriers of segregation and setting the stage for the diversity that we see today.

Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleague in the Senate, Senator JOE DONNELLY, to give these men the recognition they deserve. It is long overdue, but I hope it helps to bring some attention to their amazing accomplishments.

I ask that my colleagues join us today in recognizing the 1955 Crispus Attucks men's basketball team and thank them for bringing tremendous pride to the citizens of Indianapolis and to people of all races across our great country.

ZADROGA ACT REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could count how many times Members of Congress have come to this floor about the need to ''never forget'' September 11, 9/11, its victims, and our first responders.

Members have offered resolutions, have given speeches, have come to the floor with shocking images that are already seared into our minds forever. Through it all, we hear this refrain of ''never forget.'' I know I will never forget. I will never forget the friends and the family member I lost that day.

I have constituents who will never forget. They will never forget the phone call they may have received that day of a loved one lost or the neighbor they saw for the very last time. When I visit a firehouse in Woodside, in Maspeth, in Sunnyside in Queens, or in Throgs Neck in the Bronx, I know they will never forget.

I also know this is not just about my constituents, not just about my city of New York, not just about my State of New York, but this is about the United States of America. I know that Americans will never forget the days, the weeks, the months spent, by the men and women who worked on the pile, trying to rescue and save lives, the recovery, and the eventual cleanup efforts that took place in Lower Manhattan.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the only people I believe who seem in danger of forgetting are my colleagues right here in the House of Representatives. That is the only explanation I can give for why they let the James Zadroga 9/11 Health Act expire last week.

They are forgetting the promise that this Congress, that our country, made to these first responders, the survivors, and other volunteers in the days that followed September 11.

We all made a promise to them that they would not be left behind, they would not be ignored, left to fend for themselves. It took far too long for the Zadroga Act to become a law in the first place.

Those are difficult years to have to keep telling 9/11 heroes: Just wait a little longer. We will get there. But, eventually, we did get it done because it was the right thing to do.

It would be easy for my colleagues to shrug their shoulders and say they did their part, to think that we have wiped our hands of the entire issue. But the need is still there. The pain and the suffering are still there. So we must act and we must act now.

A few weeks ago hundreds of first responders came to Washington, D.C.,

from all over the country—not just New York—who were affected by 9/11 to look Members of Congress in the eye and ask them to renew this worthy program. They had meetings. They held press conferences. They even brought a celebrity spokesperson to draw attention to their cause.

Toward the end of the day, one gentleman said that he probably wouldn't be coming back to push Congress on this issue in the future. Now, I wish that none of them would have to come back because we would be able to tell them that we took action and permanently established this program.

But the reason he is not going to be coming back is because he has stage 4 cancer, stage 4 cancer as a result of his work on the pile, looking for his friends. He may not be coming back at all. That is what this is about. That is who we are talking about.

Every day first responders, cleanup workers, and volunteers are struggling with health conditions caused by the effects of the attack of 9/11. They have doctors' appointments, tests, treatments, chemotherapy.

And they can't do it alone. That is why we put this program in place in the first place, to help those who can't do it alone, to not just thank them for their service, but to give back to them what they have given to us.

These heroes should be thanked every day for what they have done. They deserve our thanks. They deserve to be honored and applauded and to have floor speech after floor speech given in their name.

But they deserve more than just words. They deserve action by this House, action that we must—not just should—but we must take to ensure that this program will continue to be there for those who need it.

Our heroes deserve better. We hear a lot about ''never forget.'' I want to suggest that we never use the term ''never forget'' here on the floor, ''never forget 9/11,'' until we pass a permanent extension of the James Zadroga Health Act.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am sick to my stomach this morning because we have just witnessed the 45th school shooting this year. There have been more than 294 mass shootings this year, and we have only had 272 days this year.

I am not going to stand for another moment of silence on this floor unless it is joined with meaningful action. It is a hollow gesture to act like we care for these families when the truth is we don't care enough to act.

Twenty-six times since Sandy Hook we have paused on this floor, we have paused to give our prayers and our sympathy to the families who have lost loved ones. But what are we doing for the next set of families that are going to lose loved ones?

We are going to do nothing, absolutely nothing. In fact, we create more credibility in the fictionalized ''death panels'' than we do about the actual deaths of innocent schoolchildren, college students, and moviegoers.

This is the truth: In America, more preschoolers are shot dead each year than police officers killed in the line of duty. Ninety-two Americans are shot to death each and every day. Ninety-two will be shot to death today. Do we care enough to do anything?

If there were that many people dying each day due to terrorism, disease, faulty consumer products, you bet we would do something, but not when it comes to guns. When it comes to guns, we can only muster enough to stand up on this floor and be silent. What a tragedy.

Our inaction means we are willing to let thousands of our fellow citizens die so we can prop up the myth that gun violence measures, which the Supreme Court has ruled ironclad under the Constitution, will somehow undermine the Second Amendment.

By refusing to adopt the mental health and background check measures supported by 90 percent of the population and 74 percent of NRA members, we are doing the bidding of the NRA lobbyists and the gun manufacturers. We are not standing side by side with the victims of Umpqua and Charleston and Sandy Hook. We are shrugging and saying, ''Eh, stuff happens.''

Stuff does not just happen. As you can see on this chart, gun violence is dramatically down in States that have passed strong gun violence prevention laws. You can see the trends in other industrialized countries that have reacted wisely to gun violence.

Australia had 13 mass shootings over 18 years. But then they put in strong laws to protect against gun violence, and they haven't had one mass shooting since then.

In Canada and Norway, also, they tightened their gun laws in the wake of mass shootings, and gun violence rates are a fraction today of what they were. These countries are our closest allies. They are not Fascist regimes. If they can do it, we can do it.

We need to make mental health reporting laws universal and enforce the ones already on the books. It is shameful that eight States have no mental health reporting laws and 13 States have submitted fewer than 100 mental health records each to the national background check system.

By the way, Senate Majority Whip JOHN CORNYN says that his measure is the solution. He has even introduced his own bill, but he and his Caucus have declined to advance it.

We have to make background checks universal by closing the gun show loophole and the loophole for online sales. These loopholes allow criminals, drug abusers, and mentally ill people who are already banned from having guns to get guns. Finally, we need to lift the ban on NIH and CDC research.

Mr. Speaker, I will not stand for another one of these hypocritical moments of silence, but I will stand up for any effort we make to pass sensible and genuine gun safety laws. Lipservice alone is a disservice to these families and the next families who don't want our prayers, but want the lives of their loved ones back.

CALIFORNIA DROUGHT CAUSING SUFFERING

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

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, today I had the opportunity and the honor to represent my district on the Senate side in a committee to talk about water, and it was to talk about the bill that we passed off this House floor just a few months ago back in June. Obviously, I was very excited to move that forward and excited to see the debate move forward. This is something that I think we need to talk about a little bit more here on the floor, not just in the Senate because I think people need to remember what we are talking about.

I had this picture taken just last week in my district. When people say a picture is worth a thousand words, you look at this picture, and you try to think of just a few different words that this brings to mind. You see houses here in the background, but you obviously see shacks here. You see a child's stroller, a child's toy, cans of food, a box from one of our local food banks.

These are people who are suffering today. This is in the United States of America. These are people who so many in this body claim to represent, so many in this body talk about, but when we see so many in this body sign letters, speak out in opposition to legislation that could help solve this problem, these people are suffering not because of a lack of the will to work but because we are facing a drought, and also because of legislation, because laws are in place that prevent us from delivering water to these communities.

These are people who want to make a difference. A lot of them might be immigrants. Some of them probably are people born in this country, but they are people that want to achieve the American Dream. A couple weeks ago when the Pope was here, he said so many things that both sides agreed with and some things that both sides disagreed with, but what he said was that every man has the right to work, to earn an honest day's wage. These people are being denied that opportunity.

Just beyond these shacks, you see homes. They look relatively new. You see a business here. You see trucks. Those are all people who have the ability to support themselves, but they are also people who right behind, in their own backyard, that don't have the ability to work that honest day's wage, to supply for their family, to buy new toys for their kids, to actually afford

food that was grown and produced by their own hands. Some of these food products might even be from other countries.

When we have that conversation here about helping the less fortunate, do we just throw money at a problem? Is that what Washington does? Is that what we expect to have here? Is that what builds a great society? Or is it people working hard, providing for their families, educating their next generation on what it is like to actually grow food, what it is actually like to put in a hard day's work, to inspire and actually show what it is to work hard and produce something for yourself?

□ 1045

The pride that comes with earning that paycheck and purchasing that house or purchasing those vehicles or purchasing food for your family is what we want to provide for Americans. That is something that I think every single person—immigrant or American citizen by birth or who has been here for 20 generations, whatever it may be—wants to have, the opportunity to provide for their families and for a better life.

When you look at this picture, it is insane that this is going on today. And when people sign and put their names on or trash legislation that can help solve this problem, I think it is an embarrassment for this House and for this country.

There was water flowing through the delta that we had the opportunity to pump earlier this year. Would it have solved all of our problems? No, because we are in a drought. But there was still some water there. We missed out on that opportunity because of laws that are in place today.

These people don't have to be in this position. These people don't have to live like this. Their children do not have to live in those shacks and play with their toys outside of their home. Think of what type of society allows this to happen, by allowing legislation or laws to take effect that have done nothing to actually protect the species they claim to protect, as that species continues to be in decline. We see what is going on here and how it does nothing for these people.

We talk about the environment. Is this an environment to raise a family? How are these children going to be successful in school? I have got three young children of my own. I have nieces and nephews. I would never, ever want to see this happen to them, and I would never want them to see this happen to their friends.

This is something that is happening today because of the laws that this building protects. And we have got to continue to fight and we have got to continue to work together so that we can deliver solutions that actually help these people have that American Dream, just like the rest of us want for our children.

Today, at the end of my speech to a Senate committee, I invited the Senators to come take some time and meet with some of these folks or see what it is like to actually live like this. I extend that invite to every Member of this House, especially those who speak out in opposition to legislation that can help prevent things like this from happening.

I want them to come, knock on these doors, and talk to these people and see what they want more than anything. Do they want a handout or do they want the ability to produce and to provide for their families and show their children what the next generation should do, which is work hard and help build that American Dream for all of us?

I want every single person who speaks out in opposition to take a good, hard look at this and see what we have created in the United States unless we speak up and do what is right: pass legislation that can help solve this problem so we can deliver water for these families, for these farmers, for our communities, and do what is right for our Nation and do what is right for the American people.

HONORING OUR WWII MERCHANT MARINERS ACT OF 2015

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, words cannot explain the singular honor it is to stand in the well of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today on a mission of mercy. I believe a brief vignette can best explain what a mission of mercy is as I apply it to the circumstances for which I rise.

Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress, I served for more than a quarter of a century as a judge of a small claims justice court. I can remember an occasion when a mother testified on behalf of her son. Her appeal to me was along these lines. She said: Judge, I am not asking you for justice. I know he was wrong. But he is my son. I know he was wrong. I am not asking for justice. I am asking you for mercy. You have within your power to do justice or you can grant mercy, and I beg that you grant mercy to my son.

That was her hue and cry.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I rise today, I rise in support of H.R. 563, sponsored by the Honorable JANICE HAHN. I rise in support of this legislation, which is the Honoring Our WWII Merchant Mariners Act of 2015.

This bill would establish the Merchant Marine Equity Compensation Fund. It would accord each person who served between certain dates—December 7, 1941, through December 31, 1946—a sum of $25,000.

Why should they receive the $25,000? Well, Mr. Speaker, when they served in World War II, they were not accorded the benefits other members of the various Armed Forces were. In fact, it took litigation to bring them under the purview of benefits that the other members of the Armed Forces have received and are now receiving.

It was in 1988 that they finally, after litigation, received these benefits, but the benefits were not applied retroactively. As a result of them not being applied retroactively, some of them didn't receive GI Bill benefits. They didn't receive home loans. Many of them, still alive, can be compensated if we grant mercy.

I know that there are those who would say that they already received their just compensation as a result of the litigation and as a result of being brought within the purview of the laws that allow them to receive certain benefits, but they didn't get them retroactively.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, they served honorably. As a matter of fact, approximately 9,500 of them died in service. They served their country. They bled the same blood as others when they were attacked and assaulted and when they lost limbs and their lives.

They are Americans, Mr. Speaker. And I believe we should show some mercy to these Americans. We ought to accord them the opportunity to have these benefits because they were willing to risk their lives so that we could have the quality of life that we have today.

So I make this hue and cry and appeal. I base it upon mercy, not justice. The arguments can be made as to whether just compensation has been accorded; but I believe that, if we show mercy, we will do the right thing for people who have done the right thing for their country.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

During these contentious and unsettling days during which an important transition is taking place within the House, we ask Your presence in this assembly.

Imbue each Member with confidence that they are called not to be successful in any one pursuit but, rather, faithful to the pursuit of the welfare of

the United States and faithfulness to its Constitution as they have taken oaths to do.

May they, with confidence, use their abilities to best perform their duties and obligations.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. MCNERNEY 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 SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution providing for corrections to the enrollment of the bill H.R. 1735.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 623. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Department of Homeland Security to establish a social media working group, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 32. An act to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and for other purposes.

S. 2162. An act to establish a 10-year term for the service of the Librarian of Congress.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1301

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of October being Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Domestic violence affects people across the Nation, including one in four women and one in seven men who have suffered severe physical violence.

In my district, I want to recognize the efforts of the Clothesline Project, an initiative which features T-shirts decorated by domestic violence survivors. In preparation for Domestic Violence Awareness Month, people from across the Clarion County, Pennsylvania, area have participated in this project, decorating shirts which were displayed during last Saturday's Autumn Leaf Parade in Clarion.

Mr. Speaker, this is such an important effort because last year 97 people died as a result of domestic violence in Pennsylvania. It is a wide age range. In fact, one was an infant.

I appreciate the efforts of the Clothesline Project and all the nonprofit and community organizations across my district working to bring attention to this critical issue.

RECOGNIZING 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF PHINEAS BANNING HIGH SCHOOL

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 90th anniversary of Phineas Banning High School in Wilmington. It was named after General Phineas Banning, known as the ''Father of the Port of Los Angeles,'' thus the school's mascot, the Pilots.

Banning has earned a reputation as an athletic powerhouse. The Pilots hold the title for the second-most CIS championships in the entire city of Los Angeles.

Over the past 90 years, Banning High School hasn't lost sight of its core mission: to educate the young people of Wilmington and to prepare them for their future.

It is an impressive alumni that have gone on to be NFL stars, Olympic athletes, actors, CEOs, scientists, and educators. Many of my friends and members of my staff went to Banning High School. They can trace lifelong friendships and some of their fondest memories to their time there.

Tomorrow night Banning will celebrate its milestone at its homecoming football game against the San Pedro Pirates. Both schools are in my district, however; so, I am not taking sides. But I want to wish both teams good luck and wish the Pilots a happy 90th birthday.

LIFTING THE CRUDE OIL BAN

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

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of lifting the ban on crude oil exports. It means jobs, 500,000 to 1 million jobs across the country and 2,400 jobs in Montana, with a revenue of at least $120 million.

As a former Navy SEAL commander, I understand the importance of national security. I do not want this Nation to be reliant on foreign energy sources and be held hostage by foreign countries for our energy needs.

It has been a longstanding policy of this country to be energy independent, and lifting the crude oil ban is part of that.

Lowering gas prices: All estimates look at lowering the gas prices by 1.5 to 13 cents a gallon. That is real savings to every American family.

I urge the Senate to take this up. This is not a partisan issue. This is not a Republican or a Democrat issue. This is a national security issue. So I ask the Senate to take it up. I am confident it will come out of the House in numbers that are bipartisan.

Anyone who votes against releasing the ban—there is only one country on the face of the planet that has a ban on crude oil, and that is here. Even Iraq and Iran can export their crude.

ENDING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week we experienced the 45th school shooting in 2015. Nearly 10,000 people have been killed by guns this year alone; yet, too many leaders respond with absolute indifference. They tell us that ''stuff happens,'' that we should just move on.

Are the 20 kids killed at Sandy Hook Elementary School just stuff happening? Are the 32 murdered at Virginia Tech just stuff happening? Are the 12 people gunned down in the Aurora, Colorado, movie theater just stuff happening? What about the 9 people killed at Umpqua Community College on Friday?

This stuff has real costs to families, to friends, to our whole community, to our country. It does not have to happen.

Let's make gun trafficking in illegal weapons a Federal felony and have universal background checks.

Let's end the moments of silence on the floor and have, instead, votes on the floor to end gun violence.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Violence against women is not a partisan problem. It is an American problem. So it demands a bipartisan solution.

As a father, son, and husband, to me, this issue is about protecting families, plain and simple. Unfortunately, debate in Washington is often dominated by the same tired politics, divisive rhetoric, and by the misguided notion that some issues are just too tough to take on.

We can't allow this gridlock to stop us from working to ensure that every woman feels safe and every child lives free from fear.

That is why I helped introduce the Zero Tolerance for Domestic Abusers Act. This bill is a commonsense solution to bring Federal law in line with over 30 States that already have protections in place to keep guns out of the hands of abusers, to protect families, and to curb domestic abuse by preventing domestic violence from becoming domestic murder.

Together, we can make our country safer, which is why I encourage my colleagues to join me on this important legislation, supporting safety and security for all Americans.

HONORING DOLORES HUERTA FOR A LIFETIME OF SERVICE AND THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF HER BIRTH

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise during this Hispanic Heritage Month to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dolores Huerta for a lifetime of service and honor her on the 85th anniversary of her birth.

Living in Stockton, California, she witnessed the unjust exploitation and suffering of migrant workers. Refusing to stay silent in the face of brutal working conditions, Dolores joined Cesar Chavez to co-found what is now United Farm Workers, the leading advocacy voice for the migrant community.

Dolores' actions were essential to pass the 1975 California Agricultural Labor Relations Act. Her tenacity is captured in the resonating chant, ''Si, Se Puede'' that still gives voice to today's civil rights movement.

In 2012, Dolores received the distinguished Presidential Medal of Freedom. She continues to organize communities to fight for social justice as president of the Dolores Huerta Foundation.

For her lifetime of service, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dolores Huerta.

LIFTING THE CRUDE OIL BAN

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 702, to lift the outdated ban on U.S. crude oil exports.

This 40-year-old ban was enacted during the time of oil scarcity in the 1970s in an effort to preserve domestic oil reserves and discharge foreign imports. Today the ban is driving up the price at the pump while discouraging American energy independence.

The United States is now the largest oil producer in the world, producing more barrels per day than Saudi Arabia or Russia, but we cannot take full advantage of this strength without the ability to export crude oil as the boom in domestic oil production has surpassed the ability for our domestic refiners to process crude oil for export.

The ban on crude oil exports was created in reaction to market conditions at the time. These conditions no longer exist. While the President is opening up oil markets for Iran with a nuclear agreement, U.S. oil producers should have the same access to the global market.

It is time to lift the ban on crude oil exports. I urge my colleagues to support lifting the crude oil ban.

HONORING THE LATE ALMA BEATTY OF NEWARK

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Alma Beatty, a longtime vice president of Community Affairs at Newark Beth Israel Medical Center who passed away earlier this year.

Ms. Beatty was born in Newark, New Jersey, and became one of the city's most beloved citizens through her 45 years of service at ''The Beth.''

Under Ms. Beatty's leadership, ''The Beth'' became a model of excellence in protecting the most vulnerable among us. Thanks to her vision, ''The Beth'' instituted a number of community service programs that continue to this day, including Adopt a Child Christmas Program.

Last month, I had the honor of participating in a ceremony to change the name of Newark's Osborne Terrace to ''Alma Beatty Way.'' It is a fitting recognition to Ms. Beatty's contributions to the city of Newark, the county of Essex, the State of New Jersey, and the United States of America.

To Ms. Beatty's family I send my thoughts and prayers and continued love for the work that she has done in our community.

RECOGNIZING JERRY HARTZ FOR HIS OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE CONGRESS

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the leadership of a consummate civil servant, a skilled strategist and an astute adviser for his outstanding service to the Congress for the better of three decades, a proud son of Iowa who is deeply dedicated to our country, to advancing the Democratic agenda on the House floor, and to strengthening our democracy, an exemplary professional whom I have had the privilege to have on my staff for the past 13 years. I speak of—respected on both sides of the aisle—Jerry Hartz.

Jerry is a master of House rules and parliamentary procedure. Over the years, Jerry has managed influential and consequential debates on the House floor. He played a vital role in advancing our Democratic efforts to improve the lives of Americans by moving forward vital legislation.

We simply could not have done without you, Jerry.

On the most challenging and critical legislative issues of our day, Jerry consistently exhibited the wisdom, the creativity, and the fairness needed to improve our world.

Though we will miss his experience and his expertise, I am proud that Jerry will continue to contribute shaping our Nation at the National Democratic Institute.

Thank you to Jerry's wife, Jennifer, who is with us today, and their daughters, Alicia and Evelyn, for sharing Jerry with us all these years.

Earlier this morning we had a huge number of Members of Congress come pay their respects to Jerry and to Jennifer, a large number of staff from both sides of the aisle who recognize Jerry's sense of fairness.

Thank you, Jerry, for your long and excellent service to the Democratic Caucus, to this House, and the United States Congress and, in doing so, to the United States of America. Thank you for your patriotism and your leadership.

□ 1315

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 538, NATIVE AMERICAN ENERGY ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 702, ADAPTATION TO CHANGING CRUDE OIL MARKETS

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 466 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 466

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant

to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 538) to facilitate the development of energy on Indian lands by reducing Federal regulations that impede tribal development of Indian lands, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-30. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 702) to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-29. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 466 provides for consideration of H.R. 538, the Native American Energy Act, and H.R. 702, which would repeal the ban on exporting crude oil. H. Res. 466 calls for a structured rule which makes in order 12 total amendments, including 7 minority amendments and 2 bipartisan amendments. Both of these bills deal with easing the regulatory burden when it comes to the energy sector.

Being from coastal Alabama, I have a great appreciation for the impact the energy sector has on our economy, and I am a strong supporter of an all-of-the-above approach to energy production. Unfortunately, Washington has a bad habit of putting up costly barriers that make it harder for the energy sector to grow and create new jobs. Today is about getting some of these barriers out of the way and unlocking our Nation's energy potential. One of the bills, the Native American Energy Act, would roll back the overregulation of Indian lands and encourage energy development by Indian tribes and Alaska Native Corporations.

From streamlining duplicative Federal processes to increasing tribal control over natural resource development, this bill includes important reforms to unlock the precious energy resources on tribal land and to allow these tribes to take more control of their energy assets. In fact, a 2015 report from the Government Accountability Office found that ''Indian energy resources hold significant potential for development, but remain largely undeveloped.''

Mr. Speaker, they remain largely undeveloped because the Federal Government is standing in the way. This has resulted in lost revenue for Indian tribes, and it is time we fix this problem.

This commonsense legislation has strong support from tribes across the Nation, including the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, the Intertribal Timber Council, the Navaho Nation, Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota, and the National Congress of American Indians. It is time the Federal Government gets out of the way and allows tribal nations to manage their land how they see fit, without the heavy hand of government getting in the way.

The second bill covered by this rule would end the outdated ban on crude oil exports. The ban was first put in place in 1975 as a response to the Arab oil embargo, but it is clearly no longer necessary, and it is tying our hands both economically and strategically around the world.

Over the last decade, the United States has become the leading producer of oil and natural gas in the world, which is good news for the countless Americans who work in the oil industry, and it is even better news for the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, there is broad, bipartisan support for lifting the 40-year-old ban on crude oil exports. Leading economists, including former Obama economic policy adviser Lawrence Summers, and leading scholars at Harvard University support lifting the ban. Former U.N. Ambassador and Energy Secretary under President Clinton Bill Richardson said that the U.S. needs to export our oil and gas in order to ''help us geopolitically in Eastern Europe against Russia.''

Recently, 135 senior legislative leaders from 40 States and Puerto Rico sent a letter calling on Congress to lift the ban. The letter notes that ''the outdated Federal export restrictions on crude oil and LNG are detrimental to American workers, our collective security, and economic recovery in our States.'' There were three signers of the letter from Mr. HASTINGS' home State of Florida.

Numerous editorial boards around the country, including those at The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Post, The Detroit News, The Denver Post, The Washington Times, and the Houston Chronicle have touted the benefits of ending the ban.

Most notably, 69 percent of American people support lifting this ban. Shouldn't we stand with the American people?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about some of the benefits from lifting the outdated ban.

First, it is estimated that this legislation would create 630,000 additional U.S. jobs by 2019. Lifting the ban would also benefit U.S. manufacturers and boost our GDP.

Second, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that lifting the ban would generate $1.4 billion from oil and gas leases over the next 10 years. That is really a significant number.

Third, the Government Accountability Office found that lifting the ban would lower gas prices by anywhere from 1.5 to 13 cents per gallon. Even President Obama's own Department of Energy found that increased oil exports would help lower gas prices.

Fourth, lifting the ban will allow the United States to help our allies abroad. For example, Russia has continuously used their control over oil to pressure European countries to comply with Russia's wishes. If a country refused, Russia would threaten to cut off their energy supply. By lifting the ban, the United States can begin supporting our allies and, in turn, weaken Russia's grip on many European countries.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that this administration has worked hard to open up oil export capabilities for Iran, yet they are refusing to allow the United States to do so. By allowing Iran to export oil, the President has essentially given the Ayatollah a leg up in the global marketplace, placing the strategic interests of Iran over those of the United States. This is yet another example of the President of the United States standing with the people of Iran and the Ayatollah and not standing up for the people of America. These are four very clear benefits for repealing the ban and unlocking our Nation's energy potential.

Now, the White House has said they believe lifting the oil export ban is a decision that should be made by the Commerce Department, not by Congress. So let me get this straight: The Obama administration would rather unelected, unaccountable Federal bureaucrats at the Department of Commerce make this decision instead of the democratically elected Congress? I think that speaks to a far larger problem with this White House and how they believe our government should work.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, both of these bills are about empowering the American people and getting the government out of the way. These bills both have broad support, and I urge my colleagues to approve this rule. Let's move forward on passing these commonsense bills.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of both H.R. 702, legislation to adapt to the changing crude oil market conditions, and H.R. 538, the Native American Energy Act.

As we have seen time and again in what can only be described as typical Republican fashion, we have again skirted regular order. As a matter of fact, whatever happened to regular order in this institution? It seems to have gone by the boards. Here we are considering two unrelated pieces of legislation under one grab-bag rule.

What is more, instead of striving to roll back environmental protections, we should be working in a bipartisan manner to avoid a government shutdown in December, address the debt ceiling, pass a long-term transportation bill so that we can rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and put Americans back to work, and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, the charter of which Republicans allowed to expire 100 days ago.

Mr. Speaker, the 1973 oil embargo sparked a crisis in our country that continues to influence our energy policies today. H.R. 702, the first of the bills we are debating today, makes significant changes to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, the primary statute for restricting the export of domestically produced crude oil that was enacted in the wake of the embargo.

It goes without saying that the energy situation in the United States is far different today than it was in the 1970s when the oil export ban began. Global crude oil prices fell to 6½-year lows in August. We have such a surplus of oil that the number of rigs drilling for oil in the United States dropped to 614 last week, down from 1,609 last October. Based on these facts, it would behoove us to reexamine this export ban.

□ 1330

But, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 702 unwisely repeals the authority of the President to restrict the export of petroleum products or natural gas and prohibits any Federal official from imposing or enforcing restrictions on the export of crude oil.

Last night in the Rules Committee I asked the question whether President Obama deserves any credit for the lower gas prices. Certainly, when gas prices were higher, he received an awful lot of criticism and blame. It would seem to me that, with the increased number of leases that he has allowed, he should get some credit at least.

Moreover, the bill makes it virtually impossible to limit exports of coal, natural gas, petroleum products, and petrochemical feedstocks. Repealing this authority would eliminate our ability to restrict the export of any of these products.

Lifting this ban would provide a gift to oil companies on top of the decades of lucrative subsidies the industry already receives by the American taxpayers. Enough is enough.

I would also note that the term—and I brought it up in the Rules Committee last night and didn't get a clear answer—the term ''restriction'' is undefined. Let me quote my good friend FRANK PALLONE of New Jersey, the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

He said: Since the term ''restriction'' is undefined, any Federal action that could potentially impede the efficient exploration, production, storage, supply, marketing, pricing, and regulation of energy resources—including fossil fuels—could be considered a restriction.

For instance, an order to shut down a pipeline that has been determined to be a hazard to public safety and the environment under the Pipeline Safety Act could be seen as a restriction.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 538 suffers from similar deficiencies. H.R. 538 has the stated purpose of empowering Native American tribes to utilize and develop energy resources on their lands.

I hesitate because I don't understand what part of sovereignty with reference to Native Americans in this country we do not understand; therefore, they should not have to be here hat in hand about their own resources.

But tribal lands often hold great potential for domestic energy production; yet, tribes often cannot harness the full economic development potential of their natural resources. But this bill tries to solve this problem by undercutting important environmental protections.

In the name of encouraging energy production on tribal lands, this bill severely restricts public involvement and comment on proposed energy projects, prevents the recovery of attorneys' fees in cases challenging these new energy projects, effectively chilling the public's ability to bring bona fide claims to seek judicial redress for environmental harms in their community.

And just for good measure, this legislation blocks any commonsense hydraulic fracturing rules. Instead of undermining the bedrock of our Nation's vital environmental protections, we should focus on real, constructive reforms that will achieve tribal self-determination in energy development without sacrificing commonsense environmental laws.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the esteemed gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 538, the Native American Energy Act.

Mr. YOUNG, my esteemed colleague from Alaska, I commend him on his efforts over the years. This represents a significant step for tribes across the country, especially in my State of Montana.

I have only been in the seat for a few months, and I can tell you that the Federal Government has infringed on the sovereignty of our tribes to develop their own natural resources.

What is sovereignty? Sovereignty is not going through a labyrinth of rules that are far greater than other Federal

lands or State lands. It is not right. It is not right for the Crow people. It is not right for every Indian nation across this land.

The government has infringed. The GAO report examines it and states as much. The Crow tribe, a proud tribe in Montana, wants to be self-sufficient. They want to make sure that they have a prosperous economy and do right by their people; yet, the chairman, Old Coyote, has said a war on coal is a war on the Crow people. And he is right.

There is no better job on the Crow reservation than a coal job. There is no better future than to have access to the 9 billion tons of coal that are locked in the ground that they can't develop and they can't develop in the interest of their own people because the Federal Government is in the way.

This bill doesn't skirt environmental rules or laws. What it does is it streamlines a position, streamlines their sovereignty and their rights, and that is important.

So, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, this is not a Democrat or a Republican issue. This is an American issue, and it is about respect.

I ask all Members to respect the native tribes, respect their right to sovereignty, respect their right for self-determination.

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

Background checks are the first line of defense to keep guns out of the hands of criminals. If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would expand the current background check system to include all commercial sales of firearms.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), my good friend, to discuss our proposal. He is the chair of the House Gun Violence Prevention Task Force.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule today and in support of bringing the bipartisan King-Thompson background check bill to the floor for a vote.

Let me give you some numbers: 278, the number of mass shootings in our country since Newtown; 275, the number of days this Congress has been in session; 16, the number of gun-related moments of silence Congress has held since the start of last year; and 0, the number of votes this body has taken to help prevent or lessen gun violence.

Just a week ago we endured another mass shooting. This time it was nine people at a community college in Oregon. Six weeks ago it was a news reporter and cameraman in Virginia. Five weeks before that it was two people at the movies in Lafayette. Five weeks before that it was a prayer group in Charleston.

Every single time a mass shooting happens we go through the same routine—thoughts and prayers are sent; statements are made; stories are written; moments of silence are held—and nothing changes. No action is taken. No votes are cast.

It has been said that insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. The majority leadership has done nothing over and over again. Predictably, the results have been the same: more innocent lives lost, more families forever changed, and more mass gun violence.

The five Republican coauthors of our background check bill notwithstanding, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have done nothing as mass gun violence has become commonplace. No bills have been brought to the floor. No ideas have been brought to the table. No proposals have even been considered.

You have the majority in the House and in the Senate. You have a White House and a Democratic Caucus willing to work with you. You are presumably here to govern and lead. A big part of that means stepping up when children, students, and families are routinely put in danger.

Gun violence takes the lives of 30-plus Americans every single day. It constitutes a public health emergency that demands action from the public's leaders. We have it in our power to do something. Let's not waste that.

We don't know what laws could have prevented the shooting in Oregon or Virginia or Charleston, but we do know that every day background checks stop more than 170 felons, some 50 domestic abusers, and nearly 20 fugitives from buying a gun. We know they help keep guns from dangerous people, and that saves lives.

This isn't about the Second Amendment. I am a hunter and I am a gun owner. I support the Second Amendment. If the King-Thompson background check bill undermined the rights of gun owners, my name wouldn't be on it.

This is about keeping guns from criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill. It is about taking a simple, commonsense step to keep spouses, kids, and communities safe.

All this bill does is require a background check for people buying a gun online or at a gun show. Why would anyone not want to make sure the people buying guns on the Internet or at a gun show are sane, law-abiding citizens? We do it at licensed dealers, why not for all commercial sales? Why do we want to give criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill a huge loophole through which they can buy guns? It makes no sense.

We can do one of two things here today. We can wait out the new cycle, allow the horror of Oregon to fade into our minds, do nothing, wait for the next tragedy, and then offer thoughts and prayers. That would be nothing new.

It is what the majority did with Newtown. It is what they did with Navy Yard. It is what they did with Isla Vista, Charleston, and Virginia. This time could be different. We could actually pull together and do something to make our country safer.

No legislation will stop every shooting. But passing commonsense gun laws like background checks will at least stop some, and that makes it worth doing. Don't sit here and let America's new normal become mass gun violence followed by thoughts and prayers, but no action. We are here to govern. This is happening on our watch, and it is within our power to save some lives. Let's do it.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), who is a tireless advocate for the energy interests of his State of Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, let's look at the facts. I support this rule and I support the underlying legislation, H.R. 702, which would lift the ban on oil exports for this country.

The United States is the only oil-producing country that has a self-imposed ban, and it makes no sense. It doesn't fit within our own views of open trade, open energy markets.

Why did this come about? It came about because in the 1970s we moved into an age of scarcity with regard to energy. Our producers could not keep up with demand.

American innovation, American technology, has solved that. Now we have moved into an era of abundance. This is a time where we can actually change the entire landscape of energy security not only for the United States, but also for our allies, and reap major economic benefit by lifting the ban.

When we came out of the recession, energy jobs helped lift us out of that recession. The shale revolution was a major factor. What we are seeing now with slack demand and the abundance and a lot of oil sitting that is not being used in refineries has caused slacking in prices and job loss.

We can reverse that by lifting the ban and giving American producers access to the market, just like everybody else that produces oil. Why should the Iranians be able to sell oil on the open market and we have a self-imposed ban on American energy producers? It makes no sense at all.

Secondly, if we lift the ban, this is a first and necessary step, I believe, in building out a whole new energy strategy for the United States that leads to an American view, an American imprint, on energy security, not a Russian and not an OPEC view of this.

Why? Because we embrace open markets, we embrace diversity of sources, we embrace transparency and pricing. That is what we want. Lifting the ban is that first step.

□ 1345

Thirdly, if we couple this with building out more pipelines that help us integrate the Mexican energy market and the Canadian, the North American area can clearly take care of all of our domestic demands collectively and have plenty to export.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, this will then move us in a position of dominating energy strategy globally, putting OPEC and Russia on the defense. They cannot keep up with American energy producers. They don't have the innovation; they don't have the technology; and they are running budget deficits that are harmful to their countries. They will have to change, and we will dominate the energy sector.

Further, if we integrate this with our trade policies, we then start to eliminate the abusive practices that national oil companies perpetrate and put American open-market companies, multinational companies, back in the driver's seat. But we also help American producers and producers in my home State of Louisiana, small companies that are suppliers, small companies that provide the services: the boat companies, the maritime companies that help facilitate all of this.

This is about job creation. This is about American energy production; it is about American energy security; and it is about having leverage in our foreign policy. That is why I support this first step of lifting this ban on crude exports.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding, I would like to speak very briefly about process, because a lot of times people don't understand that the base bill that we are discussing today, the two rules, the process allows the minority an opportunity to present a motion. One is a motion to recommit. One of the parts of that process that we are discussing here today has to do with gun violence. Mr. THOMPSON, who just spoke about it eloquently, I add to what he had to say.

Here in Washington, D.C., in the last 6 days, five people have been killed by guns. In Chicago and in my hometown and around this Nation, in addition to the mass killings, there have been a number of killings.

David Satcher was Surgeon General of the United States from 1998 to 2002. In the year of 2000, he was the first person that I know that raised publicly the fact that we have a gun violence epidemic in this country. There were people that wanted to run him out of office because of that. We need to pay attention.

For the purpose of discussing this further, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY), someone who has had a real experience with gun violence.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and in support of the opportunity to vote for commonsense, bipartisan gun violence prevention legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I represent Newtown, Connecticut; and on December 14, 2012, almost 3 years ago, 20 precious children and 6 dedicated educators were ripped from us by gun violence.

After Newtown, America said ''never again.'' But just 2 days ago, we observed another moment of silence in this House, this time for the community of Roseburg, Oregon.

As with every other mass shooting since Newtown, families and first responders in my district are retraumatized. In fact, by my count, we have held 16 moments of silence on the House floor to honor those Americans taken from us by gun violence since the tragedy at Sandy Hook. Sixteen times we in this House have come together and bowed our heads in silence and then refused to do anything substantial to prevent gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, we can and we must do better. We must be allowed a vote on the bipartisan bill that will close background check loopholes and save lives.

Ninety percent of Americans support background checks. Background checks keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people. That is why every gun purchase should be allowed only after a successful background check.

We are not dealing with a natural disaster. This is not an earthquake. This crisis is manmade, and it is up to us to take action to save lives.

The time has passed for moments of silence. We need hours of action. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote today to bring the bipartisan background check to the House floor.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentleman from Florida said at the beginning was inaccurate. He said that we brought two things together in this rule that are not related to one another. They are. They are both related to energy production in this country, and that is what the rule is about.

Now, I am standing here today as the grandson of a man who was shot and killed by someone who was mentally ill in 1920. I know the importance of that issue. I know what it means to families who have been victimized by it. There may be a day and a time for us to have this debate, but it is not today.

Today, we are talking about the energy security of our country. Today, we are here to talk about freeing up the American economy and freeing up domestic producers so that they can sell their product abroad, as we are now going to allow Iran to sell their product abroad. I would like for us to get back to the debate on energy. That is what we are here today about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman doesn't have the prerogative of what the minority has, and that is an opportunity to offer a motion to recommit.

He is correct that there are two bills that are being brought here in this grab-bag rule, but if he says that today is not the day for us to discuss gun violence, then I want to ask him: What day is it that we are supposed to discuss gun violence? People are being killed all over this Nation, and we have an epidemic, and we are constantly not doing anything about it. If it is not today, when? And if it is not us, who?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), my distinguished colleague and good friend.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I agree with my colleague. If not now, when? We have been asking that for many, many generations.

Because of the mass shootings, American families are demanding Congress to act. They want action, but Congress has not heard any bills. They refuse to hear them. There is nothing. There is no opportunity to have the light of day or to have some transparency to it.

The last meaningful gun violence prevention bill was in 1994, and that was the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act.

Shootings, as was pointed out, are now an everyday occurrence. It is commonplace, so people are becoming numb, except for those who are immediately affected and are asking us to move and pass legislation, give it the light of day, discuss it, bring it up, start some methodology to be able to understand what this House is looking at doing for our American people, for our children, and for our families.

Now, collective action, we need it. Transparent discussion is necessary and much needed. Enough of skirting this issue. What is more important, gas and oil or the lives of human beings?

Keep guns away from people that should not have them and/or would use them to harm others.

H.R. 1217 mandates universal background checks for all purchases. It is a step in the right direction. It would move our country forward in beginning the process of addressing this epidemic that we are facing.

We need real, constructive legislation. We need to prevent and lessen violence. We must keep guns out of the hands of people who should not have access to them, such as the dangerously mentally ill. Now, domestic abusers and people with violent histories also should not have access to them, and they currently do.

Now, without stigmatizing those with mental illness because then you have a problem on your hands, we need to inform, educate, and help young people, families, and educators. We need to help those who are exhibiting emotional disturbances and help them

learn how to access information and assistance.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to disrespect in any way the minority's opportunity that they have, but I did come here to talk about the energy bills.

I chose to go last on this side because I would like to address some of the thoughtful concerns that were raised by Mr. HASTINGS from Florida. I call them concerns because I didn't hear real objections. I think they are legitimate concerns that some people have had, and they deserve discussion. We are talking about the rule here.

He made a suggestion that somehow this lifting of the oil export ban bill, H.R. 702, takes the President's prerogative away to deal with a situation at all costs or in every situation. The reality is it does reserve a right for the President to reinstate the ban in some sort of an emergency. I want to make sure that that is clarified.

I also want to clarify that he mentioned we are not in regular order, and perhaps he is referring to the Native American Energy Act. I know we have had a couple of hearings since I have been in Congress on that, perhaps not this Congress. I don't know. I am not on that committee.

I can tell you that the Energy and Commerce Committee has had a hearing on H.R. 702, and two other committees have had hearings on similar bills: the Agriculture Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee. So this has been a thoroughly vetted issue. In fact, with the admonition of Speaker BOEHNER, we really did take a long time with this issue to help educate one another, those of us from energy States. So I do think we have had a thorough debate on the topic, and I think it is time to have this discussion.

Coming from North Dakota, I just want to tell you that I come from a State that, prior to the energy revolution, or the Bakken revolution, the shale revolution, we were experiencing outmigration and low personal per capita income. Today, we have the second highest personal per capita income in the country. We can't accept people fast enough to deal with the jobs that are available. We are at a bit of a standstill right now because we are overproducing light sweet crude in this country, which is the type of crude that the global markets are demanding, but our domestic markets, because of our refining capacity, are not.

This is the time to lift this ban, and this is the body to do it. I hope we can get to it this afternoon.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding, I would like to correct myself.

When I spoke, I spoke about the minority's right for a motion to recommit, which indeed we do have; but in this particular instance, it is the minority's right to offer up the previous question, and that is what we are proceeding under.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), a gentleman I have known a very long time in this institution and care greatly about, a very thoughtful Member.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and in protest to the Republican leadership's failure to bring commonsense legislation to the floor to stem our Nation's tide of gun violence.

In the wake of seemingly endless mass shootings, Americans of all backgrounds and diverse political beliefs are urging elected officials to stop merely wringing our hands and actually do something that protects our communities.

One measure that has virtually unanimous support is background checks to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill. The problem is that our current background check system is rife with loopholes: background checks are not required at gun shows; they are also not required when individuals purchase weapons online.

The bipartisan King-Thompson background checks bill would close these egregious loopholes. It is an entirely sensible reform that would have a measurable impact on the safety of our schools and neighborhoods without preventing law-abiding citizens from using guns for self-defense or for recreational purposes.

I wholeheartedly reject the defeatist notion that we cannot do anything about our Nation's gun violence. I ask my colleagues: How much longer must we wait? How many more people have to die to get our attention? How many more American towns and cities must be added to the growing list of places like Columbine, Aurora, Charleston, and Newtown?

In the last 3 years, we have had some 20 moments of silence here on the House floor to honor victims of gun violence in the United States. Moments of silence are not enough. Thoughts and prayers are not enough. We need action, and I call on my colleagues to bring the background checks bill to the floor for a vote and to do it now.

□ 1400

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my good friend and a former member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago I was here for a moment of silence on behalf of the 12 killed and the 70 injured in the Aurora movie theater. Since that time, we have had at least 55 mass shootings where four or more people were killed and we have had at least 22 moments of silence.

How many more senseless acts of violence and hatred must occur before we stand up and take action? How many more young, bright lives are going to be cut short because of loopholes in the law? How many more times must we stand on this floor in moments of silence, solemnly remembering another victim? How many more times must the flags be lowered at half staff in honor of servicemembers gunned down in their own backyard?

As important as these moments of reflection are, they happen with such regularity, we become numb to their significance. When will this violence end? Why is it we are paralyzed by the very laws that are meant to protect us?

It is incumbent upon us, as Members of Congress, to act and protect our citizens from unnecessary gun violence. I appreciated the gentleman from Alabama mentioning the violence that his own family has experienced.

It is time for a dialogue in the spirit of civility and compassion, bringing all Americans together to have a discussion about peace and safety in our schools, churches, and community centers. We have to begin. We can do this. It requires courage, but we can act to reduce this violence by passing meaningful gun violence prevention legislation that respects the Second Amendment.

Last week I joined 147 other Members of this body in writing to the Speaker, demanding action on gun violence prevention legislation. We demand a vote. Action is needed. I urge the defeat of the rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to advise how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alabama has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), a good friend of mine. He is the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule, and in particular I oppose H.R. 702. Apparently, we have learned nothing over the past 40 years because this bill asks that we forget about oil shortages, oil recessions, and painfully high energy bills.

Do we really believe that the days of $100 per barrel of oil are gone? Do we really believe that our military will never again be called upon to keep vital oil trade routes or production areas open? I wish that were true, but I doubt it.

Until we reduce our dependence on oil, we should retain control over our domestic oil resources. Our Nation is not energy independent. We still use a great deal of oil and other petroleum products.

Our transportation sector is still extremely vulnerable to price increases, whether we are talking about certainly

individual drivers, certainly our airlines or freight companies.

Our manufacturing sector is vulnerable, also. China may now be the largest importer of oil, but we are still the world's largest consumer of oil. This policy is not just about whether we open up trade on another commodity. It is a matter of national security and economic security. It is in our national interest that we can and do export crude oil and refined petroleum products now.

When we export refined products, we gain the extra benefit of jobs in the refining industry as well as those in oil production. This bill eliminates Presidential authority to restrict trade in crude oil.

It allows decisions about oil exports to be made by the oil companies, and they put a higher value on their profits than on our national security, our United States consumers, or our environment.

The oil companies see this window of low global oil prices as the opportunity to lift the ban on crude exports. The advocates for this policy point to the current slowdown in new drilling activity as evidence that our export policy is eliminating jobs in oil production.

The fact remains that oil is a global commodity and the global market price for a barrel of oil is no better than the price here in the United States. When oil is under $50 per barrel, wells that are marginal or with higher costs will be capped until the price rises. That situation will not change by exporting to any already oversupplied global market.

But what happens when Asia's demand for oil increases, as it surely will, and the global price again climbs into the $100 per barrel range? That is an excellent opportunity to sell as much as possible on the global market, a windfall for the oil companies and an economic downturn for us.

This policy change benefits a few of the wealthiest companies on this planet. There is no benefit for consumers. We will put our national security at risk, and certainly jobs and infrastructure in the refining industry and other industries as well will be hurt.

Exports of oil, in fact, and any of our strategically important resources should be in our national interest. Big Oil gets more than their share of subsidy from the United States' taxpayers. They do not need this additional windfall, and consumers and taxpayers cannot—simply cannot—afford to provide it.

I urge you to reject this rule and to oppose H.R. 702.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the gentleman talk, and he was talking about how this might have a negative impact on American consumers with regard to gas prices. I would remind the House that even President Obama's own Department of Energy found that increased oil exports would help lower gas prices.

The gentleman also mentioned what this might do to the security of the United States. A member of President Clinton's Cabinet has said this will enhance the security of the United States by strengthening our hand in Central and Eastern Europe.

I have listened to the gentleman. I respect his views, but I must say that I think the evidence that comes to us from Democratic administrations proves that what he said is really not accurate.

Mr. Speaker, we have no additional speakers. So if the gentleman is prepared to close, he may do so. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My Republican friends argue that these bills will encourage growth and investment in our Nation's energy markets, local communities, and economy and are, therefore, important measures that we must address even as we face a highway trust fund that will become insolvent in a matter of weeks as well as another looming government shutdown in December.

All the while, those same individuals refuse to authorize the Export-Import Bank's charter, an entity that has created and sustained 1.5 million American jobs since 2007 at no cost to the taxpayer.

Passing a responsible budget, delivering on a long-term transportation bill, and reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank will encourage the growth and investment that my friends speak of. The time to deliver on our promises to the American people is long overdue.

I call on House Republicans to stop wasting our time with legislation that rolls back long-held environmental protections—and stand almost certain veto threats—and take up the important measures that I mentioned.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to return to this notion of the previous question with reference to gun violence.

I believe in the Second Amendment. I own a gun. When I was a child, at age 7, I had a Red Ryder BB gun. When I was 12, I had a single-shot .22 rifle. I believe in every citizen's right to own a gun, and I believe my colleagues here on this side believe the same thing.

If every man, woman, and child is accounted for in the estimate of guns that are in this country, that would be more than 330 million. There are some people in our society who believe that somebody is going to come and take their guns. I wonder who that person would be.

Would it be a President of the United States? Would it be the military? Are they going to go and take the guns from their moms, their brothers, their sons, their fathers? That is foolish.

We need to stop this madness. Doing nothing in the face of all of this epidemic violence that we are experiencing allows that not only is this House dysfunctional in many of its particulars, but it is frozen in its indifference to the gun violence in this country.

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

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

American technology is a marvel in the world. We Americans figure out how to solve problems by using technology.

Just a few years ago we were struggling with how we were going to get enough energy into this country from other places, and now, because of the changes to the American people, we figured out the technologies it takes to be able to exploit energy resources right here.

It is almost like a miracle. We get to become energy independent where we won't have to get energy from other places. In fact, we found so much energy that we are in a position where we can export it and benefit our economy and people in America with more jobs.

Now, I have got to tell you something: I am proud to be American for a lot of reasons, but there is a great reason right there.

Our ingenuity solved this problem and created opportunities that we couldn't have dreamt of, but the Federal Government is standing in the way. We can't fully do what we need to do here.

There are many things in the way, but we are trying to deal with just two of them today. One of them is the limitations we put on the sovereign tribal nations that my friend from Florida so eloquently spoke about.

We put limitations on them and their ability to develop energy resources on their land. It is their land. Let them develop it. There are a couple good things from that. One of them is all of us in America get the benefit from that. As we develop any part of our energy sector, it benefits all of us.

Secondly, it benefits those people in those tribal nations. They are not asking for the Federal Government to give them something. They are asking for the Federal Government to get out of the way so they can do something for themselves. I think we ought to celebrate that in America and give them that opportunity.

The second bill removes a decades-old ban on oil exports. I am old enough to remember the 1970s. I remember waiting in a gas line and not being able to get gas, but that was then with the technology we had then, not now with the technology and the proven reserves we have now.

I don't want to shoulder my children with limitations based upon technology or technological understanding we had when I was their age. As they tell me all the time: Daddy, we have moved on. We have moved on in a very positive way in this particular aspect.

So it is time to get the dead hand of the past off of our energy industry so it can start doing the things it has so miraculously proven that it can do.

I urge everybody in this House to support this rule. I urge everybody in this House to support both of these underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 466 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1217) to protect Second Amendment rights, ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and provide a responsible and consistent background check process. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1217.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 183, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

YEAS—244

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

NAYS—183

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence

Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Cleaver
Connolly
Dingell
Hudson
Sinema
Vela
Wilson (SC)

□ 1442

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA FLOOD

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of Congress, the people of South Carolina have faced an unprecedented, catastrophic weather event, also known as a 1,000-year rain, exceeding 20 inches virtually overnight, causing flooding and widespread damage. We are grateful for your thoughts and prayers.

The flooding and rain destroyed homes and roads, collapsed bridges, and broke dams across the State; 400 roads and bridges are still closed. Tragically, to date, the flooding has claimed the lives of nearly 20 citizens across the Carolinas. We ask for your thoughts and prayers for their families.

We are grateful for the strength of the people of South Carolina, led by Governor Nikki Haley and Adjutant General Bob Livingston.

We are inspired by people like Aaron and Amy Dupree, with their four small children, who were rescued by boat from their home in Columbia's Lake Katherine community by their neighbor, Brian Boyer.

You will hear stories of incredible acts of volunteerism, like Kassy Alia, the widow of Forest Acres Police Officer Greg Alia who was murdered last week, leaving her and their 5-month-old son, Sal. Despite her grief, she joined others in distributing food to those in need.

Wherever you go, you will find heroes like these and hear about the service of the first responders, emergency personnel, officials, and State employees who have worked tirelessly to aid our community.

We appreciate that Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson will lead a fact-finding delegation with members of our delegation to our State tomorrow.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN). If he is not available, I just want to thank him for his service. We look forward to being on the delegation with him tomorrow.

God bless South Carolina, and I ask my colleagues to stand and join me in a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise for a moment of silence.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 185, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

AYES—244

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

NOES—185

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

NOT VOTING—5

Cleaver Gibson Sinema
Dingell Hudson

□ 1456

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIVE AMERICAN ENERGY ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill H.R. 538.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 466 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 538.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1458

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 538) to facilitate the development of energy on Indian lands by reducing Federal regulations that impede tribal development of Indian lands, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROUZER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

□ 1500

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 538 has been in the works for several years. This is not a bill that came out of nowhere. Its provisions are the result of oversight hearings and consultation with Indian tribes and Alaska Native Corporations. The bill streamlines Federal permitting for, and increases tribal control over, energy and other natural resource development on Indian lands. It gives tribes options to perform or waive appraisals of their lands and prohibits the Interior Department's hydraulic fracturing from applying to Indian lands without the consent of the tribe.

It also contains provisions to streamline judicial review and deter frivolous lawsuits concerning Federal permitting for Native American energy projects. The judicial review provisions are crucial for Alaska Natives, whose ability to develop their land claims settlement lands has been abused by special interest groups filing lawsuits.

The bill also authorizes a pilot project for the Navajo Nation to handle mineral leasing of its trust lands if Interior approves its tribal leasing program.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 538 promotes tribal forest stewardship contracting on Federal lands adjacent to Indian reservation land to provide a full supply of biomass energy for the tribes.

This summer, the GAO issued a report called ''Indian Energy Development—Poor Management by BIA Has Hindered Energy Department on Indian Lands.'' Here a couple of the highlights:

''The BIA does not have comprehensive data to identify ownership and resources available for development, does not have a documented process or data to track and monitor its review and response times, and some offices do not have the skills or adequate staff resources to effectively review energy-related documents.''

''In 2012, Interior's inspector general found that weaknesses in BIA's management of oil and gas resources contributed to a general preference by industry to acquire oil and gas leases on non-Indian lands over Indian lands.''

This is a jobs bill. It provides energy for America, and more than that, it takes care of the tribal community that has been blessed with resources. In some Indian reservations, where unemployment rates are 50 percent, energy jobs are the only high-wage, private sector jobs available for members. These energy jobs dollars go a long way in supporting families.

The Native American Energy Act is strongly supported by a broad array of Native organizations as well as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, specifically, the National Congress of American Indians, the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, the Intertribal Timber Council, Navajo Nation, Southern Ute Indian Tribe, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, and the Ute Tribe of Utah.

I am a little bit surprised that the White House has issued a statement against this bill. Really, it is not anything new. I always listen to this administration's ''all of the above but none of the below'' as far as energy goes. In other words, the administration promotes only wind and solar, while opposing oil, gas, and coal on Nations' lands—Nations' lands.

In the Dakotas, it takes 15 permits on tribal lands and 2 off of tribal lands. That is a disgrace, and I suggest, with 56 million acres of land, there ought to be the ability to be self-determined, be the first Americans, with the ability to take and produce energy, and help their tribal members out.

Those that oppose this, it is the same old story: don't get too smart; we will give you a side of beef and a blanket. Don't let us help ourselves, let the government tell you what to do.

This is a good piece of legislation. This did not come from me. This came from the Native tribes themselves. It is an example, as we have trust authority, we should let them control their own destiny.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, frankly, we are still not addressing the most pressing needs in Indian Country. Six years later, the Carcieri decision still has not been fixed, despite much lipservice that has been given to it from the majority.

Our colleague Mr. COLE and our colleague Ms. MCCOLLUM both have legislation, bipartisan legislation, that would deal with that immediately. We should call that up. We should have a hearing, and we should deal with this decision that has left so much doubt and confusion in Indian Country.

Sacred sites are in need of identification and protection rather than midnight riders attached to unrelated legislation that violates tribal sacred site protections, as has happened already. Lack of funding from this body coupled with sequestration has left Indian health and education really with no relief in site.

Yes, barriers to energy development on Indian land are among the most pressing needs, both as an economic driver for tribes and for the energy needs of the United States. But this bill does not address the real energy needs on tribal lands, and while we are wasting time on it, these other, and even more pressing needs, just continue to grow more urgent.

The legislation claims to facilitate energy development, but, instead, it short-circuits the review process set up by the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, and limits judicial review of development decisions. Instead of helping tribes develop energy resources on their lands, this approach will lead to less environmental protection on Indian lands and less judicial recourse to those affected.

These proposals are not new. We have seen and debated them before as part of the failed Republican energy bills last Congress, and here they are again. The legislation would amend NEPA, one of the Nation's bedrock environmental laws, to limit review of and comment on proposed projects to members of the affected Indian tribe and other individuals residing within an undetermined affected area. This limitation severely restricts public involvement in proposed Federal projects that may affect the environment, a central tenet of NEPA.

Arbitrarily limiting such review and comment would prevent even other Indian tribes with cultural ties in the so-

called affected area from commenting on a proposed project. Limiting the universe of members of the public who can participate in the NEPA process but then failing to actually define that universe is not reform. It is not reform at all.

Additionally, this restriction is not just applicable to energy projects; it applies to any major project on Indian lands. This could mean proposed mining contracts, proposed water development projects, construction of solid waste facilities, and even construction of tribal class III gaming facilities all would slip through this undefined loophole. Nontribal partners would also reap this benefit as well, as long as the project is located on Indian lands.

The legislation also throws up insurmountable barriers to those seeking to hold the Federal Government accountable for its actions in court. It prevents the recovery of attorney's fees in cases challenging energy projects, and it makes a claimant who fails to succeed on the merits of a suit potentially liable to the defendant for attorneys' fees and costs. This makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for members of the public—even tribal members whose homelands may be impacted by a major Federal action of any kind—to seek judicial review.

The other side will say this is in response to frivolous lawsuits that have been filed in these cases in the past, but according to the Department of the Interior Solicitor's Office, very few approved energy-related projects have ever been challenged in court. This is truly a solution in search of a problem. It is clear the real intent of this provision is to chill legitimate litigation and to undermine the real teeth of NEPA by making the availability of injunctive relief all but disappear.

Furthermore, this applies even to non-Indian land. If an energy company is developing natural resources anywhere in the United States and they get a tribal partner, they can fall under this provision. This could incentivize energy companies to partner with tribes simply for the benefit of skirting NEPA and profiting from restricted judicial review.

The legislation is opposed by the administration, as well as many environmental and conservation groups. I enter the following letter of opposition to this legislation into the RECORD, which has been signed by the Alaska Wilderness League, Center for Biological Diversity, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Green Latinos, The Lands Council, League of Conservation Voters, National Parks Conservation Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, Northern Alaska Environmental Center, San Juan Citizens Alliance, Sierra Club, Western Environmental Law Center, and The Wilderness Society.

ALASKA WILDERNESS LEAGUE, CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE, EARTHJUSTICE, GREEN LATINOS, THE LANDS COUNCIL, LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS, NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, NORTHERN ALASKA ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER, SAN JUAN CITIZENS ALLIANCE, SIERRA CLUB, WESTERN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CENTER, THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY,

September 9, 2015.

Chairman ROB BISHOP,
Ranking Member RAÚL GRIJALVA,
House Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP AND RANKING MEMBER GRIJALVA: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters, we write to express our strong concerns with H.R. 538, the ''Native American Energy Act.'' The bill purports to promote and encourage increased energy production on tribal lands by reducing government barriers and streamlining burdensome procedures. While we are not opposed to the development of energy projects on tribal lands under the law, this bill goes far beyond that by severely limiting public involvement in the development of any major project on tribal lands, as well as by insulating potentially environmentally devastating energy projects on tribal lands (or even projects done in partnership with an Indian tribe on non-tribal lands) from judicial review. It further erodes the public interest by diminishing its full authority to conduct appraisals, especially in the context of land exchanges between the federal government and an Alaska Native Corporation. Given the problems with these provisions, we ask that you oppose H.R. 538.

We are particularly concerned with Sections 2, 4, and 5 of this legislation.

Section 2 would diminish the public interest by allowing state-chartered, for-profit corporations to gain full authority to conduct appraisals, especially in the context of land exchanges between the federal government and an Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) corporation. Many land swaps have been very controversial in Alaska, including in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Section 4 would amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) by mandating that Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) for any federal action on tribal lands by an Indian tribe ''shall only be available for review and comment by the members of the Indian tribe and by any other individual residing within the affected area.'' This provision would severely undermine one of the most basic tenets of NEPA: to facilitate public involvement in decision making. Additionally, this limitation is applicable to more than energy projects; it applies to any major project on tribal land by a native community. By its terms, section 4 applies to the lands of Native Corporations transferred under the provisions of ANCSA, or associated land trades. For example, if passed into law, this section would limit public participation in a broad range of EISs: Clean Water Act 404 permits for any purpose; highway projects; energy or any other federal project; or funding of any project on tribal lands by an native community. Furthermore, the provision would allow for significantly limiting the defined ''affected area'' such that some members of the public would be excluded from commenting on a draft EIS. This would artificially limit what the agency might learn about the potential impacts of its project, leading to uninformed decision making.

Section 5 aims at insulating energy related projects from judicial review by placing severe restrictions on the time in which to file claims and making the pursuit of any legal challenge overwhelmingly cost-prohibitive. In addition to curtailing the amount of time an individual or group has to challenge the decision to only 60 days, Section 5 further restricts judicial review by requiring plaintiffs to pay the attorney's fees and costs of the defendants if they do not ''ultimately prevail.'' Furthermore, even where plaintiffs are successful in their challenge, this section precludes them from winning awards typically provided for through the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA) and the Treasury Department's Judgment Fund. EAJA and the Judgment Fund costs are incredibly important in cases which seek non-monetary relief, such as those involving environmental protection and public health issues. These funds make the courts accessible to the individual citizen, non-profit organization, small business, or public interest group that would otherwise lack the financial ability to challenge large corporations or the federal government, who are harming their communities or environment in the name of energy development. For over three decades, the financial backstop provided for under EAJA and the Judgment Fund has meant that access to the courts is not limited to those with deep pockets. By eliminating the ability of parties to utilize EAJA or the Judgment Fund, H.R. 538 prevents such individuals or organizations from bringing cases that challenge harmful or illegal energy related projects. Section 5 creates insurmountable barriers to justice at the expense of the American public and rejects equal access to the courts in favor of a perverse pay-to-play system.

Additionally, Section 5 defines ''energy related action'' broadly so as to ensure the restrictive judicial review provisions of this section apply equally to projects on tribal land as well as those energy projects on non-tribal lands where at least one tribe is involved. This invites the partnering of energy corporations with native communities for the purpose of limiting judicial review.

Finally, Section 9 of the bill would eliminate health and environmental protections established by the Department of the Interior in rules regarding hydraulic fracturing. Those living on and near tribal lands would possibly be subjected to heightened risk of spills, underground contamination from toxic chemicals, weakened air quality, reduced well construction standards, and other benefits from DOI's updates to long out-of-date rules.

We recognize the self-determination framework for federally recognized tribal governments and tribal members, but it is important to ensure that development decisions adequately address all of the impacts of those decisions, some of which occur well beyond the project site, and that the public has the ability to participate. H.R. 538 eliminates broad public participation for projects on tribal land, including ANCSA Corporation lands. Further, it will have a significant chilling effect on the ability of the public (including tribal members) to seek judicial review of a decision related to an energy project on Indian land or proposed by (or done in partnership with) an Indian tribe to ensure that the project complies with the law. For these reasons, we ask that you oppose H.R. 538.

Sincerely,

Alaska Wilderness League, Center for Biological Diversity, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Green Latinos, The Lands Council, League of Conservation Voters, National Parks Conservation Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, Northern

Alaska Environmental Center, San Juan Citizens Alliance, Sierra Club, Western Environmental Law Center, The Wilderness Society.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, instead of using energy development on Indian land as an excuse to weaken NEPA and judicial review, we should be concentrating our efforts on real reform that would achieve tribal self-determination and energy development. We should be dealing with the disparities in the Tax Code that stymie investments in Indian Country and create an unfair playing field. Tax credits and incentives for energy development that cities and communities have long used to their benefit, these need to be available to tribes as well. We should be encouraging investment in the future of renewable energy on tribal lands.

According to the Department of Energy Office of Indian Energy, Indian land contains an estimated 5 percent of all renewable energy resources, and the total energy potential from these resources is almost 14 percent of the total U.S. potential. In my home State of Arizona, there is a great potential for solar, wind, and geothermal energy on Indian land. We just need to fix the real issues that prohibit the investment in these projects.

But this bill doesn't do that. Instead, the majority is here today to once again attack NEPA and judicial review, this time attempting to use this as a wedge issue, attempting to drive a wedge between people that care about tribal self-determination as well as environmental stewardship.

Picking between tribal sovereignty and responsible energy development is a false choice. We can have both. We can have successful energy development in Indian Country while retaining the environmental protections that will ensure future generations of Native Americans that they, too, can enjoy the benefits of that economic development.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to abandon this irresponsible proposal in favor of a real tribal energy bill. In the meantime, I would plead with my colleagues to bring legislation to the floor addressing Indian health care, Indian education programs, a codified process for tribal consultation with Federal agencies that respects sovereignty and upholds the trust responsibility that we have to Indian Country, and a fix—finally, a fix—for the current cloud hanging over the status of so many trust lands.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention one thing. I do have an amendment for a future day—I am speaking to the gentleman—on NEPA. We don't change the NEPA policy at all, other than the fact that only those affected can have comments on how it affects their land, not a bunch of people from New York or Maine or Dallas or Florida. So that is really a red herring that was drug across this bill. This is to help the tribes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), my good chairman of the full committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Alaska yielding.

There are some Native American tribes that do not rely on gaming alone for their source of revenue. They can't. It is amazing how often we hear, dealing with North American Native tribes, all of a sudden give lipservice that we would like to empower them, until they actually have a chance to do so; and then, all of a sudden, we change. We are talking about a lot of tribes who have a great deal of land but very little employment.

This bill, in fact, is based on recommendations that come from Indian Country. By that, I don't mean the Bureau of Indian Affairs, because they, shamefully, oppose this bill. I do mean groups like Southern Utah Utes, the Confederated Tribes of Colville, the National Congress of American Indians, the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, and community groups like the Chamber of Commerce. All of those people are realizing the importance of this particular bill in empowering Native Americans in this Nation.

I hope we do not turn this into a partisan affair by saying, by voting ''no'' on this bill, you might get three Democrat callers on C–SPAN to support your vote. But it still does not make that right. We need to do something differently.

In these areas in which the potential employment is based on agriculture, mining, and energy, we don't need more regulations on the Native Americans than there are on everybody else. We don't need duplicative regulations on them more than anybody else. Instead, we need to streamline that so they can be successful in charting their own destiny and making their own choices.

Far too often we have too many people, unfortunately, with titles around this place that still have a paternalistic attitude toward Native Americans. That attitude has to change. This is what this bill does.

It is amazing. Sometimes when this administration says, well, if it deals with marijuana, they are a Native tribe, they are a sovereign country, let them do what they want to; but if it deals with agriculture and mining, well, not so fast. That is public lands. We still need to have some kind of control over that.

That is the problem: pot, yes; energy, no. That doesn't work. We need these people to be able to make decisions for themselves.

I appreciate the chairman of the subcommittee mentioning that he does have an amendment on NEPA which does solve those problems. This is not a NEPA issue. This is an issue on whether we truly believe in empowering Native Americans so they can make decisions for themselves and help their own people.

□ 1515

I had a chairman of a tribe who sat in my room and wisely said: I don't care what game we play. I just want to know what the ball looks like.

This bill gives them a chance to see the ball. It gives the Native Americans a chance to approve the design of the ball. More importantly, it gives them a chance to win.

So, Lucy, please, just before contact, don't pull the ball away. Let the Native Americans win. This bill gives them an opportunity to win and chart their own destiny. That is why they support it, and that is why we should vote for it.

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

The GAO report has mentioned many times about the rationale behind and the catalyst behind this particular legislation; yet, the conclusion, which I agree with, is that we are not living up to our responsibilities as it applies to energy development on Indian land.

But reading the recommendations, nowhere does it say that the solution to the problem is to gut NEPA or to stifle judicial recourse. Instead, the recommendations talk about resources that are needed by Indian Country to successfully fulfill their obligations and responsibilities to their members. It talks about staffing shortages, outdated mapping systems, and the need to ensure that the BIA can provide support to the tribes on energy programs.

These are things the BIA has asked for in their budget and that the President's budget sent over has requested time and time again. Funding these requests go unheeded by this majority.

So it is disingenuous, as the majority does time and time again, to starve an agency or a program of needed funding and then to complain that that agency program is ineffective.

It is also disingenuous to say that the responsibility to work with and honor our trust responsibility to Indian Country is down to the choice in this legislation whether you vote ''yes'' or ''no.''

As I stated in my opening statement, there is a litany of pressing issues that face Indian Country and Native Americans in our Nation, a litany of benign neglect for many, many years, of which all bear responsibility.

But with that responsibility comes also the opportunity to act. The fix is necessary so that fact is quelled on a bad Supreme Court decision. We need the adequate funding so that the trust responsibility that we inherit as Members of Congress is upheld.

We need programs of infrastructure in Indian Country. We need many, many issues to address not only the human need, but the economic needs of Indian Country.

To say that this bill is the watershed moment that is going to turn all that benign neglect and irresponsibility backwards is disingenuous at best.

I would suggest let's talk about a real comprehensive approach to the issue of Indian Country and the support this Congress needs to give to our trust responsibility.

If we do that, I am sure all of us collectively can come to the same conclusion, that we need to do something and that there is before us legislation from both sides of the aisle that begin to address it.

This legislation is not it. It is not a panacea. And to pit the trust responsibility this Congress has and to question whether sovereignty is supported or not by Members that oppose this is not fair.

The fairness in this would have been an energy bill that is comprehensive. The fairness would have been not to gut NEPA, judicial review, and present a bill that is clean and upholds bedrock environmental laws and—and it is not complicated—uphold the trust responsibility that we have when we swear an oath of office to serve in this Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS).

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Native American Energy Act.

Having an all-of-the-above energy policy means all people in all communities. Each community across the country should have the opportunity to unleash the natural resources closest to them to help meet their energy needs. For those of us in the Pacific Northwest, it means encouraging biomass.

We have just had a devastating wildfire season, and the issue of forest health continues to be on the forefront. Fallen trees, overgrowth, and general mismanagement have led to worsening fire seasons.

By encouraging forest products for biomass, we would add and have a benefit of reducing forest fire risk by keeping our lands healthier, in addition to creating a stable energy source.

This legislation allows a pilot project to encourage greater biomass production on tribal forestland. In my district in eastern Washington, it would help the confederated tribes of the Colville Reservation, who already play a very active role in forest management, get new tools at their disposal to maintain the health of the adjacent forest to the reservation. It would help them develop energy and, most importantly, help them protect their homeland.

I am proud to support this legislation and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to give my voice in strong support for the Native American Energy Act.

I would also like to be able to thank Chairman YOUNG and Chairman BISHOP for their leadership and support of Native American energy development.

Energy resource development on Native American lands is important and becoming increasingly significant year after year. For example, in 2014, responsible conventional energy development on Native American lands alone generated revenues of $24 billion.

This revenue figure does not include renewable energy development on tribal lands, which is the potential to increase revenues, jobs, and household incomes for Native American communities.

I am privileged to be able to represent the Southern Ute Indian Tribe located in southwest Colorado. Some of my colleagues know that the Southern Ute Indian Tribe is a model of tribal governance and economic development. The tribe is widely known as the premier natural gas developer and the largest employer in the region.

I am extremely proud that the Southern Ute Indian Tribe continues to take the lead in demanding that the Federal Government respect self-determination and tribal decisionmaking when it comes to energy and environmental regulation.

To his credit, Chairman YOUNG continues to hold numerous oversight hearings and legislative hearings to allow tribal leaders to illustrate the challenges they face daily as they attempt to develop their natural resources so that they can provide programs, services, and jobs for their nations.

The result is H.R. 538, which will remove a number of these barriers. The legislation streamlines the appraisal process that must be undertaken by the Department of Interior because the status quo has resulted in delays that have caused the tribe to miss out on royalty payments totaling more than $95 million.

The legislation also amends the Tribal Forest Protection Act of 2004, to direct the Department of Interior to enter into agreements with tribes to carry out demonstration projects that promote biomass energy production on Native American forestland and in nearby communities by providing tribes with reliable supplies of woody biomass from Federal lands.

It also prohibits the Interior rule regarding hydraulic fracturing from having any effect on land held in trust or restricted status for Native Americans, except with the express consent of the Indian beneficiaries. The Southern Ute's repeated attempts to ensure tribal lands were not included in this misguided rule were completely disregarded by this administration.

Fortunately, H.R. 538 promotes Native American self-determination, strengthens tribal sovereignty, and reinforces our commitment to tribal self-sufficiency.

I urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation.

Once again, I thank Chairman YOUNG for his leadership and Chairman BISHOP on this issue.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support of this commonsense legislation.

This bill empowers Native Americans to invest in their communities, their people, and their resources as they see fit without the heavy hand of Washington bureaucracy trying to insert itself between them and their own land.

Under current policy, potential resource development on tribal lands face many obstacles that projects on private or State lands do not.

Before entering into a lease agreement with energy developers on their own land, a tribe must first attempt to navigate the long, slow, and duplicative process of the Department of Interior's approval. This process can be fraught with litigation and delays that chase away potential investments and crush otherwise viable projects.

The Native American Energy Act streamlines many of the duplicative Federal regulatory hurdles that prevent tribes or individuals from profitably developing energy resources on their land.

This will provide tribes with greater control over how they best develop their own natural resources and allow them to do so in ways that will best benefit their communities, not a D.C. bureaucrat's ideology.

Because of the commonsense and empowering reforms it contains, this bill has widespread support from the Indian tribes. It is odd that the only groups on record in opposition to this bill are the Obama administration and some Democratic members of the Natural Resources Committee.

Why does the administration continue to insist that bureaucrats from their comfy leather chairs and marble offices in Washington, D.C., know more about how to manage Indian land than the tribes themselves?

If Congress is actually serious about supporting tribal efforts to generate high-paying jobs and improving the everyday standard of living in American Indian communities, this bill is a real, concrete way to empower them to do so.

I commend the chairman and the committee for their work on this bill. I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska for bringing this legislation forward.

In my hometown of Hobbs, New Mexico, truck drivers are making $100,000 a year. They don't have to have a college degree, not even a high school diploma. And, yet, we limit this sort of opportunity on tribal lands. This bill is fairly simple. Simply let them free. Let them free to develop their lands in the way they want to.

I heard one of my colleagues say that there are no frivolous lawsuits. Just this week the WildEarth Guardians were found to have filed a frivolous lawsuit on matters such as these, trying to stop development, trying to hold things up. The judge said this is frivolous. It is the WildEarth Guardians v. Kirkpatrick decision that is very recent.

We are told that there are a litany of issues that we should be dealing with. I will tell you that Native Americans are sophisticated enough to take care of their own problems. They just need the opportunity to have jobs. They need the opportunity for economic development inside their own nations.

Just recently we hosted in New Mexico a gathering of different tribes who are looking at investments in oil and gas. One lady said: My son is working in North Dakota for $60,000 a year, and he should be working here on the reservation in the oil and gas industry for $60,000 a year. That is the urgency that I am sensing on the reservations.

The reservations are beginning to build their own houses, and they are doing magnificent work. They are becoming self-determined. But we here in Washington say we know better. Mr. YOUNG's bill says that we don't know better.

Just let them develop what they want. Take the shackles off, take the chains loose, and let the American spirit that is on the reservations live and breathe. It is a very simple concept, but one some have a very difficult time accepting.

I say vote for H.R. 538 and put them free.

□ 1530

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I just want to note that the Democrats on the Natural Resources Committee filed several amendments to this bill. We felt our Members were squarely within the House rules.

Sadly, the majority on Rules failed to make any of their amendments in order. One of these rejected amendments would have fixed the terrible mess created by the decision in Carcieri.

If you want to help tribes in a legitimate, coequal way control their own lands and move closer and closer to self-determination, you have to address this problem. It is telling that my friends on the other side have refused to even address the bill or to have a legitimate hearing on the bill.

Let me just in closing address the Statement of Administrative Policy.

While the administration supports the need to facilitate energy development in Indian Country, it does not support H.R. 538, the Native American Energy Act. This bill would undermine public participation and transparency of review of projects on Indian lands under the National Environmental Policy Act, set unrealistic deadlines, and remove oversight for appraisals of Indian lands or trust assets, and prohibit awards under the Equal Access to Justice Act or payment of fees or expenses to a plaintiff from the judgment fund in an energy-related action.

By foreclosing the judgment fund, this provision would negatively impact the Indian Affairs budget that is intended to serve all tribes. In addition, this bill's changes to mineral leasing loss applicable to Navajo Nations land may adversely affect energy development on these lands.

The bill also stipulates that Indian lands are exempt from the Department of the Interior's hydraulic fracking rule. That rule already contains the provision allowing for variances from the rules requirements when tribal laws meet or exceed the rule standards.

The rule approach both protects environmental and trust resources while also protecting decisionmaking of the tribes. Overall, H.R. 538 would not ensure diligent development of resources on Indian land.

The administration appreciates the committee's efforts to address energy needs in Indian Country. Income from energy development is one of the largest sources of revenue generated from trust lands, and delays in development translate to delays in profits to Indian mineral rights owners.

The administration has been taking meaningful action to update the leasing process for lands held in trust for Indian tribes and is actively working to expedite appraisals, leasing, and permitting on Indian lands, and to provide resources to ensure safe and responsible development.

The administration looks forward to working with Congress to develop the reforms necessary to support this development.

The point is that this legislation is a rush to judgment. It is a gift, in a sense, when you exempt from the judicial review and from NEPA the exploration and production of energy on Indian land. As coequals, these environmental protections and public processes are intended for all.

So rather than be patronizing, as coequals and within our trust responsibility, this bill should be rejected. We should work on comprehensive energy opportunity legislation that truly recognizes self-determination for all members of tribes, provided the environmental, public health, and judicial processes would guarantee them that they would be treated equal under the law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I suggest one thing. This bill came from the tribes, not from the Sierra Club and not from the friends of this and not from the friends of that. All 28 organizations had nothing to do with the tribes.

I have said all along—and I am pretty well related to the Athabascan Tribe in Alaska—it is time they are given the opportunity to fulfill the self-determination act that we passed. Words do not do that.

This administration has these great conferences, and we invite everybody down and winky, winky, and now have a good time. Nothing happens administratively.

Now, I know there is some legislation and I am working very hard to get legislation, but I can't do it all. I have to do it one little step at a time.

This bill is requested by American Indians to have more control over their land.

I have to remind this Congress that I sit in that we are now ranked in the nations around the world 20th in the freedom category. We have gone from number 1 to 20th. Think about that. The American Indians, our first people, are 13th in freedom because of our so-called free government. Now, there is something wrong with that.

We are doing an indirect thing, as trustees, by not allowing them to expand their God-given right, their ability, their intellectual capability, to expand their self-worth and keep their identity.

Every time we try to bring a bill to the floor to do that, it is, first of all, ''We can do it better administratively.'' That is why they are ranked 13th in freedom because of our government.

Now, I want everybody to think about this in Congress, from number 1 freest nation in the world to right now 20. That is not a good thing.

In the last 5 years, we have dropped three spaces in that freedom chart, mainly because of overreach, regulation, and dictation by our government. That is what it is based on. Individual freedoms are lost.

Try that as a tribe and have to go through all the other steps that the other person doesn't have to. Well, they dropped down to 13th.

I am asking the people in this body to support this bill if you believe in self-determination, if you believe in self-sufficiency, if you believe in the right to get ahead, especially in nations by this Congress that gave them the ability to be self-determined. They really take it away.

So this is a good piece of legislation, a piece of legislation that should be voted ''yes'' on. We should give a chance for the American Indian to go forth as I know they have the capability of.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Chair, today I will vote against H.R. 538, the Native American Energy Act. The bill makes needed changes to allow tribes to fully manage their lands which I strongly support. Unfortunately, it goes too far by weakening bedrock environmental protections, and makes it difficult for those with legitimate legal grievances to seek justice.

Technically the 2005 Energy Act allows tribes to enter into energy development leases

through what are called Tribal Energy Resource Agreements, which must be approved by Interior. I say technically because no tribe has ever been successful in doing so. Tribes have submitted proposals that have sat with Interior for as long as eight years and then were never approved. Interior has never clarified what requirements are needed to gain approval. Potential business partners cannot and will not sit wait to see if the federal government will do its job. They will find partners that are able to move forward.

One of most laudable parts of the bill is the creation of biomass demonstration projects. Our forests are overgrown and are infected with insects and disease. Fuel reduction is vital to forest health and reducing the severity of fires. Often overgrowth is not suitable for timber production, but can be suitable for energy production. Many tribes are ready to take advantage of these resources; they have their own processing facilities, trained work force and infrastructure in place to discover benefits to improve forest health, maintain fish and wildlife habitat, and create renewable energy.

Tribes, lest we forget, are sovereign nations. Yet they regularly encounter obstacles not experienced by private landowners. The federal government already has the tools to solve this inequity, but refuses to do so. The lack of urgency to correct what amounts to bureaucratic indifference is not acceptable. America's first stewards of the land have the right to manage and develop their lands, and the federal government's inaction to ensure their rights is deplorable.

Because the bill goes beyond necessary reforms by curtailing environmental and judicial review, the president has issued a veto threat. I look forward to the Senate removing those provisions which unnecessarily hinder what could be a good bill and sending it back to the House.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). All time for general debate has expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–30. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 538

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 ''Native American Energy Act''.

SEC. 2. APPRAISALS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Title XXVI of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 2607. APPRAISAL REFORMS.

''(a) OPTIONS TO INDIAN TRIBES.—With respect to a transaction involving Indian land or the trust assets of an Indian tribe that requires the approval of the Secretary, any appraisal relating to fair market value required to be conducted under applicable law, regulation, or policy may be completed by—

''(1) the Secretary;

''(2) the affected Indian tribe; or

''(3) a certified, third-party appraiser pursuant to a contract with the Indian tribe.

''(b) TIME LIMIT ON SECRETARIAL REVIEW AND ACTION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary receives an appraisal conducted by or for an Indian tribe pursuant to paragraphs (2) or (3) of subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

''(1) review the appraisal; and

''(2) provide to the Indian tribe a written notice of approval or disapproval of the appraisal.

''(c) FAILURE OF SECRETARY TO APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE.—If, after 60 days, the Secretary has failed to approve or disapprove any appraisal received, the appraisal shall be deemed approved.

''(d) OPTION TO INDIAN TRIBES TO WAIVE APPRAISAL.—

''(1) An Indian tribe wishing to waive the requirements of subsection (a), may do so after it has satisfied the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3).

''(2) An Indian tribe wishing to forego the necessity of a waiver pursuant to this section must provide to the Secretary a written resolution, statement, or other unambiguous indication of tribal intent, duly approved by the governing body of the Indian tribe.

''(3) The unambiguous indication of intent provided by the Indian tribe to the Secretary under paragraph (2) must include an express waiver by the Indian tribe of any claims for damages it might have against the United States as a result of the lack of an appraisal undertaken.

''(e) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'appraisal' includes appraisals and other estimates of value.

''(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall develop regulations for implementing this section, including standards the Secretary shall use for approving or disapproving an appraisal.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13201 note) is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title XXVI the following:

''Sec. 2607. Appraisal reforms.''.

SEC. 3. STANDARDIZATION.

As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall implement procedures to ensure that each agency within the Department of the Interior that is involved in the review, approval, and oversight of oil and gas activities on Indian lands shall use a uniform system of reference numbers and tracking systems for oil and gas wells.

SEC. 4. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS OF MAJOR FEDERAL ACTIONS ON INDIAN LANDS.

Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) is amended by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before the first sentence, and by adding at the end the following:

''(b) REVIEW OF MAJOR FEDERAL ACTIONS ON INDIAN LANDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For any major Federal action on Indian lands of an Indian tribe requiring the preparation of a statement under subsection (a)(2)(C), the statement shall only be available for review and comment by the members of the Indian tribe and by any other individual residing within the affected area.

''(2) REGULATIONS.—The Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality shall develop regulations to implement this section, including descriptions of affected areas for specific major Federal actions, in consultation with Indian tribes.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, each of the terms 'Indian land' and 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given that term in section 2601 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3501).

''(4) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—Nothing in the Native American Energy Act, except section 6 of that Act, shall give the Secretary any additional authority over energy projects on Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act lands.''.

SEC. 5. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) TIME FOR FILING COMPLAINT.—Any energy related action must be filed not later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the final agency action. Any energy related action not filed within this time period shall be barred.

(b) DISTRICT COURT VENUE AND DEADLINE.—All energy related actions—

(1) shall be brought in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; and

(2) shall be resolved as expeditiously as possible, and in any event not more than 180 days after such cause of action is filed.

(c) APPELLATE REVIEW.—An interlocutory order or final judgment, decree or order of the district court in an energy related action may be reviewed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals shall resolve such appeal as expeditiously as possible, and in any event not more than 180 days after such interlocutory order or final judgment, decree or order of the district court was issued.

(d) LIMITATION ON CERTAIN PAYMENTS.—Notwithstanding section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, no award may be made under section 504 of title 5, United States Code, or under section 2412 of title 28, United States Code, and no amounts may be obligated or expended from the Claims and Judgment Fund of the United States Treasury to pay any fees or other expenses under such sections, to any person or party in an energy related action.

(e) LEGAL FEES.—In any energy related action in which the plaintiff does not ultimately prevail, the court shall award to the defendant (including any intervenor-defendants), other than the United States, fees and other expenses incurred by that party in connection with the energy related action, unless the court finds that the position of the plaintiff was substantially justified or that special circumstances make an award unjust. Whether or not the position of the plaintiff was substantially justified shall be determined on the basis of the administrative record, as a whole, which is made in the energy related action for which fees and other expenses are sought.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) AGENCY ACTION.—The term ''agency action'' has the same meaning given such term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) INDIAN LAND.—The term ''Indian Land'' has the same meaning given such term in section 203(c)(3) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58; 25 U.S.C. 3501), including lands owned by Native Corporations under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (Public Law 92–203; 43 U.S.C. 1601).

(3) ENERGY RELATED ACTION.—The term ''energy related action'' means a cause of action that—

(A) is filed on or after the effective date of this Act; and

(B) seeks judicial review of a final agency action to issue a permit, license, or other form of agency permission allowing:

(i) any person or entity to conduct activities on Indian Land, which activities involve the exploration, development, production or transportation of oil, gas, coal, shale gas, oil shale, geothermal resources, wind or solar resources, underground coal gasification, biomass, or the generation of electricity; or

(ii) any Indian Tribe, or any organization of two or more entities, at least one of which is an Indian tribe, to conduct activities involving the exploration, development, production or transportation of oil, gas, coal, shale gas, oil shale, geothermal resources, wind or solar resources, underground coal gasification, biomass, or the generation of electricity, regardless of where such activities are undertaken.

(4) ULTIMATELY PREVAIL.—The phrase ''ultimately prevail'' means, in a final enforceable judgment, the court rules in the party's favor on at least one cause of action which is an underlying rationale for the preliminary injunction, administrative stay, or other relief requested by the party, and does not include circumstances where the final agency action is modified or amended by the issuing agency unless such modification or amendment is required pursuant to a final enforceable judgment of the court or a court-ordered consent decree.

SEC. 6. TRIBAL BIOMASS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

The Tribal Forest Protection Act of 2004 is amended by inserting after section 2 (25 U.S.C. 3115a) the following:

''SEC. 3. TRIBAL BIOMASS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, the Secretary shall enter into stewardship contracts or other agreements, other than agreements that are exclusively direct service contracts, with Indian tribes to carry out demonstration projects to promote biomass energy production (including biofuel, heat, and electricity generation) on Indian forest land and in nearby communities by providing reliable supplies of woody biomass from Federal land.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—The definitions in section 2 shall apply to this section.

''(c) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—In each fiscal year for which projects are authorized, the Secretary shall enter into contracts or other agreements described in subsection (a) to carry out at least 4 new demonstration projects that meet the eligibility criteria described in subsection (d).

''(d) ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.—To be eligible to enter into a contract or other agreement under this subsection, an Indian tribe shall submit to the Secretary an application—

''(1) containing such information as the Secretary may require; and

''(2) that includes a description of—

''(A) the Indian forest land or rangeland under the jurisdiction of the Indian tribe; and

''(B) the demonstration project proposed to be carried out by the Indian tribe.

''(e) SELECTION.—In evaluating the applications submitted under subsection (c), the Secretary—

''(1) shall take into consideration the factors set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 2(e) of Public Law 108–278; and whether a proposed demonstration project would—

''(A) increase the availability or reliability of local or regional energy;

''(B) enhance the economic development of the Indian tribe;

''(C) improve the connection of electric power transmission facilities serving the Indian tribe with other electric transmission facilities;

''(D) improve the forest health or watersheds of Federal land or Indian forest land or rangeland; or

''(E) otherwise promote the use of woody biomass; and

''(2) shall exclude from consideration any merchantable logs that have been identified by the Secretary for commercial sale.

''(f) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) ensure that the criteria described in subsection (c) are publicly available by not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this section; and

''(2) to the maximum extent practicable, consult with Indian tribes and appropriate intertribal organizations likely to be affected in developing the application and otherwise carrying out this section.

''(g) REPORT.—Not later than one year subsequent to the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes, with respect to the reporting period—

''(1) each individual tribal application received under this section; and

''(2) each contract and agreement entered into pursuant to this section.

''(h) INCORPORATION OF MANAGEMENT PLANS.—In carrying out a contract or agreement under this section, on receipt of a request from an Indian tribe, the Secretary shall incorporate into the contract or agreement, to the extent practicable, management plans (including forest management and integrated resource management plans) in effect on the Indian forest land or rangeland of the respective Indian tribe.

''(i) TERM.—A stewardship contract or other agreement entered into under this section—

''(1) shall be for a term of not more than 20 years; and

''(2) may be renewed in accordance with this section for not more than an additional 10 years.''.

SEC. 7. TRIBAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.

Unless otherwise explicitly exempted by Federal law enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act, any activity conducted or resources harvested or produced pursuant to a tribal resource management plan or an integrated resource management plan approved by the Secretary of the Interior under the National Indian Forest Resources Management Act (25 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) or the American Indian Agricultural Resource Management Act (25 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), shall be considered a sustainable management practice for purposes of any Federal standard, benefit, or requirement that requires a demonstration of such sustainability.

SEC. 8. LEASES OF RESTRICTED LANDS FOR THE NAVAJO NATION.

Subsection (e)(1) of the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (25 U.S.C. 415(e)(1); commonly referred to as the ''Long-Term Leasing Act''), is amended—

(1) by striking '', except a lease for'' and inserting '', including leases for'';

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''25'' the first place it appears and all that follows and inserting ''99 years;'';

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) in the case of a lease for the exploration, development, or extraction of mineral resources, including geothermal resources, 25 years, except that any such lease may include an option to renew for one additional term not to exceed 25 years.''.

SEC. 9. NONAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN RULES.

No rule promulgated by the Department of the Interior regarding hydraulic fracturing used in the development or production of oil or gas resources shall have any effect on any land held in trust or restricted status for the benefit of Indians except with the express consent of the beneficiary on whose behalf such land is held in trust or restricted status.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114–290. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114–290.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chair, I have an amendment that was made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, strike lines 9 through 15, and insert the following:

''(1) REVIEW AND COMMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the statement required under subsection (a)(2)(C) for a major Federal action regarding an activity on Indian lands of an Indian tribe shall only be available for review and comment by the members of the Indian tribe, other individuals residing within the affected area, and State, federally recognized tribal, and local governments within the affected area.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a statement for a major Federal action regarding an activity on Indian lands of an Indian tribe related to gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, this amendment clarifies who may submit public comments on a NEPA study concerning a Federal permit or land approval for Indian lands. It also preserves current NEPA requirements concerning tribal gaming proposals.

When a NEPA study is done on Federal action, like a mineral lease approval on Indian lands, the agency must consider comments received by any member of the public, regardless of whether they are affected. This is unfair to the tribe because tribal lands are not public land. They are private lands.

Section 4 of the bill limits public comment in these situations to the tribe and individuals who live within the affected area of the project.

Section 4 was drafted. We expected an individual living within the affected area would include State, tribal, and county officials, but no one from New York or San Francisco. It is none of their business.

To address any ambiguity, the amendment would clarify that tribe, States, and county governments within the area affected may have their comments considered along with those of individuals.

Finally, the amendment provides that section 4 will not affect Federal actions related to tribal gaming. Gaming is a unique area of law. Gaming facilities have a significant impact outside the local area.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition to the manager's amendment, although I am not in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I just want to tell Chairman YOUNG that I appreciate the lipstick on this particular

piece of legislation, but the content is still haphazard.

It does not fix the underlying problem with public review and judicial review. We are not in opposition, but I appreciate the lipstick.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chair, I hope it is the right color for Ranking Member GRIJALVA.

I yield back the balance of time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 114–290.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, after line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 4. TRIBAL FOREST MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

''The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out demonstration projects by which federally recognized Indian tribes or tribal organizations may contract to perform administrative, management, and other functions of programs of the Tribal Forest Protection Act of 2004 (25 U.S.C. 3115a et seq.) through contracts entered into under the Indian Self -Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of my amendment that allows the Forest Service to establish a pilot program to execute contracts with tribes under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, known as 638 contracts. 638 contracts allow tribes to manage and implement Federal programs in Indian Country.

When I was the New Mexico Secretary of Health, I witnessed how successful and beneficial these contracts can be at efficiently delivering services to tribes. Through these contracts, tribes can operate hospitals, health clinics, mental health facilities, and a variety of other community health services.

Having tribes manage and operate programs in their communities not only recognizes tribal self-determination and self-governance, but it also helps ensure that tribal needs are being met through traditionally and culturally appropriate methods.

Although several agencies have the authority to execute 638 contracts, such as the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian Health Services, the Forest Service does not have this authority. Several tribes have expressed to me that they would like to see the Forest Service have this authority.

Many of the Pueblos in New Mexico have land and tribal forests adjacent to national forests, and we know that wildfires in the past can quickly affect entire regions, regardless of who owns the land.

In fact, the Las Conchas wildland fire, which was one of the largest wildfires in New Mexico history, started on June 26, 2011, in the Santa Fe National Forest and burned more than 156,000 acres in New Mexico, including land belonging to Pueblos of Santa Clara, Ohkay Owingeh, San Ildefonso, Pojoaque Jemez, Cochiti, and Kewa.

So it is imperative that the Forest Service and tribes actively work together to co-manage forests.

This amendment previously passed by voice vote as part of the Resilient Federal Forest Act, which the House passed this July.

I urge my colleagues to once again support my amendment, which will improve the Forest Service's ability to partner with tribes to work on projects that impact tribal lands and forests.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I do not oppose the amendment. I just want to congratulate the lady on backing up what is in the bill, making this correct.

We have had testimony from a lot of the timber tribes on how well they have managed their timber, and right next door will be the Forest Service land that is managed terribly. That is a threat to the tribal timber, too.

I really think, if we want to get back on this track of the freedoms I was talking about, if we allow the tribes to contract with the Forest Service, make it a contract for thinning, encouraging growth, managing growth for future timber needs—you know, the native tribes are doing so much better than the Federal tribes. So I compliment the lady on this deal.

□ 1545

I compliment the gentlewoman on this view, and I accept the amendment. I think the gentlewoman is doing a great job, and I appreciate it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 538) to facilitate the development of energy on Indian lands by reducing Federal regulations that impede tribal development of Indian lands, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 466, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ben Ray Luján of New Mexico moves to recommit the bill H.R. 538 to the Natural Resources Committee, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 10. PHYSICAL INTEGRITY OF SACRED SITES.

Nothing in this Act shall contravene the authority of the President to avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of any site, identified as sacred by virtue of established religious significance to, or ceremonial use by, an Indian religion, under Executive Order 13007 (May 24, 1996).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which does not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer an amendment to protect sacred sites across America. This issue is not a new one. We have been part of many debates here on the floor and in committee on this important issue.

The amendment is straightforward. It reads: ''Nothing in this Act shall contravene the authority of the President to avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of any site, identified as sacred by virtue of established religious significance to, or ceremonial use by, an Indian religion, under Executive Order 13007.''

Mr. Speaker, as we come from different faiths, we all have respect for one another. Just as we worship in different places, like churches or temples, so, too, should we have respect for these sacred places. Just as we would honor the sanctity of where our loved ones have been laid to rest, so, too, should we honor the sanctity of tribal sacred sites.

Sacred sites are an essential part of the culture and heritage of tribal communities, and the degradation of these sites means a loss of identity as well as disrespect for the faith and religion and the culture and the history of our tribal brothers and sisters who are connected to these lands. Sacred sites should not be desecrated. They should be protected.

I know it is a sentiment that many of us in this Congress share. Protecting sacred sites is the right thing to do. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this very important amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this act that changes the President's authority. I go back to self-determination. These are tribal lands owned by the tribes, controlled by the tribal council, and they will make a decision about the sacred sites; not somebody, again, in Miami or New York that wants to stop the project.

These are tribal sites, and that is the thing I don't quite understand. This affects nothing of the present law. If they decide this is a sacred site, that will be their decision, instead of someone else.

I urge people to reject his motion to recommit, and let's pass this legislation, this one little, tiny step forward for our first Americans. This bill came from them and they support it. They are not worried about these sacred sites because they will control them, not somebody who is an official. We take no authority away from the President.

Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, this is a motion to recommit to slow the bill down. They say it doesn't, but this is an attempt to do so. I urge a ''no'' on the motion to recommit and a ''yes'' on the passage for that little, tiny step for the American Indians, our first people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 239, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

YEAS—184

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

NAYS—239

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

NOT VOTING—11

Brat
Cleaver
Dingell
Hinojosa
Hudson
Payne
Pittenger
Reed
Sinema
Stutzman
Thornberry

□ 1621

Messrs. ROYCE, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, FINCHER, POMPEO, and RYAN of Wisconsin changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mses. LEE, LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. HIGGINS, CONYERS, DOGGETT, and McDERMOTT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BRAT. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 543 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 173, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

YEAS—254

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

NAYS—173

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

NOT VOTING—7

Cleaver
Dingell
Hinojosa
Hudson
Payne
Pittenger
Sinema

□ 1630

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION DAY IN VENEZUELA

(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, last month in Venezuela, the president of the national association of opposition mayors issued a message to the international community—including here in the United States, obviously—stating many of the obstacles being faced leading up to Venezuela's legislative elections, which are scheduled to take place on December 6.

According to their statement, Venezuelan regime employees are obligated and harassed to attend public events to demonstrate support for pro-regime candidates. Socialist Party militants are dispatched to intimidate voters under the guise of assistance. And the Maduro regime is using military forces to keep citizens from voluntarily auditing electoral precincts, as it is stated by law.

As the Maduro regime continues to refuse allowing international monitors, the United States must be even more vigilant of the threat of the fraud before and during election day in Venezuela.

We should also be ready to sanction any regime official who perpetuates human rights violations because of this electoral process.

REPUBLIC OF CHINA NATIONAL DAY AND HO FENG-SHAN

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Taiwan's National Day, or Double Tenth Day, on Saturday, October 10.

Taiwan and the United States have shared a close relationship since passage of the Taiwan Relations Act in 1979. With deep trade ties and close security cooperation between our two countries, Taiwan is going to be an important regional and global actor and friend to the United States.

One famous diplomat from the Republic of China, Mr. Ho Feng-Shan, perfectly embodied the bravery and the heroism of so many in this country. Mr. Ho, consul general in Vienna during Nazi occupation, defied orders from his superiors and issued hundreds of visas to Jews who, without his efforts, would have been forbidden from leaving Austria and would likely have fallen victim to Hitler's plans to exterminate the Jews.

For his selfless and courageous actions, he rightfully earned the title of Righteous Among the Nations from the Yad Vashem Holocaust Museum.

Please join me in celebrating Taiwan's National Day and paying tribute to Mr. Ho's sacrifices and actions.

LIFT CRUDE OIL EXPORT BAN

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, with just one change in the law, we could create nearly 400,000 American jobs, potentially help lower gas prices, and

exert soft power that keeps bad actors around the world from destabilizing the price of oil. That change would be lifting the ban on crude oil exports.

With all of these benefits for America, it makes sense that we should embrace that change and put it on the President's desk right away. The export ban is a relic of the past that needs to be lifted to help establish the United States as a preeminent energy leader in the world.

The United States is the only country in the world that has a ban on exporting oil. With countries like Iran and Russia flexing their muscle on the world stage, lifting the ban would help enhance both our energy and our national security. But even more than that, removing the crude oil export ban means helping our economy with more good-paying jobs for hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to lift the crude oil export ban.

HONORING HO FENG-SHAN

(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 rise today to honor the Republic of China on Taiwan's National Day and recognize the heroism of Ho Feng-Shan, a Chinese diplomat stationed in Vienna during World War II. At great risk to his own life, Feng-Shan issued thousands of Chinese visas to Jews, allowing them to escape Nazi camps. Ho Feng-Shan's courage is just one example of the Republic of China's proud heritage celebrated on National Day.

A vital U.S. trading partner, Taiwan helps maintain peace and stability in the western Pacific and shares our values for freedom, democracy, and respect for human rights. Rooted in our history of mutual interests and common goals, the U.S.-Taiwanese relationship will continue to flourish.

I pay tribute to Ho Feng-Shan and wish the people of Taiwan a happy National Day.

EARTH SCIENCE WEEK

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, next week marks the 18th annual international Earth Science Week. Today I am introducing a House resolution to recognize Earth Science Week to highlight the importance and broad impact of earth science research.

Geoscientists and researchers in our country continually push the frontier of human knowledge; help develop and incubate the concepts and programs that keep us at the innovative forefront of the world's economy; and inspire future generations of researchers, scientists, and informed citizens. Earth science funding is a stimulant to the American economy and an investment into our future global leadership.

The devastating drought in my home State of California highlights the need for earth science research, which can address major gaps in our understanding of water availability, quality, and dynamics. Having a better understanding of natural systems allows for more informed policy.

I am committed to working with my friend and fellow science advocate, Chairman CULBERSON, to ensure that Federal earth science research is given robust support and is not hindered by misguided legislation that micromanages and places funding caps on these critical fields. It is critical that we study and understand our ''pale blue dot,'' our one and only home.

REMEMBERING SENIOR AIRMAN QUINN JOHNSON-HARRIS

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to mourn the six servicemembers and five civilians killed in the recent crash of an Air Force transport plane in Afghanistan. Yesterday, the House held a moment of silence to mark their sacrifice.

One of those who died was Senior Airman Quinn Johnson-Harris, whose family now calls Milwaukee, Wisconsin, their home. He and his fallen comrades join the list of the 2,300 heroes who have given their lives in Afghanistan.

As a Member of Congress, there is no more difficult moment in our jobs than this. My heart and prayers go out to family.

There is no question that Quinn made our community in Milwaukee stronger and our Nation safer because of his service. This young man made a difference wherever he went. I hear it in the stories that have come out after his death from his family, his friends, his teachers, and others about his dedication to them and his country.

His mother said: ''Quinn dared to be different. He beat by his own drum.''

When his family, community, or country called, this young man stood up and did not shrink back. According to his sister, when she heard he was being deployed to Afghanistan, ''he was ready to go,'' and this surprised no one.

He came from a military family. His grandfather served in Vietnam. His older brother was a marine, and another older brother is a 2015 graduate of West Point and is in the Army.

Mr. Speaker, I join his family, his friends, and his fellow servicemen in mourning his life, yet celebrating the life of this young hero, Senior Airman Quinn Johnson-Harris.

MEDICARE PREMIUM FAIRNESS ACT

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, without congressional action, Medicare premiums and deductibles will increase in 2016 by 52 percent for an estimated 7.5 million American seniors and people with disabilities. Because these folks will not be receiving a Social Security cost of living adjustment for 2016, 30 percent of beneficiaries will not be held harmless, and their premiums will increase from $104 to $159 per month.

To stop rates from increasing, I have introduced the Medicare Premium Fairness Act, which will protect seniors and people with disabilities by capping premiums at 2015 levels for a year. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation.

Seniors in our communities worked hard all their lives and saw our country through a war, Depression, and dramatic social change. At a time when every dollar counts, this critical legislation will ensure that seniors can put food on the table and buy lifesaving medication.

So let's stand up for America's seniors.

□ 1645

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BABIN). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mrs. BLACK, Tennessee

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 451 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (Pub. L. 113–128), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following individual on the part of the House to the National Council on Disability:

Lt. Colonel Daniel M. Gade, Ph.D., New Windsor, New York

THE PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, this past spring Congress passed legislation that authorized the President to negotiate and sign sweeping trade agreements with limited input from Congress.

When I say ''the President,'' I am not just talking about Mr. Obama, Mr. Speaker. I am talking about anyone who sits in the Oval Office from now on.

This body then went on to pass a trade adjustment assistance package that falls far short of what is necessary and, in and of itself, acknowledges the loss of employment that comes from the trade agreement. Those steps set the stage for the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the final language of which was announced earlier this week. That deal was built from years of secret negotiations between corporations and trade representatives, with little to no input from the working families who will have to bear the loss of jobs here at home.

Mr. Speaker, back in New Jersey, we know what happens when trade deals don't consider American workers. Factories close, employees are laid off, and whole cities that used to pump out products for consumers around the world are suddenly faced with stunted economies and incomprehensible unemployment.

While I am not opposed to free trade, our priority can't simply be corporate gains under the guise of economic growth; it must be the welfare of working families. But working families are going to find themselves out of luck if they are forced to compete with salaries of just cents an hour overseas.

TPP is a very bad deal. It lacks prohibitions to address currency manipulation; it lacks environmental standards that will keep manufacturers accountable and ensure we are preventing some of the human causes of climate change; and it lacks labor standards that protect the human rights of workers in places like Mexico, Vietnam, and Malaysia, running against even the most basic human American values. It does all this based on the flawed philosophy that supporting multinational corporations somehow helps the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, let me state for the record that no trade deal is ever crafted to support the American middle class, and any suggestion otherwise is a flat-out, bold-faced lie.

International trade is always marketed as the key to economic growth, but we are told that opening new markets means more opportunities for U.S. businesses. That is true in part. But the businesses that profit most are multinational corporations, and part of that profit comes from sending American jobs overseas. We will allow those same companies to continue to enjoy tax loopholes that maximize their bottom line and allow them to keep much of their profits stashed away elsewhere. If NAFTA and CAFTA are any example, these profits will never make it down the line to Americans striving to get to the middle class.

If we are serious about growing our economy in a way that supports every American, there are plenty of policy changes that we could make:

We could give our workers a living wage that would allow them to support their families;

We could provide better primary and secondary education and more affordable higher education;

We could offer employment through the hundreds of thousands of jobs we could create by investing in infrastructure repairs and upgrades;

And we could do a lot better than TPP.

So before we move forward, my congressional Progressive colleagues and I have come to the floor to urge Members on both sides of the aisle to take what limited time we have to change the course. We have just one last opportunity to fix this deal, to protect American workers, and to ensure a deal that will actually boost our economy, not just the profit margins of multinational corporations, and we need to take that time.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to a Member who has been as outspoken as any of us as we talk about the need to reexamine this flawed agreement. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), our ranking member on the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the gentlewoman yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a debate I seem to have had before. I was here for the NAFTA debate.

Congressional districts throughout this country, including my own of Rochester, New York, will find it very difficult to survive another trade deal that sends our jobs overseas to countries that ignore human rights violations and undermine our laws in public health here at home. During my time in Congress, I have never seen a trade agreement that the United States participated in that benefited either the American manufacturer or the American worker, and everything I know about Trans-Pacific Partnership suggests it will be more of the same.

Despite a bipartisan push by 158 Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives, the trade deal announced this week will do nothing to address the largest trade barrier our manufacturers face, which is currency manipulation. As with past trade deals, a side agreement in the TPP related to currency manipulation is window dressing that is unlikely to be enforced at all, as most of the NAFTA side agreements were not, and will do little to stem the flow of American jobs overseas. As with past trade deals, this will force American manufacturers to compete with foreign companies that receive unfair advantages from their governments. For this reason, Ford Motor Company has come out in opposition to this trade agreement.

The TPP has been negotiated under a cloud of secrecy—by the way, they all are—by multinational conglomerates, and we know from the United States, the financial services industry and the pharmaceutical companies—both have only one priority, their bottom line—were very important in those negotiations. Now that an agreement has been reached, the negotiators will no longer be able to keep the contents of the bad trade deal hidden from the public.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, were any of us to look at the trade bill that they did make available over here, we were not able to take a pencil or paper with us. We had to have somebody with security clearance go with us—our own staff could not go—and we could not speak about it. That is some strange idea, I think, of democracy.

I have been in conversations with parliamentarians from Australia and from Canada who have had the very same problem. As a matter of fact, in Australia, if any of the parliamentarians wanted to see the trade bill, they had to sign a paper they would not discuss it for 4 years. For three of the greatest economies and democracies in this trade agreement—the United States, Canada, and Australia—to allow their parliamentarians to be put into that kind of restraint is one of the most egregious parts of these trade agreements.

Now that we will be able, since it has been signed, to look at it, negotiators are going to have a lot of explaining to do. Because as Americans learn more in the coming weeks and months about how this agreement will impact their day-to-day lives with things like unsafe food imports—we are pretty certain about that because we already turned around a great number, tons of seafood coming in; 98 percent of the seafood that we eat is imported, and about 2 to 3 percent of it is inspected—the momentum of a bad trade deal will continue to grow.

Let me tell you why we, the Canadians, the Australians, the European Union, and the United Nations are upset about this. There is a thing called the investor-state dispute settlement, and it is onerous. It gives to three corporate lawyers the right to settle disputes.

Any investor-state in this agreement can bring a case against any of the other countries in the agreement if they think that a law or a practice in that country affects their bottom line. We know that everybody is worried about that here because one committee of the House, just in talking about it, did away with country-of-origin labeling.

So, as I have pointed out, both the United Nations and the European Union have done papers on the fact that this is a very bad way to run anything, to let three corporate lawyers make that decision; but we are going to be stuck with that, unfortunately, unless we can kill the bill.

What is even more abhorrent is that some of our trading partners, Malaysia—Malaysia has the worst human rights record on the face of the Earth. We know that. The State Department has always given them a very low grade. They have slave labor. We know that they do sex trafficking, and they just recently took the Prime Minister off on some kind of charges. There is no reason in the world that we would include them in a trade agreement. Then there is also Brunei, which practices sharia law. These two countries, under the investor-state dispute settlement, can make sure that our laws do not interfere with their making a profit.

We are better people than that, Mr. Speaker. We are going to be looking at this very closely. It is really not a trade deal. In my view, it is a race to the bottom.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New York for her comments and for being with us today as part of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to a Member who has been outspoken on behalf of working families and American workers, Mr. POCAN from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am really glad to be here today with the Progressive Caucus Special Order hour, and I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for all her hard work on behalf of the Progressive Caucus and on behalf of this issue on the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

As we know, over the weekend and all last week, the U.S. Trade Representative Office's cooks have been in the kitchen, and they have told us now the Trans-Pacific Partnership is done; but from everything that we can tell, it is not fully baked. In fact, at best, it is half-baked when it comes to labor, environmental, and consumer concerns.

Now that a final deal has been reached, we asked the administration to let the American public immediately see the full text of this agreement. This negotiating process has not been transparent up to this point, despite claims from the U.S. Trade Representative Office. We know that about 600 people, largely corporate CEOs, have been involved in the drafting of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, but not Congress, and certainly not members of the public. The secretive nature of these negotiations is compounded by the pressure to throw together this deal based on the political timelines of our negotiating partners rather than with the regard of the U.S. worker in mind.

Reports throughout the course of the negotiating process have raised serious questions about the impact of this agreement on a number of areas ranging from workplace and environmental protections to food safety, but, most importantly, jobs and wages. We all know this economy has been rebounding. The stockmarket is significantly up from the 2008 crash. Corporate profits are up. CEO pay is up. Productivity is up. But wages for the American worker have, unfortunately, been dead flat, and the Trans-Pacific Partnership will lead to the loss of good-paying jobs right here in the U.S.

Through several decades of unfair trade rules, corporations have outsourced production and offshored jobs, and the TPP will only exacerbate this problem. In fact, on Tuesday, in its initial analysis, The Wall Street Journal has projected an increase in the manufacturing trade deficit of $38.2 billion. That means jobs and wages right here in the United States.

□ 1700

Additional reports have also said that the labor standards will remain subpar, that currency manipulation has not been adequately addressed, rules of origin for autos have been weakened, and human rights issues with countries like Malaysia and Brunei have not been dealt with properly.

Among these concerns, corporations still have the ability to supersede laws of our country through the investor-state dispute settlement process, something that Representative SLAUGHTER explained very aggressively in her comments.

This agreement has nothing to do to effectively address currency manipulation, which that alone has contributed to the loss of up to 5 million U.S. jobs.

Despite claims by the administration that this agreement is the most progressive high standard deal that we have ever negotiated, the labor environmental rules in our free trade agreements are rarely enforced in our partner nations.

In fact, 4 years ago, when we passed the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, to the letter of the law the Colombian Government has put the provisions within Colombian law and not one bit of that has actually been implemented and over 100 labor leaders in the last 4 years have been killed just in Colombia.

So these trade agreements haven't worked based on past practice, and without changes they are not going to work in future progress as well.

In addition, the administration has gone out of its way to help cover up human rights atrocities in order to conclude these negotiations.

Malaysia was demoted in the State Department's 2014 Trafficking in Persons Report due to its grossly inadequate response to the perverse tracking of minority groups throughout the country.

By downgrading them within the same year that mass graves were found of workers in Malaysia is an insult to human rights conditions, and to include them and countries like Brunei that still stone gays and lesbians and single mothers is a further evidence that this deal is not ready for the public or for Congress to accept for the public.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is neither free trade nor fair trade. In reality, it is a system of rules crafted by multi-national corporate interests and their lobbyists that work for a select group of powerful people at the expense of everyone else. This just isn't about jobs or wages. This is an agreement about corporate profits. Past trade deals have been a disaster for American workers. So it is imperative that Congress rigorously review this deal to ensure that the American people aren't yet taken for a ride again.

Again, I will renew my call and the Progressive Caucus' call to immediately release the text of the agreement. Six hundred corporate CEOs know what is in the deal, but the 435 Members of this House and the American public don't. That is simply wrong.

If this deal is as good as they say it is, put the language on the table and let's review it with the public. My fear is that it is not. If it is going to cost American jobs and wages, it is the wrong thing to do, and we have to reject the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for taking the time to be with us to talk about what is such an important issue for us.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't often that we get a second bite at an apple in realtime, but this is one of those opportunities that we do have. There have been a number of issues that have been raised that I believe validate from our perspective that this is not a good deal.

It is not a good deal for American families. It is not a good deal for American workers. It is only a good deal for multi-national corporations.

We are engaging in a trade relationship with countries whose values we do not share and who, on occasions, we have actually had the opportunity to shame.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we, as Members of Congress, can find this as an opportunity to work together to do something collectively, which is better for the American family and the American worker. We can do that at the same time we have an opportunity to have fair trade agreements and just trade agreements.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a Member who has been as outspoken as any other Member in this House about the need to turn back from this flawed agreement, a leader on workers' rights and human rights and women's rights and building an economy that works for average Americans.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you to my colleague and what an honor for me to join with you and to thank you for your steadfast efforts in fighting for working families, for the American workers, men and women, and not being afraid to stand up and say no to what would be injustice for our American workers and their families.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 4 days since the Trans-Pacific Partnership was announced. We have not yet been shown the text, but we have heard a chorus of spin about the supposed benefits of this secret agreement.

After more than 5 years of talks, the parties have announced a deal without having released a single word to the public. The negotiations took place under unprecedented secrecy.

Corporate special interests had a place at the table. Congress and American families were locked out. The American people and their elected representatives in Congress are forced to rely on leaks to find out what is in this agreement.

But the truth is that, on vital issues like workers' rights, environment, and human rights, the standards are only valuable if they are enforced. If experience is any guide, we will do little to enforce those provisions.

I remember in 2007 when my Democratic colleagues in this Chamber forced the Bush administration to renegotiate a number of trade agreements to include enhanced labor standards.

In the 8 years since, neither the current administration nor its predecessor has taken meaningful action to enforce those provisions. So dozens of Colombian union organizers are being murdered despite labor provision in the U.S. Colombia Free Trade Agreement. Thousands of acres of Peruvian forests are being destroyed despite the environmental provisions in the U.S.-Peru Free Trade Agreement.

Why would we assume that the Trans-Pacific Partnership will be any different when it comes to Brunei's persecution of LGBT people, Malaysia's human trafficking and forced labor, or Vietnam's abundant use of child labor?

In fact, the administration has already shown us how little regard it pays to these issues by upgrading Malaysia's classification on human trafficking in order to sign the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement.

Past experience tells us what to expect in other areas as well. The last big trade deal, the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, cost this country 75,000 jobs in just 3 years, according to the Economic Policy Institute.

The TPP will be even worse. Not only is it far bigger, it will throw Americans into competition with Vietnamese workers who make less than 65 cents per hour. These provisions will offshore jobs, lower our wages, and increase income inequality. Americans workers have seen this happen to them year after year after year.

To compound these problems, it has been reported that the TPP will remove support from green jobs and American industry by outlawing buy American and buy local standards in government procurement contracts and potentially opening the door for Chinese state-owned enterprises to take those contracts.

In common with every previous trade agreement, the TPP does nothing to curb currency manipulation, which basically allows countries to keep their goods and the price of their goods at artificially low prices. That means, if they lower their prices and their currency, ours are more expensive.

This abuse, not in my words, but in the words of economists C. Fred Bergsten at the Peterson Institute, Jared Bernstein at the Center for American Progress—they believe that currency manipulation and its practice by China, by Singapore, and Vietnam, who are all part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement—that currency manipulation has led to the loss of almost 5 million jobs in the United States of America.

One of the biggest historical manipulators, as I said, Japan, is a member of the TPP. The administration has even floated the idea of adding China, probably the worst currency manipulator in history.

China's recent devaluation just a few short weeks ago of the yuan cost up to 640,000 American jobs, according to the Economic Policy Institute. And after the administration decided to take no action against China, TPP partner Vietnam followed suit, and they devalued their own currency.

In other words, with this agreement, we are rewarding the cheats. No currency forum, as the administration has talked about, because currency and enforceable currency regulations are not in the legislation.

But they say there is going to be a forum, that we will have the opportunity to discuss this. Well, you can have a lot of forums, but unless you have an enforcement mechanism to say no, it is not going to be fixed. It has to be fixed in the agreement, and it is not. So the forum is meaningless.

The predictable calamities do not end there. Earlier this year, WTO trade agreements led to the dismantling of American food labeling laws, country of origin labeling, so that the American public will know where their food is coming from.

Again, the TPP goes even further by allowing multi-national corporations, as well as foreign governments, to challenge U.S. law. It will not be long before we start to see challenges to our food safety system, a system already strained to the breaking point by a flood of tainted contaminated seafood from the TPP countries like Malaysia and Vietnam.

Finally, we know that the TPP will establish rules that give Big Pharma different monopoly periods across partner nations. That makes no sense in a free trade agreement. Why would you do this? That is only to keep drug prices high.

One commonly used combination of HIV drugs cost $10,000 per year when bought from a Big Pharma monopolist, from the big pharmaceutical company, but as a generic, it only costs $250. What this agreement will do is to delay generics coming to the market.

And by locking in these corporate monopolies, the agreement compromises our access to medicines for the people who need it the most: your constituents, my colleague, and mine, and all of our colleagues.

President Obama said on Monday that the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement ''reflects American values.'' But the administration's approach has been the opposite. It has put corporate special interests before the interests of the American people instead of learning from past experience. We are being railroaded into yet another trade agreement that risks our jobs, our wages, and the health of our family.

But, under the law, there is still time for Congress to reject the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement, and that is what we need to do in a bipartisan way. There are people on both sides of the aisle in this institution that oppose this agreement.

We need to come together and we need to come together for the sake of the working men and women that we represent all over this country. That is what our job is to do right now. We have a moral responsibility. We have an obligation to the people who elect us and send us here to represent their best interests.

Everything that we know from past agreements and what limited amount of information we know from this agreement will put the economic security at risk for American families.

I want to say to my colleague, thank you for doing this. We need over the next several weeks to be doing this every single day because the word has got to go out to the American public of just what is at stake in this trade agreement, and they will be calling their representative and telling them to vote ''no.''

Thank you very, very much for the opportunity to participate tonight.

□ 1715

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for her eloquent and compelling words. Whenever she speaks up for the American people, she does so in such a convincing way and a way that is backed by empirical data, not just anecdotes and not just sort of dreams, but that which she already knows.

So I appreciate and feel particularly honored to represent the Congressional Progressive Caucus here this evening to speak out on issues that we know are very important, vitally important, to the well-being of the American worker and our American families.

I do pray that our congressional body can come together around an issue that affects all of us in any district that we might represent, in any corner of the United States of America, and at any economic strata that we might represent.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers who want to address this issue this evening. I thank you for your indulgence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LIFTING BAN ON OIL EXPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership allowing me to visit with you about something that is near and dear to my heart. I hope we spend the better part of the next hour discussing a bill tomorrow that will be before this body, which is H.R. 702, which would lift the 40-year-old, decades-old ban on exporting a domestic product, a domestic commodity, called crude oil.

As you look at the things that America buys and sells around the world, the only commodity that we produce here in the United States that we cannot export is crude oil. It harkens back to 40 years ago, and I will talk about it in a second.

There are no restrictions on imports. You could import all the crude oil that you would like, but we have a restriction on exporting that crude oil.

Now, the administration recently signaled a bit of a change in that in that they licensed a swap of certain number of barrels of heavy crude from Mexico for light sweet crude coming to the United States. So there was at least one opportunity recently where the Department of Commerce authorized that swap and, in effect, began to export some of this crude that we produce every single day.

Forty years ago the Arab oil embargo and all the things that happened with that—most of the folks in this Chamber, except maybe you and I, don't necessarily recall the long lines at the gas station and the rationing and the way that even-numbered license plates were okay one day and odd-numbered license plates were okay the next day to buy gasoline.

I can remember living in Dallas at the time. I would have to get up at 5 o'clock in the morning and go sit in line at a gas station in order to fill up the car so that I could make it downtown and back and forth. It was somewhat disruptive to our quiet lives.

The price of oil went from $3 a barrel to $12 a gallon, a fourfold increase. That shock hammered the economy with a lot of things that were going on.

As a part of that response, in addition to the response, just before the Arab oil embargo in the 1973–1974 timeframe, the United States had, through a secret study, determined that American crude oil production may have peaked in 1970 and that the wells in the United States that were then producing and the new ones that were going to be drilled and brought online—that the daily production in the United States would slowly decline from that point on and that that scarce resource of strategic value needed to stay here in the United States.

So while we were even a net importer at that point in time, the wisdom of this House, the Senate, and the President at the time was: Let's just don't export any U.S. crude. Let's use all of it here. And then we will buy from other folks the crude oil that we need to make up the difference in our refinery loads.

That held true for 35 years. Then something pretty stunning happened, and that was this incredible renaissance in the oil and gas business that has occurred over the last 5 years.

When history writes about this era of the oil and gas business, it will talk about these incredible breakthroughs in technology and the science associated with it and the risk taking of the private sector.

The current President likes to brag about the oil and increased production. Quite frankly, this has all come in the private sector, private lands, and private initiatives, where this has happened. Permitting on public property, public lands, has slowed down, and actual production off our Federal lands has shrunk from where it has been.

So for 35 years it was a policy that was out there. It was never an issue because we didn't produce enough every day to export.

Then about 5 years ago this process of increased production was driven by the shale oil play in the Bakken, the shale oil play in west Texas, and the shale oil play in the Eagle Ford shale in south Texas, big frac jobs, technologies that broke the rock up or allowed the oil to escape out of that rock in quantities heretofore not really contemplated or known.

The oil was in the rock. Everyone knew that. They just didn't know how to get it out of the rock. This wonderful renaissance began to occur, and U.S. production began to increase every day to the point now that the estimates, had the price not dropped, were that, by 2020, we would be the largest exporter and that we would have an excess.

So we already had a bit of an excess of crude oil in the United States because it had to go through U.S. refineries. U.S. refineries are set up to process heavy crude, which is not what is produced out of this oil shale. That is light, sweet crude. So, consequently, we had more light sweet. We are still importing crude every day from Venezuela and other countries that feed heavy crude into our refineries.

So it got on everybody's radar screen that we need to figure out a way to unlock this market and eliminate the inefficiencies associated with not being able to export U.S. crude.

As a result of that, there are two sets of prices in the world markets. There is a Brent price of crude, which is North Sea crude, and there is also a West Texas Intermediate price that is in the markets.

There has been for a long time now a differential between those two prices. The West Texas Intermediate price, which is what our local American producers get, was less than the Brent crude.

That differential was driven by the fact that we had no market for U.S. crude, other than U.S. refineries, given the laws and the restrictions that were in place. So the movement began to explore the opportunity for lifting this decades-long ban on crude oil.

Throughout the years that HARRY REID was in charge of the Senate, it was a nonstarter because it was not likely we could get a bill like we are going to vote on tomorrow in the House through the Senate. With the Republican victory last November and control in the Senate by Republicans, it then became an opportunity for us to examine this policy and see if it makes sense.

Just to set the record straight, even without the bad deal the President has foisted on us, we treat Iran better than we treat American producers. Because even before the sanctions are lifted in Iran, they can produce and export about a million barrels of crude oil a day. The U.S. is zero.

So as you step back to look at the big picture, we treat Iran—with all the mischief they do and the bad actor they are and the threat to world peace that they are, they get better treatment than domestic producers, and that makes no sense whatsoever when you look at the overall issue.

So we are at a point now where, with this drop in prices to almost half of what it was, we have begun to see that crude oil production will probably tail off here in the United States this quarter.

But the oil is there. We know how to get it. The science is available. It is just simply driven by the price. Recovering the drilling and completion costs is what is causing the current decline in production, but we know where it is and how to go get it.

When a well comes online, from day one, it will begin to produce less oil today than it did yesterday. That process, that decline, will move forward throughout the life of that well until it reaches its economic limit.

The economic limit of a producing well is driven by the price versus how much it costs you to get it out of the ground, the taxes associated with the barrel, the royalties associated with it. Those have got to be in positive circumstances or it doesn't make any sense to produce that crude oil.

In the drilling and the completion of a well, you have got to be able to recover that investment from the total number of barrels that you expect to produce out of that well. When you know those fixed costs going in, there are very few of those costs that are recoverable once you drill a well.

Your only return is to sell the crude oil. And given how much you think that each well will produce, it has got to be at a price where you can recover that investment as well as cover your incremental costs each day of producing that crude oil.

So there are some sound economic reasons why, at current prices of crude

oil, there is less drilling going on and certainly less completions going on in the market.

That oil is not going anywhere. That shale is just the way it was when the prices were a lot higher. So if prices were to recover and it made sense, then our American domestic producers could go back to producing more and would then reset that decline on an upward slope so that we are, in fact, producing more oil each day than we did yesterday because we are bringing on more wells every single day to offset the natural decline that each well will experience. While we have got this window of opportunity, it is time now to lift this crude oil ban.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined by my neighbor, who represents the southern two-thirds of New Mexico. More importantly, he represents my three grandsons who live in Las Cruces, New Mexico. So I watch him like a hawk to make sure he is doing a good job representing my grandsons.

I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to attention that we are engaged in a very important activity here. We are talking about American jobs.

Now, some people dismiss jobs as being a four-letter word. Well, I mean it kind of is, but not that kind of four-letter word. It is an important piece.

When I was born, my father was a sharecropper. In 1947, the year I was born, he made $200. The next year, the drought year, he made 50 bucks.

Mom said, ''We are leaving the farm.'' She jumped in the pickup truck. Dad jumped in the back, along with us kids. There were three kids at that time, later to become six.

They headed to the West. I don't think they knew where they were going. I guess they would have stopped when they got to California. But they got 75 miles down the road and broke down 3 miles outside of Hobbs, New Mexico. They hitchhiked into Hobbs, and that is where I grew up.

Dad was able to find a job almost immediately in the oilfield. He got in at the lowest level, a roustabout, making $2.62 an hour.

Now, to them, to my family who had made $200 for a full year's work and $50 for the next year's work, $2.62 an hour was the absolute pinnacle.

They never moved from Hobbs. They stayed there and raised their six children on $2.62 an hour. And, of course, it graduated through the years.

That is why I am passionate about this export ban. Because right now we have people in my home county who are being laid off because our oil is sitting in the pipelines. The pipelines going to Houston are filled up. And so companies are having to shut down wells. They are having to stop production.

Now, some of the countries in the Baltics have come to Eddy County, which is one of the counties I represent, and they have said, ''We would buy your light, sweet oil. That crude oil is better than what we buy from Russia. We would stop buying from Russia and buy from you,'' except we have this ban in place. We can't ship oil out of this country.

Now, we have to understand that 95 percent of the world's consumers are outside the United States. So when we have this self-imposed problem, this self-imposed restriction on sending a product that is very needed out there, know that we are penalizing American jobs.

The President has been very, very ardent in his willingness to create Iranian jobs because he insists that Iran should be able to export their oil while all the time saying that he is opposed to the idea of this bill.

□ 1730

We are going to consider this bill tomorrow, and I think in my heart that we are doing things that would benefit people like my parents, people who did not have the option to move to New York and be on Wall Street. They didn't have the option to move to Albuquerque or Dallas. They were where they could get to, and they were able to find work and raise a family. That is the people that I am fighting for, the people that don't have other choices.

Now, the oilfield provides very good jobs. In this current energy revolution that is taking place in the country, this explosion of shale oil production, truck drivers in my hometown were receiving $100,000 a year to drive a truck. If you wanted to work overtime, you could get up to $120,000. That is the sort of job that is now available to people like my father. If he were still working, those jobs would be out there.

But it is not just the people in the oil and gas industry. It is the people who work in the convenience store at the corner. They are busy 24 hours a day, and the local convenience store operator may have to pay $15 an hour just to attract people in. It benefits everyone, regardless if they are in oil and gas or not.

In New Mexico, oil and gas provides about 40 percent to our State's budget. I tell teachers on the other side of the State: With no oil and gas, you should be vitally interested in this export bill because, if we put people back to work in the oil industry, that money goes straight to the State government, and it helps pay your salary.

Up and down the spectrum, people are benefited when we have a vital energy economy.

If we are going to allow our light sweet crude to be exported, people wonder: Are we going to run out of energy? Absolutely not. It is not going to get more expensive.

Back when my father was working for Humble, which later became Exxon, they had a company philosophy. They were the largest energy company in the world. They simply said this area, the Permian Basin here in New Mexico, is going to run out of oil in the late 1980s, so they sold every producing well in that area. They simply moved out.

Just a couple of years ago, a discovery was made in southern New Mexico—keep in mind, some of the majors moved out, said there was no more future in this area; it is going to be out of oil—and a discovery was made that is going to produce more oil from that one field than has been produced in New Mexico through the whole of New Mexico in all of its history, from one field that was discovered recently.

We have this kind of thing where people are saying, well, we have got to worry and we have got to think about the future and save it for the future. No, there is as much oil out there unused as we have used in New Mexico. So let us have New Mexico jobs. Let us continue to export now instead of allowing the oil to fill up the pipelines and shut down jobs. That is the main reason that I am supporting this.

Obviously, I appreciate the fact that energy is national security. The low energy prices now are rebuilding the manufacturing economy. As we drive the price of oil down—and keep in mind that the consumers benefit from that. Gasoline had gotten to over $4. Now, then, it is right down in the $2 range. So it benefits the consumers.

It is also attracting back industries that manufacture. That is essential for that kind of business. If you are going to manufacture, you need affordable, reliable energy. Firms are moving back here in order to produce. That is creating even other jobs that don't even seem associated with the energy business.

So, again, you have many, many reasons for supporting this energy export bill, and I urge my colleagues to do that.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for his thoughts and comments. He and I are blessed to share a group of people who work across that State line between Texas and New Mexico—our districts are contiguous with each other—who live in one State, work in the other, vice versa, some of the hardest working, most dedicated, patriotic folks on the face of the Earth, like his dad and his mom who have built wealth, raised a family, protected that family, and produced a U.S. Congressman. It makes them easy to talk about and easy to defend.

I want to flush out this idea of the geopolitical aspects of lifting the ban. I was recently in a Baltic country in conversations with one of the top two leaders, and I had the chance to ask a question of the Prime Minister. I said: Mr. Prime Minister, if you could buy crude oil directly from the United States, would it make your issues with Putin and all the mischief and things he is up to less difficult to deal with?

He lit up like a Christmas tree. He said: Oh, absolutely, absolutely. We would love to buy U.S. crude and not spend that money with Putin and Russia and help lift the boot—the Russian

boot off their neck—that is driven by crude oil and natural gas.

If they could supply to these countries that can't supply themselves, then there is absolutely no reason whatsoever that they shouldn't be running our light sweet crude through their refineries at this point in time.

Steve talked about his dad. My dad was the same way in the sense that if rigs—he was a roughneck, and roughnecks are that hardy group of individuals who work on a drilling rig. It is dangerous. It is hard. It is 24 hours a day. They work 8-hour shifts.

My dad would pull doubles in order to get the extra time and a half so the cash flow to the family would be enough to feed my brother, sister, me, and my mom. He lost a part of a finger as a part of that experience. If the rigs were running in Borger, Texas—we lived in Borger, Texas, where I was born. If the rigs were running in Odessa, Texas, we moved to Odessa, Texas, because my dad thought it was more important to have a job than necessarily where we lived because that was key.

In the early 1990s, I was part of a group that did a needs assessment in Midland, Texas. And we sometimes lose sight of why jobs are important because we talk a lot about it. But that needs assessment did a scientifically sound, statistically sound survey of Midland, asking folks what are the issues within your home, what are the issues within your neighborhood, what are the issues within your community that have a problem, that create this problem? We then winnowed those down to the top 10.

If you looked at that list of top 10 needs of Midland, Texas, at the time, 9 of those would have been positively impacted by somebody having a job. Whatever that need was, it was less of a problem if a family had a job than if they didn't have a job.

The jobs that this will create, jobs that this will protect and maintain are important. The unemployment rate in Midland, Texas, is still in the 3, 2 range, and Odessa is the lower 4. That hides some other issues associated with this problem; and that is, before the drop in the price of oil, not only were there a lot of jobs, but a lot of those jobs were providing some 10, 15, 20 hours of overtime each week to the people that were working. Overtime is a real boost because it is time and a half.

Now, then, these folks still have a job, and with the decreased activity, the decreased drilling and all the other activity associated with the crude oil business, that overtime has evaporated. These folks still have a job, but they built commitments and bought trucks and other things based on that overtime, and they are now not getting it. So while they still have a job, the cash flow to their families is impacted.

I had another opportunity to see the impact of that recently when I toured our local food bank and was discussing with them what was going on. They said that the elderly population coming to the food bank had dramatically increased over the last 4 or 5 months as a result of this drop in prices.

I asked, Well, why is that? They said that many of these adults, these elderly adults, their families had been helping them with their monthly bills. Because they had this extra overtime, they had extra money that they were able to help their families with, and now that that has evaporated, that trickle-down effect is impacting these elderly who are on fixed incomes and are having to now go to the food bank. Creating jobs, you just can't overstate how important that is.

I have now been joined by my fellow Texan from the Dallas area, PETE SESSIONS, current chairman of the Committee on Rules. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. SESSIONS. Chairman CONAWAY, I want to thank you for leading this effort tonight as we talk to the American people about what we are not only doing in Washington, D.C., but about what we began several years ago, a process of talking to our colleagues about how important it was that America have a strong energy policy. America is the only nation in the world that has a provision that does not allow the export of crude oil.

Crude oil is something that we have been told for a long, long time, since the mid-1970s, that we are running out of. It is a natural resource that America has an abundance of, but over the years that we are running out of oil, we are running out and depleting what we have.

Then a few years ago, some bit of reality took place because a change in technology, a change in technology that was called horizontal drilling, allowed those people who were in the oil patch actually drilling and doing the hard work necessary to extract this gift that we have in this country, developed a process that would allow them to get 60 percent more oil than what had previously been provided for through those existing processes.

Overnight, Americans saw that we also gained the advantage of getting more natural gas. The proven reserves of not only natural gas, but also crude oil shot up dramatically; and it became very apparent not only to the marketplace, because we have seen consumer prices fall over the last few years from over $4.40 per gallon in lots of places to last week, in Dallas, Texas, 2 weeks ago, gasoline at $1.97. It is true, last weekend that I was home, it was $2.18. Mr. Speaker, I would sooner be paying between $1.99 and $2.18 for the gasoline that I use as opposed to the scare tactics of where we were just a few short years ago of over $4.

What does this mean to the American consumer? What does this mean to families all over the United States? More importantly, what does it mean to America? It means that in testimony that was gathered yesterday at the Committee on Rules, on which I have a chance to serve as the chairman, that we heard that they are expecting at least 400,000 regular jobs that would be added to the economy. That would be all across the United States of America—New York, Illinois, Florida, North Carolina, all over this country—because it would encourage us to do more work, to be able, instead of taking these places and putting a stop on their production, we would now do more production, get it into the worldwide market, sell it overseas, and it becomes a product just like a farm product that can be sold around the world that would help America's exports.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to thank not only Chairman JOE BARTON, but also Chairman MICHAEL CONAWAY for the hard work that they have done to sell the ideas and the reality that America can have it both ways, and that is: we can produce our natural products; we can get more than 60 percent more out of the ground than we were getting before because of the technology; and we can help the American consumer, moms and dads who need to get to work, who need to go to softball and football practice, and also to work and back and church and back, all in a way that they can meet their budget.

I am pleased and proud to say, Chairman CONAWAY, you can count on me tomorrow, that I will be there to support this great piece of legislation. I want to thank you for allowing me to be with you to talk about the importance of this bill and to wish you good luck tomorrow.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules, PETE SESSIONS, for his kind words and also his support tomorrow.

I think the bill that went through the Committee on Energy and Commerce that started life as a Joe Barton bill will be the one that makes it to the floor tomorrow.

We are expecting to have a really solid, bipartisan vote, by the way. This is not a partisan issue, per se, but the White House might try to make it that. This is a bipartisan issue.

I yield to my colleague from Arkansas, FRENCH HILL. FRENCH.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this commonsense bill, which has been a long time in coming.

I want to thank Mr. CONAWAY for his leadership in bringing it to the floor tomorrow, and the process the committee used, which was a series of hearings through the process, supported by our chairman, supported by members on both sides of the aisle.

I want to thank JOE BARTON and Mr. CUELLAR of Texas for their leadership in recruiting cosponsors, a large bipartisan group of cosponsors, to bring this longstanding bill to the floor and the positive efforts it will have on our economy.

□ 1745

I would like to say to my friend, Mr. SESSIONS—and I invite him to come to

Little Rock—that I filled up last week for $1.82. So, perhaps Arkansas is a more competitive gas pricing market than even Texas. That may be the biggest economic news of the day here on the floor.

We have touched on the importance of American jobs. All of our American jobs in the oil patch right now are suffering due to low prices and low development budgets. I don't have any doubt that when reserves are revalued September 30 for our publicly traded companies, their oil and gas exploration lines of credit will be down because of pricing in the U.S.; and, therefore, this is a boost for the economic opportunity for jobs in the United States in development.

I want to touch on the national security aspects of this bill that I think are so important, Mr. Speaker. Early in the year, this House passed ways to improve liquefied natural gas to be developed and shipped overseas to international markets. We have an abundant amount of natural gas in this country. We are now the world's leading producer, and we have the opportunity to provide natural gas in liquefied form around the world to our allies in Asia and Europe. Likewise, eliminating the ban on crude oil, long outgrown by North American production and our economic success, will allow us to now, from a national security point of view, to have liquefied natural gas and crude oil as export potential and as economic job potential for the U.S.

But more importantly, to our NATO allies and to our Asian allies, we offer them North American gas and crude oil as an alternative to the Mid East and, most importantly, Europe to Russia. For too long, our allies in Europe have been held hostage by the politics of the Mid East or the politics of Russia. This allows us to be a much better not only economic partner, but national security partner with our allies in Europe and our allies in Asia.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to come to the floor and speak in strong support of this bill to remove the export ban on crude oil in the United States. I urge my fellow Members, both Democrat and Republican, to provide a good, strong, bipartisan vote and send that message to the United States Senate to join us in passing this lifting of the ban, and to send a message to White House, Mr. Chairman, that a veto message here is not appropriate.

I invite the President and the OMB and the Department of Energy to reconsider that, in fact, this is a national security benefit to the United States and a jobs and economic benefit to the United States, and it is not the kind of thing that our President should issue a veto threat on.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his comments and opinions on this issue. I hope his support draws Members of the other side of the aisle to our arguments and to make this happen.

The gentleman mentioned the price he paid in Arkansas recently. I dare say, there is not another commodity in America that we don't check the price on more often than gasoline. You may not buy gas every day, but every time you drive by a gasoline station, you check the price because it is right there for everybody to see. We don't put the price of bread and milk up like that, but we do put the price of gasoline up.

I have got a district that has 29 counties and is 300 miles wide and 200-plus miles north to south. We do a lot of driving. My district director and I are always looking for that better gasoline price deal in the district as we are moving around, because hardwired into most all of us that drive very much is to check those prices.

This increased production in the United States will also help protect consumers from price shocks. I mentioned that in 1974, the price of crude oil went from $3 a barrel to $12 a barrel, a fourfold increase. The more production you have from a stable environment like the United States, the less whipsaw you will get in the market from disruptions in supplies from places and part of the world where it is not quite as stable, such as the Middle East and others.

So, this increased U.S. production will also help protect American consumers from being whipsawed by dramatic increases in the price of crude oil because we have got that supply.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), who is from another State benefitting from the shale play and someone that is probably more familiar with the Bakken Shale than anybody else.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, your leadership on this has been great.

As I think about what Mr. HILL from Arkansas was saying in expressing his appreciation for regular order and the committee process, this really is probably one of the greatest examples since I have been in Congress of a piece of legislation and a concept that has gone through the process the way it is supposed to go through the process. Because not only did the Energy and Commerce Committee have hearings on H.R. 702, which we are going to vote on tomorrow which lifts the ban, I know you had a bill that similarly lifts the ban. You had hearings in the Agriculture Committee, which I think, by the way, the hearing you had was probably the best hearing on the entire topic. You honed in on that impact on the consumer and the input costs for producing another important product: food.

And we are pretty good in the United States in places like Texas and North Dakota and lots of places in between at growing food—enough food to feed not just Americans, but a hungry world, and enhance our trade balance and enhance our economy in using the peaceful tool of food rather than weapons of war.

I think, similarly, the shale revolution presents the same opportunity that food does, and that is to use the peaceful tools of energy development in place of or to enhance weapons of war.

One doesn't need to be too creative to see that in the world today there is some chaos. When you have Vladimir Putin pushing further into Eastern Europe, when you have him now bombing in Syria, when you have him selling arms to Iran, you have Iran being able to get arms and now being able to sell their oil in the global marketplace, to have this stabilizing impact of U.S. production into the global marketplace, I think it can only benefit everybody. And that is true of not just stabilizing price, as we see the Brent global price much higher than the domestic WTI price. On average, over the last 5 years, that spread has been $11—a spread that is not enjoyed by consumers, but certainly harms economic opportunity and job opportunity in the United States. Your hearing really honed in on that cost to consumers and the benefit to consumers. Also, the hearing in the Foreign Affairs Committee as well.

So we have had three committees of jurisdiction talking about this issue and this bill coming to the floor tomorrow, going through the Rules Committee, and the Rules Committee allowing a number of amendments to be debated and voted on tomorrow. Many amendments were introduced by Democratic Members as well as Republican Members. It has just been a rich experience. There are a number of issues related to it.

Coming from North Dakota, I can tell you firsthand that not that many years ago I was the economic development and finance director in the State of North Dakota at a time when we were just stabilizing out-migration. But part of the reason we were stabilizing it was because we lost so many of our young people. Our small towns were shrinking. While we were diversifying our economy a little bit here and there, the shale revolution that came along with the technology that combined fracking with horizontal drilling dramatically changed our State.

Probably my favorite anecdote of the whole situation—while there are many—is the fact that the little town of Killdeer hadn't had a football team for 20 years because they couldn't field enough young men, and now they have a football team. And that is just illustrative of what has happened in many of our small towns; because in the supply chain in the oil and gas industry, the jobs are not only numerous, they are really good. They pay, on average, 25 percent higher than the national average.

So it really is a grand opportunity that is somewhat being lost—certainly, its potential is being lost—because we are now sort of hemmed in with light sweet crude being produced more than we can use in our refineries in the

United States, especially the light sweet crude which our refineries are not set up to take, for the most part, but refineries outside the United States are set up to take, for the most part. In fact, 92 percent of the oil refined outside of the United States is light sweet crude. Only about 25, 30 percent of the refining capacity in the United States is set up to take light sweet crude. So that distinction is important to understand when you see that we are now overproducing for the refinery capacity we have in our country.

I want to address, Mr. Speaker, some comments made earlier this week by Secretary of Energy Ernie Moniz, a man I have great respect for—clearly, an intellect. He made some comments in the Senate Commerce Committee that, while technically accurate, I suppose were certainly incomplete. He had said that now is not the time to lift the oil export ban; and he said that according to the EIA, somehow we weren't really hemmed in because we were still importing some oil.

It ignores so many things, not the least of which is that distinction between light sweet and heavy sour that I talked about just moments ago; the fact that our refineries, for the most part, in the United States are set up for the heavy sour that we aren't producing an excess of—and, by the way, about 30 percent of which are owned by vertically integrated companies outside of the United States who have more of an interest in buying their oil than ours. But the world is really where the opportunity exists.

The other thing that he ignores in his statement saying that we are not yet hemmed in, he ignores just the natural order of things, that global markets, global demand being accessible to domestic producers, U.S. producers, will grow the production. You can't expect people to produce more of something than they can sell or than can be used in their limited market. If we have access to the global demand, of course we are going to produce more—that is the whole point—creating more jobs, more entrepreneurial opportunities.

The other thing that bothers me about what Secretary Moniz said about now not being the time is that it ignores so many things. It ignores the fact that we still have a very low workforce participation rate in this country. We need more jobs. We have many people that are either underemployed, unemployed, no longer looking for work, and these are good, high-paying jobs up and down the supply chain.

And lest we forget, they are not just jobs in the oil patch. It is not just in west Texas; it is not just in Houston; it is not just in North Dakota or Oklahoma or New Mexico. These jobs are in every State in the country.

In fact, according to the Energy Equipment and Infrastructure Alliance, which did a vast study on this, the third leading recipient of new jobs, if this export ban is lifted, is the State of Illinois. And you might wonder, well, why is it? Well, because Illinois has a lot of manufacturing, especially a lot of large equipment manufacturing. Those manufacturing jobs are great for families. They are great for the economy. They are great for startup business opportunities. So it is every State in the country that benefits. Secretary Moniz certainly dismisses that, or at least ignores it, in his statements.

I want to wrap up with this point. I always like to say that America's national security and America's economic security are tied directly to America's energy security. I touched on it earlier, but there has never been a time certainly in my public service when the world was in a more fragile state, and certainly chaos is reigning.

I talked about Vladimir Putin's push into Eastern Europe, his bombing of Syria, his alliance with Iran.

Iran, by the way, is another major producer of oil, who, as per the Iran nuclear deal, now gets to sell their oil onto the global marketplace. But our President thinks it is a better idea for them than he does for United States producers. He ignores the opportunity that, again, the peaceful development of oil and gas and the production of it and then the marketing of it in the global marketplace, the opportunity that has to spread influence and create peace in places that desperately need it, especially for our allies.

It is interesting. I doubt that the folks that scheduled the floor time for tomorrow's bill had this in mind, because this was more of a process of regular order than it was the calendar; but we are, right now, in the middle of the 42-year recognition of the Yom Kippur War.

□ 1800

The Yom Kippur War was what sort of began, really started, the energy crisis that led to the 1973 embargoes. We are reliving, in many respects, some of the geopolitical aspects of that time and that situation.

Our friends in Israel are not sure whether we are with them or not as a country, whether we are going to be with them on big issues, dependent on Russian oil largely, a Russia that is playing bad in the neighborhood, and uncertainty as to who is going to fill the leadership vacuum in places like Syria, a very important player, 42, 43 years ago.

There is a lot adding up to this being a very, very important vote tomorrow on lifting the export ban on H.R. 702. There are things adding up that we didn't even contemplate at the time that the bill was introduced.

But it is a grand opportunity to secure America's economy, secure America's national security while at the same time spreading our influence of freedom and free enterprise around the world.

So I am looking forward to, hopefully, a lot of bipartisan votes tomorrow, a big vote, so that we can send that over to the United States Senate, who I know has a different standard than we have. But, hopefully, we can show them the way.

I thank the gentleman for yielding so much time to me.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota, clearly, a State that is a major player in this oil and gas renaissance that has occurred over the last 5 years.

I would also like to point out that the oil and gas business, per se, is an incredibly fertile ground for small business development. And my dad, I mentioned earlier, was a great example of this.

There are lots of narrow-focused aspects of the service side of the business. We all think of the drilling rigs and the big investments there, but there are various aspects, whether it is hauling things or mud or whatever is the deal, where entrepreneurs, men and women who want to take a little risk, can put a little capital together, put some tools together, and begin servicing an aspect of the business that is there.

So it is incredibly fertile in terms of setting up new businesses. I have got one group in Eastland, Texas, that, just as the renaissance was beginning to start, they thought it was a good idea to get into some aspect of the fracking business and, over a very short period of time, built that business into a multi-billion-dollar deal and sold it.

So incredible wealth was created as a result of small businesses turning into a medium-sized business, turning into a big business, and then, ultimately, sold to another bigger business for an awful lot of money.

And every time that happens there are jobs created associated with that and wealth created with that that benefits not only those individual communities, but all of us that are involved.

We failed to mention that there is no ban on exporting product. Crude oil that is refined, turned into gasoline, turned into diesel, there is no ban on that.

So refiners today can take that heavy crude that they use and the little bit of light, sweet crude that they use, turn that into a product that they then can sell into the world market, and the same folks can sell it back into our communities for us to use in our cars and in our trucks.

That gasoline, in the main, particularly by folks, individuals, is bought with after-tax dollars. That means they have had to earn a buck, pay the taxes on it, and then take what is left out of that dollar to actually buy gasoline.

As we have seen over the last several months, these lower gasoline prices have been a big boon to folks in our country that have to drive a car to get to work or take their kids to school, whatever it might be.

So if you have got a $1 or a $2 drop in the price of gasoline and you are buying 15 gallons a week or 15 gallons

every so often, that is $15 to $30 of after-tax dollars that you can then spend somewhere else to benefit you and your family.

Another aspect of what is happening is not related to what will go into the bill tomorrow, but it is something we have talked about on this floor ad nauseam, and that is the XL Pipeline. This pipeline is designed to haul Canadian oil sand oil, bitumen oil, that is, in effect, heavy crude south to the United States.

This is the kind of crude that could run our refineries and our refineries would desperately like to have rather than buying the heavy crude from Venezuela and other places where the recipients of our checks when we buy that crude oil aren't necessarily friends of ours, aren't necessarily on the same geopolitical page that we are on.

So having that pipeline would be another aspect of freeing up this market. The more efficient you can make markets, the less artificial restraints, the less goofy things you have got in there, then the better pricing mechanisms you get, the better and the more efficient those markets are, and then everybody up and down that chain benefits from that.

As I mentioned earlier, we have got this odd circumstance where the producers in the United States sell on the West Texas Intermediate number to a refinery. That refinery then turns it into gasoline, and they sell it based on the Brent crude.

So there is a differential being made by somebody, and shrinking that differential is what will keep the price of gasoline and diesel from increasing.

One of the arguments for folks who don't represent producing provinces is: Why would I be in favor of something that would increase the folks I represent gasoline and diesel prices?

Every study has shown that that will not happen. Now, the price of gasoline and diesel will go up by the world market. But as a result of lifting this export ban, it will, in fact, not increase the price of gasoline as we produce it.

This is a win on every level. It is a win for consumers, as I have mentioned, it is a win for taxpayers, and it is a win for taxing entities.

My colleagues from North Dakota and from Arkansas mentioned that reserves in the ground are valued for property tax purposes, and those property taxes that are generated from that then support our schools and other county, city, and State functions.

As that developed crude oil is explored and those producing wells come online, that creates a property tax base that benefits all of the taxpayers in those particular entities.

So it is a win across the world. It is a win for our allies and the geopolitical issues that we have talked about. So it is good for this country. It is good for jobs. And it is something that I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle can thoroughly look at. They have had plenty of time to do it.

As was mentioned, it went through regular order, several hearings on the issue, actual legislation went through the subcommittee and the committee, the normal regular order, as we like to say around here, and everyone has had a chance to weigh in.

Tomorrow there will be some amendments made in order under the rule. Folks will be able to weigh in. Some of those I will support. Some of those I will be against. But they were all presented as a way to get someone else's idea about this issue to the floor to have us debate it. I think that is a healthy thing, that we will be able to do that tomorrow. Some of those will perhaps pass, and some of them won't.

But whatever happens, I have got great confidence that the bill that we will pass tomorrow with a big bipartisan vote can then go to the Senate and move the ball and move the initiative over there.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas, whose work on this issue started his career in this business and has just joined us and is the lead sponsor on the bill that we will be voting on tomorrow.

We have got probably 4 or 5 minutes left. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), my chairman emeritus of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Dean of the Texas delegation, for whatever thoughts he might care to share with us.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Midland, Texas, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and a stalwart original sponsor of the bill. I appreciate your leadership, and I appreciate you doing this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are going to have a debate on H.R. 702. It is a bill to repeal the ban on crude oil exports. This is the last remnant of the 1970s era energy policy for America that said we were running out of energy and that the only way to use the energy we did have was to keep it in the United States.

As a consequence of the Arab oil embargo, we had price controls on oil. We had price controls on natural gas. We had limits on what natural gas could be used for. We had a very restrictive, defeatist, in my opinion, energy policy.

All that has been repealed except for one thing, and that is this ban on crude oil exports. There are a number of opinions about why that has not been repealed, but I think the primary reason is that, until the last 5 years, Mr. Speaker, we really didn't have a significant amount of oil that could be exported.

But a funny thing happened. Some engineers in Texas—I have to give my State credit—developed two technologies, one called hydraulic fracturing where you pressurize a formation, and another where you can turn the drill bit and drill horizontally.

The combination of hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling has transformed what were considered to be uneconomic reserves, i.e., these tight shale formations in south Texas in the Eagle Ford, in North Dakota in the Bakken, in Louisiana, and up in through Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York, into economically producible oil and gas formations.

The consequence is, in the last 5 years, U.S. oil production has doubled. It got as high as almost $10 million a barrel about a year ago. Because of the collapse in oil prices, that production level has declined some, but the capacity is still there.

So we have created a surplus in the domestic market of this light, sweet shale oil, but we can't export it. So what has developed is a two-tiered price market. You have a domestic price for oil in the United States that is anywhere from $2 to as much as $30 below the world price, which is set by North Sea oil called Brent.

That price differential is causing wells in the United States to shut in. It is preventing new wells from being driven.

If we can pass our bill tomorrow and the Senate pass it and the President sign it, that price differential, Mr. Speaker, will go away, and we will be competitive to export oil into the world market.

If we are able to do that, good things happen. We create jobs in the United States. We put pressure on OPEC and Russia in the world market. We probably bring that world price down slightly, which will result in lower gasoline prices for United States consumers.

We will be competitive in the energy markets everywhere in this world. In Asia, in South America, in Western Europe, Central Europe, U.S. oil will be used as an economic product, but also as a strategic asset for the security of our country.

So, Mr. Speaker, we hope to have a big vote on that tomorrow, somewhere between noon and 1:00. We have, I think, 10 amendments the Rules Committee has made in order. Some of those we will accept. Some of them we will oppose.

But it has been an open process, hearings in a number of committees, including your committee, Mr. Chairman, the Agriculture Committee, open markup in subcommittee of Energy and Commerce, full committee, and amendments accepted from both sides of the aisle that will be on the floor tomorrow.

So H.R. 702 is good for America, good for the country. It is a job-creation bill, and we hope that we will get a big vote tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman.

I want to brag on the House for having conducted this business with respect to this bill the way it has.

If you go back to your grade school or your junior high civics classes, I'm a bill on Capitol Hill trying to become a law, this is exactly what happened with this deal. It went through the process the way it is supposed to, kind of the old-fashioned deal.

We hope to see tomorrow a big bipartisan vote so the American people can at least in this one glimmer look and say, hey, the House of Representatives functioned the way that the Founding Fathers intended it to and moved an important piece of legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to a big vote tomorrow. I yield back the balance of time.

WATER PROBLEMS IN THE CITY OF FLINT, MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I have 5 legislative days—and any other speaker who may arrive—to revise and extend remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today just to take a few minutes to call attention to a problem that I have been trying to raise in this body and in my work before I came to Congress for some time, specifically, to describe the conditions in my own hometown of Flint, Michigan.

The subject that I am addressing is the unique and really difficult challenges facing America's older industrial cities, cities like my hometown of Flint, Michigan, a city that is the birthplace of General Motors. It is where the first UAW contract was created, was signed. But it is a city that has really struggled as it has made this transition from the old to the new economy.

It is a city that had 200,000 people just a couple of decades ago and now hovers right around 100,000 citizens, a poorer city than it once was, a city that has lost 90 percent of its manufacturing jobs.

□ 1815

I raise this because I believe that this Congress and the Federal Government have an obligation to reinvest in these communities, communities that helped build this country and that can have a significant effect on our future. These are the cities where innovation took place and where it can take place again.

But my own hometown right now is struggling, struggling with a problem, unfortunately, that is not entirely of its own making. My home of Flint, a city that was once really the center of the auto manufacturing universe, can't even guarantee to its citizens one of the most essential functions of government. It can't guarantee to citizens that it can deliver clean, drinkable water to their households.

We have elevated lead levels in the city of Flint in their water system. It has been known for some time, for about a year that there have been significant problems with water quality in Flint. And despite protests, really, at the State and Federal levels, public officials saying that there is no problem with the water, that it is completely safe to drink—in fact, one State official told city of Flint residents that they just needed to simply relax.

It has been revealed recently through independent studies, now confirmed by the State government, that we have lead levels far in excess of what is allowed under the Federal lead and copper rules. This is completely unacceptable.

In fact, what makes this even more troubling is that this is a tragic set of circumstances that has public health implications for the citizens of my community that were completely avoidable, that are the result of decisions that were made by the State of Michigan when it took over control of this fiscally stressed city.

This is a city that is struggling in a lot of different ways. Twice in the last decade, it has been under the control of a receiver, of a State-appointed emergency manager that takes away the authority of local government officials to make decisions for themselves, takes away the authority of the Flint citizens to elect their own representatives to govern themselves, and places authority to control the city in the hands of a single master, an emergency manager.

Well, it was during the period of time that one of those emergency managers was in control that the State decided for the city of Flint that, for a temporary period of time, simply to save money, it would begin to draw water, rather than from the city of Detroit water system, which had a water source from Lake Huron, but it would begin to draw water from the Flint River, a small river that passes through our hometown, a river that is the namesake of our own community.

The sad thing is—and this tells you a little bit about how some folks in different levels of government at the Federal and State level think about these older cities. There was no robust review, no testing, no examination as to whether or not this river water would result in clean water being delivered to homes, drinkable water delivered to citizens. As a result, this water drawn from the Flint River is substantially more corrosive and has led to lead leaching from the pipes in the delivery system into the drinking water in Flint homes.

In fact, there was a study that was just done in the last day or two that shows that in Flint school district buildings, water being delivered to Flint schoolchildren has lead levels far above the actionable level under the EPA lead and copper rule.

Think about this. In the 21st century in the United States of America, we have a city, a great, old city that was a part of the industrial revolution, that can't even deliver clean and safe drinking water to its citizens, not only because of our failure to invest in infrastructure in this country, which is a big part of the problem, but largely because officials at the State government simply decided, well, that Flint River water, that will be good enough. There was no real scientific research that determined whether or not that water would be safe—''it will be fine.'' And even when evidence was presented indicating that that water might be unsafe, Flint citizens were told by the State government to just relax; don't worry about it.

Well, that is a complete failure of government. It is a failure of government, frankly, at the Federal level because, for almost a year now, I have been asking the EPA to intervene; to, first of all, help this old city of Flint rebuild itself and rebuild its water system by providing some relief through the clean drinking water revolving loan fund, some degree of loan forgiveness, which is allowable under Federal law; but in this case, a technicality has prevented the EPA from allowing the State of Michigan to grant that kind of relief. That could make a huge difference for the city and its ability to rebuild its own infrastructure. But so far, all we get from the EPA is ''no,'' and we asked for technical assistance from the EPA.

Now, recently we have had more attention; but, frankly, it is not enough. I mean, where is the urgency?

If the role of the U.S. EPA is to ensure adherence to this rule, this law that requires clean and safe drinking water to be available to its citizens, they ought to do more than sit back and offer opinion. They need to be engaged. So I call on the EPA to take a much more focused role in making sure that the citizens of Flint have clean drinking water.

I mentioned that this was not an accident. This decision to use this questionable water source was done when the city was under financial receivership, when an appointed emergency manager was making the decisions for the city of Flint. So here we had a situation where this emergency manager, this outside new management is appointed to come in and deal with the issue of fiscal insolvency and, by only looking at the short-term balance sheet, made a decision to get cheaper water that turned out to be dangerous for the residents of the city and, actually, potentially has handed the city a huge cost to fix what could be hundreds of millions of dollars of permanent damage to the water system as a result of that decision.

So an emergency manager comes in with the idea that somehow outside management is the only problem that this city faces, makes decisions that not only ruin the reputation of the city but also cause significant health risks,

and then hands the city a bill, potentially to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars, and at the same time, over the last decade, has continued to cut direct support to that very city. I mean, this just doesn't make sense.

The citizens of the city are not responsible for the fact that its infrastructure has been allowed to deteriorate. They are not responsible for the fact that at the Federal level and at the State level we have not supported redevelopment in these places. In fact, through transportation policy, housing policy, tax policy, land use policy at the Federal and State levels, we have actually, unfortunately, contributed to the hollowing out of these older cities, and now the citizens of this place have to pay the price.

The failure to reinvest in these older cities is not without victims; and right now, it is the people of the city of Flint that are the victims of a failure at the Federal, frankly, and at the State level. It is something that just cannot be tolerated.

So when we think about this question, when we think about this particular case of the city, my hometown of Flint, and the fact that these decisions have been made for them by people at the State capital, they are paying the price. And almost inexplicably, even though today in a complete reversal, an admission of failure by the State, the State has come in and said now they are going to help facilitate the reconnection temporarily to the Detroit water system until a permanent Lake Huron line can be established. Inexplicably, there they are actually asking the city government to empty out its remaining resources, financial resources, and put millions of dollars up to help contribute to pay for fixing a problem that the State government is actually responsible for making. The State broke the system, and now, yet again, it is the city residents who are being asked to contribute to pay for a problem that they did not create in the first place.

Sadly, while this may seem like an extreme case, it is a pretty consistent tale all across this country, but especially in the Northeast and Midwestern United States. But in the South and West as well, there are older cities that have, in the past, contributed greatly to economic growth in this country and have been allowed—in some ways, encouraged—to wither, to be hollowed out, and we can't let this continue.

So here when we see before our very eyes 30, 40, 50 American cities—as I said, including my own hometown—continue to fall farther and farther behind, have their infrastructure continue to deteriorate, what do we spend our time talking about here in the United States Congress? Petty fights between Democrats and Republicans and, frankly, more recently, petty fights between Republicans and other Republicans.

We haven't even touched the idea of a big infrastructure bill that could help places not just like my hometown of Flint, but other places across the Midwest and across the country that could be much more productive if we simply had 21st century infrastructure, a water system that can deliver clean water to its residents.

There is no excuse. There is no excuse at the Federal level for us not providing the kind of help that would make a place like Flint a far more productive place with decent roads, good schools, and a water system that delivers clean water. I mean, that seems pretty fundamental, and it is. Without that, these older communities, these older cities have no chance of connecting to the new economy, no chance of contributing the way they are capable of to the next economy of this country. It is shameless that we haven't seen the urgency that I think is required in order to deal with this enormous problem.

There are victims of this failure. There are victims, individuals who have been really left behind because of the failure at the Federal and at the State level.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know I have taken a few moments. I don't need to take the full half hour that has been allotted to me because we will continue this discussion. We will continue this conversation.

I just want to make sure that the folks who are listening, the people in this body, people across the country understand that unless we take time, unless we make the effort in this body to address the problems of these older cities, we will not have done our job. It is important that the American people know that this Congress is willing to stand up for them and stand up for America's cities.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and October 9 on account of family reasons.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 32. An act to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary; in addition, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 2162. An act to establish a 10-year term for the service of the Librarian of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 7, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2835. To actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 9, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the third quarter of 2015, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO TIMOR-LESTE, INDONESIA, NEPAL, AND KOSOVO, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 11 AND AUG. 21, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Vern Buchanan	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste		383.26		(3)				383.26
Hon. David Price	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste		383.26		(3)				383.26
Hon. Adrian Smith	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste		383.26		(3)				383.26
Hon. Jim McDermott	8/14	8/15	Timor-Leste		191.63		(3)				191.63
Hon. Dina Titus	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste		383.26		(3)				383.26
Hon. Susan Davis	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste		383.26		(3)				383.26
Justin Wein	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste		383.26		(3)				383.26
Sean Brady	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste		383.26		(3)				383.26

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO TIMOR-LESTE, INDONESIA, NEPAL, AND KOSOVO, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 11 AND AUG. 21, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Vern Buchanan	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(3)				512.56
Hon. David Price	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(3)				512.56
Hon. Adrian Smith	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(3)				512.56
Hon. Jim McDermott	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(3)				512.56
Hon. Dina Titus	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(3)				512.56
Hon. Susan Davis	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(3)				512.56
Justin Wein	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(3)				512.56
Sean Brady	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(3)				512.56
Hon. Vern Buchanan	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(3)				508.22
Hon. David Price	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(3)				508.22
Hon. Adrian Smith	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(3)				508.22
Hon. Jim McDermott	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(3)				508.22
Hon. Dina Titus	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(3)				508.22
Hon. Susan Davis	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(3)				508.22
Justin Wein	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(3)				508.22
Sean Brady	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(3)				508.22
Hon. Vern Buchanan	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		406.00		(3)				406.00
Hon. David Price	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		326.00		(3)				326.00
Hon. Adrian Smith	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		406.00		(3)				406.00
Hon. Jim McDermott	8/19	8/20	Kosovo		163.00		(3)				163.00
Hon. Dina Titus	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		406.00		(3)				406.00
Hon. Susan Davis	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		406.00		(3)				406.00
Justin Wein	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		326.00		(3)				326.00
Sean Brady	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		326.00		(3)				326.00
Committee total					13,805.69						13,805.69

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. VERN BUCHANAN, Sept. 20, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Frank Lucas	8/31	9/1	Switzerland	749.30	785.42		9,263.35				10,048.77
Hon. Frank Lucas	9/1	9/4	France	887.58	995.04						995.04
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	8/31	9/1	Switzerland	749.30	785.42		14,351.75				15,137.17
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	9/1	9/4	France	887.58	995.04						995.04
Tom Hammond	8/31	9/1	Switzerland	749.30	785.42		2,987.45				3,772.87
Tom Hammond	9/1	9/4	France	817.58	916.57						916.57
Adam Rosenberg	8/31	9/1	Switzerland	749.30	785.42		2,987.45				3,772.87
Adam Rosenberg	9/1	9/4	France	817.58	916.57						916.57
Committee total					6,964.90		29,590				36,554.90

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, Oct. 1, 2015.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3107. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fee Increases for Overtime Services [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0047] 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 Agriculture.

3108. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Golden Nematode; Removal of Regulated Areas in Orleans, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties, New York [Docket No.: APHIS-2015-0040] 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 Agriculture.

3109. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Tomato Plantlets in Approved Growing Media From Mexico [Docket No.: APHIS-2014-0099] (RIN: 0579-AE06) 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 Agriculture.

3110. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Greene County, PA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8401] 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 Financial Services.

3111. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Reportable Events and Certain Other Notification Requirements (RIN: 1212-AB06) received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3112. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3113. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Multiemployer Plans; Electronic Filing Requirements (RIN: 1212-AB28) received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3114. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled ''The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran'', the twenty-third in a series of reports required by Sec. 1245(d)(4)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3115. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Mica-Based Pearlescent Pigments [Docket No.: FDA-2015-C-1154] 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 Energy and Commerce.

3116. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the Minor New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Portable Facilities [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0283; FRL-9935-04-Region 6] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3117. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0185; FRL-9935-21-Region 4] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3118. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Butanedioic Acid, 2-Methylene-, Homopolymer, Sodium Salt; Inert Ingredient Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0395; FRL-9933-74] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3119. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Sulfur Content of Fuels [EPA-R01-OAR-2014-0605; A-1-FRL-9935-31-Region 1] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3120. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2008 Lead, and 2010 NO2 National Ambient Air Quality Standards; North Dakota [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0974; FRL-9935-15-Region 8] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3121. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dimethyl sulfoxide; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0630; FRL-9934-17] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3122. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead NAAQS [EPA-R04-OAR-2014-0443; FRL-9935-19-Region 4] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3123. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky: New Sources in or Impacting Nonattainment Areas [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0384; FRL-9935-22-Region 4] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3124. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0696; FRL-9935-24-Region 4] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3125. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Maine; General Permit Regulations for Nonmetallic Mineral Processing Plants and Concrete Batch Plants [EPA-R01-OAR-2015-0527; A-1-FRL-9935-33-Region 1] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3126. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trans-1,3,3,3-tetrafluoroprop-1-ene; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0043; FRL-9934-74] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3127. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cellulose Carboxymethyl Ether, Potassium Salt; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0482; FRL-9934-45] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3128. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; MI; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2010 NO2, 2010 SO2, and 2012 PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0657; FRL-9935-18-Region 5] received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3129. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Infrastructure for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R06-OAR-2014-0205; FRL-9935-44-Region 6] received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3130. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon: Lane Regional Air Protection Agency Open Burning Rules and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality Enforcement Procedures [EPA-R10-OAR-2014-0562; FRL-9935-48-Region 10] received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3131. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Governmentwide Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards [FRL-9926-01-OARM] (RIN: 2030-AA99) received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3132. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule: 2015 Revisions and Confidentiality Determinations for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0831; FRL-9935-50-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS37) received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3133. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — NESHAP for Brick and Structural Clay Products Manufacturing; and NESHAP for Clay Ceramics Manufacturing [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0290 and EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0291; FRL-9933-13-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AP69) received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3134. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report certifying that the export of the listed item to the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, pursuant to Sec. 1512 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1999 (Pub. L. 105-261), as amended by Sec. 146 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for FY 1999 (Pub. L. 105-277), and the President's September 29, 2009 delegation of authority [74 Fed. Reg. 50,913 (Oct. 2, 2009)]; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3135. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3136. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3137. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3138. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule and technical amendment — Ocean Dumping: Expansion of an Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site Offshore of Jacksonville, Florida [EPA-R04-OW-2014-0372; FRL-9934-57-Region 4] received October 7, 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.

3139. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Steam Electric

Power Generating Point Source Category [EPA-HQ-OW-2009-0819; FRL-9930-48-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF14) received October 7, 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.

3140. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Women-Owned Small Business Federal Contract Program (RIN: 3245-AG72) 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 Small Business.

3141. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a letter respectfully urging Congress to take action as soon as possible and raise the debt limit well before Treasury exhausts its extraordinary measures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3142. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Annual Report on Continuing Disability Reviews for FY 2013, pursuant to Sec. 221(i) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3143. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting draft legislation to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and the Judiciary.

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. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MOORE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LEE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 3708. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide for an increase in the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIQUIN (for himself and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 3709. A bill to make permanent the pilot program administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs regarding enhanced contract care authority for the health care needs of veterans located in highly rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 3710. A bill to amend the Plant Protection Act with respect to authorized uses of methyl bromide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 3711. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to conduct a special resource study of Chicano Park, located in San Diego, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3712. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to mental health services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. TROTT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 3713. A bill to reform sentencing laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 3714. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow the Small Business Administration to establish size standards for small agricultural enterprises using the same process for establishing size standards for small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 3715. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to permit interments, funerals, memorial services, and ceremonies of deceased veterans at national cemeteries and State cemeteries receiving grants from the Department of Veterans Affairs during certain weekends if requested for religious reasons; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 3716. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to provide to the Secretary of Health and Human Services certain information with respect to provider terminations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 3717. A bill to provide for the establishment of a grant program to support United States-Israel cooperation for neuroscience-related research and related technological innovation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 3718. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUINTA (for himself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 3719. A bill to provide for the comprehensive approach to eradication of the heroin epidemic, to develop the best practices in law enforcement and prescription medication prescribing practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mrs. TORRES):

H.R. 3720. A bill to encourage water efficiency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Armed Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 3721. A bill to expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 3722. A bill to strengthen our mental health system and improve public safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Veterans' Affairs, Appropriations, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 3723. A bill to provide for media coverage of Federal appellate court proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 3724. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service from rehiring any employee of the Internal Revenue Service who was involuntarily separated from service for misconduct; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3725. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to guarantee principal and interest payments on bonds issued by the government of the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico, including its public corporations and instrumentalities, on the condition that the government of the territory demonstrates meaningful improvement in the management of its public finances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 3726. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize States to issue special permits to allow the operation of vehicles of up to 95,000 pounds on Interstate System highways for the hauling of livestock; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 3727. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for consumers against excessive, unjustified, or unfairly discriminatory increases in premium rates; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3728. A bill to amend the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 to modify the requirement to impose sanctions with respect to the provision of specialized financial messaging services to the Central Bank of Iran and other sanctioned Iranian financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and 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 Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 3729. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain research on human fetal tissue obtained pursuant to an abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3730. A bill to authorize unused visas numbers made available under section 101(a)(15)(E)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to be made available to nationals of Ireland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.J. Res. 69. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution condemning the senseless murder and wounding of 18 people, sons, daughters, fathers, mothers, uncles, aunts, cousins, students, and teachers, in Roseburg, Oregon on October 1, 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. PELOSI):

H. Res. 467. A resolution establishing the Select Committee on Gun Violence Prevention; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. ESTY, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 468. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 8, 2015, as ''National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. BYRNE):

H. Res. 469. A resolution urging North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member countries to meet or exceed the two percent gross domestic product commitment to spending on defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. JOYCE):

H. Res. 470. A resolution congratulating the National Institute of Nursing Research on the occasion of its 30th Anniversary; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MENG, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. LEE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 471. A resolution recognizing Filipino American History Month and celebrating the history and culture of Filipino Americans and their immense contributions to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. POLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. FARR, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. TAKAI):

H. Res. 472. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of October 11, 2015, through October 17, 2015, as ''Earth Science Week''; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. 473. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June as National Gun Violence Awareness Month and calling on Congress to address gun violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

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. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 3709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 ''. . . 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. LAMALFA:

H.R. 3710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 3711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution, which states: The Congress shall have the Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or any particular State.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 3712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 3713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 3714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 3715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States—The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 3716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 3717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states the United States Congress shall have power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 3718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 states The Congress shall have Power To provide . . . for the . . . general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 3719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VII, Claus XVIII: 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

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

Article I; Section 8; Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 3721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

General Welfare: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 3722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.''

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 3723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Secion 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to borrow money on the credit of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such powers, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 3726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes;

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 3727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1. Section 8.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.J. Res. 69.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 167: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 288: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 304: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 546: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 592: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 602: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 674: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 771: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 775: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 776: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 793: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 845: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 855: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 870: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 953: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 969: Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H.R. 985: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1142: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1149: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 1188: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1197: Mr. BERA, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1217: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BASS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1233: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 1258: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1388: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1401: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1427: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BASS, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1453: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1516: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1550: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1559: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1603: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1608: Mr. TURNER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 1627: Mr. PIERLUISI and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 1671: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1686: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1786: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1853: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 1854: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 1877: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1986: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2017: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2077: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2217: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2237: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2248: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2266: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2293: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2322: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2366: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2368: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2450: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2477: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. WALBERG, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 2493: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2494: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2513: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2597: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2646: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2657: Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 2667: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2698: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 2710: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2713: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2716: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 2730: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2732: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2759: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2808: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2855: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2863: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 2880: Mr. HONDA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2894: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2896: Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 2903: Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2923: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2994: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 3024: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 3033: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. MESSER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3036: Mr. REED.
H.R. 3151: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 3221: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3222: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 3225: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 3229: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. REED, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3299: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 3314: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 3351: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 3364: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3366: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3381: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 3384: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3418: Mr. HIGGINS and Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 3423: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3463: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3468: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 3471: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 3473: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 3480: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3488: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BUCK, and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 3513: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3518: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 3532: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3559: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 3573: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 3580: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 3628: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 3634: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3640: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3652: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3664: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 3666: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LONG, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3696: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3707: Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MOORE.
H. Con. Res. 75: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H. Res. 112: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H. Res. 203: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H. Res. 289: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 348: Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. DESANTIS.
H. Res. 354: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 416: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H. Res. 419: Mr. DEUTCH.
H. Res. 429: Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 440: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H. Res. 445: Ms. ADAMS.
H. Res. 456: Ms. FUDGE.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2015 No. 148

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today the opening prayer will be offered by Reverend Dr. Charles R. Smith, pastor of the Madison Baptist Church in Madison, GA.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious God, the One who created us in Your image and the One who values every person as uniquely as our fingerprints, we invoke Your guidance with the realization that we are nothing without You. Guide those in this Chamber to recognize that honorable governance seeks the best for all; that today's actions bear tomorrow's fruit; that integrity should be championed over winning. Offer them wisdom to weigh their decisions not propagating partisan policy but based on fair legislation for everyone. Grant them fortitude to exemplify selfless service even to those individuals on the other side of the aisle, recognizing that what they do has a ripple effect, much like tossing a pebble into a pond.

We thank You that You cherish every person as an individual. We thank You that You hear our prayer. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The Senator from Georgia.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to acknowledge the presence of our guest Chaplain today, Charles Smith, and his lovely wife Jennifer and his family members who have traveled from Madison, GA, and around Georgia to be here today as he serves our country as our guest Chaplain for today.

Charles has a doctor of ministry degree from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. His wife is a family and marriage counselor and an ordained minister. His niece Megan serves us in the Republican cloakroom and does so on a daily basis with great joy for all of us.

So we want to welcome Charles Smith, his family, and thank him so much for his ministry today, his witness today, but also thank him for all the leadership he has given to Megan, who does such a great job for us.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, ask most Americans to name two of the most basic duties of a Senator, and you are likely to hear some combination of the following: No. 1, protect the country. That means working with us to pass the National Defense Authorization Act. No. 2, fund the government. That means working with us to pass the 12 appropriations bills that fund it.

But some of our Democratic colleagues don't seem all that interested in these things. It is not just that their words tell us this story, their actions do as well. The Democratic leader has used the phrase ''waste of time'' to refer to a bill that protects our country. Passing that bill usually inspires bipartisan cooperation, but this year it required overcoming senseless resistance from the other side before we finally witnessed that cooperation yesterday with the bill's passage.

Democratic Senators have used phrases such as ''kind of a waste of time,'' and ''a huge waste of time,'' to refer to the bills that fund our government.

Passing these bills used to be routine, and the new majority has worked hard to ensure that it does again after 6 years of inaction. That is why we passed the budget. That is why we passed the 12 appropriations bills through committee in a bipartisan way. But now Democrats have decided as part of some arbitrary political strategy to indiscriminately filibuster every last funding bill.

Now Democrats may no longer be interested in passing these bipartisan bills, but it doesn't mean they aren't interested in taking credit for the same legislation they are now blocking. Take the bill that funds veterans. Democrats voted with us to support it in committee, then they issued press releases bragging about its contents, and then they filibustered it. Take the bill that funds defense. Democrats voted with us to support it in committee, then they issued press releases bragging about its content, and then they filibustered it, repeatedly.

Today we will consider the bill that funds America's energy security and its water infrastructure. Democrats voted with us to support this bill in committee, too. In fact, over 70 percent of the Democrats in committee supported the bill that is before us today. Democrats issued press releases with nice things to say about the bill's contents. One lauded the bill for funding important energy efficiency advances in our military and for low-income families. Another reminded us the bill provides ''robust funding'' for vital programs that deserve to be funded. Today

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

we will see if Democrats are seriously prepared to filibuster this bill as well.

This bill would strengthen our national security. The bill would enhance our energy security. The bill would root out waste with smart targeted reductions so we can put that money to better use, funding more important infrastructure projects, more innovative energy research, and more critical safety improvements for our dams and waterways.

This bill is also critically important to our home States. Kentuckians would benefit from initiatives to protect the Ohio River shoreline, from cleanup work in Paducah, and from construction of the Olmstead Lock and Dam and other vital inland waterway projects.

Mr. President, this is a good bill. It deserves our support on the merits. It is good for our constituents and good for our country. That should be reason enough to support this funding bill. I would also remind my Democratic colleagues that 70 percent—70 percent—of the Democrats in committee did support the bill before us today.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me finally announce the schedule for today. At 12:45 p.m. there will be a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to the Energy and Water appropriations bill. That will be the last rollcall vote of the week.

RECOGNITION OF THE ASSISTANT MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader is recognized.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for the record, the Democratic leader, Senator REID, is attending a funeral this morning and I am standing in his stead.

First, I will address the comments from the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL. I have to disagree with his opening that Democrats are not interested in funding the government, that Democrats are not interested in funding the Department of Defense. I may remind my friend from Kentucky, the Senator who is the Republican leader, that it was the Republican side that initiated the government shutdown 2 years ago. For 16 days the government was shut down in a vain attempt to protest the Affordable Care Act. Now that threat is before us again.

It is unfortunate we are facing this, but I don't believe it is fair to blame our side of the aisle for delay. You see, Mr. President, as early as June, we started saying we are facing an October 1 deadline, and we need to have a budget compromise, a budget negotiation. Why? Because there is a fundamental disagreement about funding our government in this fiscal year that began October 1.

The Republicans have argued to use wartime funds—$38 billion worth—to supplement the Department of Defense. The leaders at the Department of Defense say this is the wrong approach. They cannot build a strong national defense with an injection of wartime funds which may or may not exist at the end of the process—may or may not exist next year.

I might add, coincidently, that the Republicans failed—failed—to put additional funds in for nondefense spending. Some of it is related to national security—the Department of Homeland Security, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and so many agencies that keep us safe here in the United States. The failure of the Republicans to provide funds for critical agencies that provide health and education services is the reason we have reached an impasse in the budget negotiations.

It is why 3 months ago we on the Democratic side said to the Republicans: You are in charge. You are in the majority. But if we are going to have a process that ultimately succeeds, you need to engage on a bipartisan basis in this negotiation. They refused. They refused and they came up with a short-term spending bill—we call it a continuing resolution or CR—which takes us to the first or second week of December. Beyond that there is no certainty about what is going to happen.

The Senator from Kentucky talks about the appropriations process, where so many Senators voted for a bill and now are against it. I have been on appropriations committees in the House and the Senate for a long time. In the Senate we have an upside-down approach, where you vote on the overall bill first, then vote on amendments. In each of the cases the Senator from Kentucky refers to, many of us may have voted for the overall bill, hoping that amendments would solve the budget problems I have described. When those amendments failed to solve those budget problems, we said: This ultimate bill is not going to work, and we know it. That is the reality of the process in the Committee on Appropriations.

So in June we invited the Republicans to meet with the President and Democratic leaders to work out a budget compromise. There is an indication that some conversation is underway, but not enough.

Why have we reached this impasse? Frankly, it is because the Republican leadership—certainly in the House—is in disarray. Today there is going to be an election in the House of Representatives for a new Speaker. A group of ultraconservative Republican House Members were successful in ousting JOHN BOEHNER from the Speakership. Now they are going to try to replace him but with conditions. One of those conditions is, as printed in the paper this morning, that the new House Speaker has to pledge to the Freedom Caucus—the tea party Republicans—that he will never, never agree to any compromise that is a bipartisan bill coming out of the Senate.

Now, how is that for a standard when you are trying to govern in this country—when you have a President of one party and the Congress in control of the other party? The Freedom Caucus says: Don't negotiate; don't compromise. That is a recipe for a shutdown, a sequestration, and a continuing resolution. Let me tell you what that does. If we get into a continuing resolution for next year—this year we are in, I should say—it is going to mean dramatic cuts in many agencies.

Yesterday the National Institutes of Health were called by Senator BLUNT, who chairs the appropriations subcommittee for that agency. We sat before Dr. Collins and his leading researchers for the United States of America, and we asked them: What happens if our budget process breaks down, if we go into sequestration, which is an across-the-board cut, or we go into a continuing resolution, which is a continuation of this year's budget? What happens at the premier medical research facility in the world, the National Institutes of Health? Dr. Collins told us in very honest and somber tones: It would mean that we would suspend research in areas like precision medicine, destined I think to save lives across the world. We would suspend brain research in areas like Alzheimer's disease.

Once every 67 seconds in America—once every 67 seconds—an American is diagnosed with Alzheimer's. Last year, we spent $226 billion as a Federal Government in Medicare and Medicaid on Alzheimer's care. We estimate about the same number, over $200 billion, was spent by families trying to care for those inflicted by dementia and Alzheimer's. There is a suggestion now that because our failure on budget negotiations will lead to the suspension of research, we would destroy any hope of finding a cure for this dreaded disease and scores of other diseases. That is how serious this conversation is. It is unfortunate that it has reached this point.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, when I was young and going to grade school, we feared the bomb. We were in a cold war. We were given duck-and-cover drills to get under our desk just in case there might be a nuclear attack on the United States of America. That is imprinted in my mind to this day—the fear which we had about this threat to our safety.

I wish to read a commentary that is making the rounds with wide circulation by a mother who talks about a similar concern for her children. She writes:

> Two weeks ago, my second and fourth grade daughters came home from school and

told me they'd a ''code red drill in case someone tries to kill us. We had to all hide in the bathroom together and be really quiet. It was really scary but the teacher said if there was a real man with a gun trying to find us, she'd cover us up and protect us from him. [Her little boy] started crying. I tried to be brave.''

This mother goes on to write:

My 3-year-old nephew had the same drill at his preschool in Virginia. Three-year-old American babies and teachers—hiding in bathrooms, holding hands, preparing for death. We are saying to teachers: Arm yourselves and fight men with assault weapons because we are too cowardly to fight the gun lobby. We are saying to a terrified generation of American children—WE WILL NOT DO WHAT IT TAKES TO PROTECT YOU. WE WILL NOT EVEN TRY. So just be very quiet, hide and wait. Hold your breath. Shhh.

In the year 2013, the number of American police officers shot dead in the line of duty was 27—27, in 2013. In 2013, the number of preschoolers—that is, children under the age of 4—who were shot dead was 82; 27 American police officers, 82 children under the age of 4 were shot dead. We need to do better as a nation.

When I heard on the news this last Saturday that the monstrous tragedy in Oregon was the 45th—45th—school shooting this year in America, it broke my heart, and, more, it angered me.

In just a short while, in a few minutes, Members of the Senate Democratic caucus will come together outside of this building to talk about the need for America to take action to deal with gun violence. There are so many aspects of it.

I am honored to represent the city of Chicago, but having met with Mayor Rahm Emanuel yesterday, we have seen a 20-percent increase in gun violence and deaths this year, and in Milwaukee, a 100-percent increase over last year. In scores of other cities, there is the same phenomenon. The city of Chicago and many others will be flooded with guns.

When I met with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives in Chicago on Monday, I asked them: Where are all these guns coming from? And they told me they have analyzed the crime guns seized in the most violent areas of Chicago, and they found that 40 percent of those guns came from gun shows in Lake County, IN, just across the border from Chicago—40 percent of guns. We also know that we have a phenomenon where girlfriends and friends and family will go buy guns, because the criminal—the felon who wants to use those guns to terrorize and rob and kill—couldn't pass the test for purchasing a gun. It is known as a straw purchase. The girlfriend buys the gun and hands it over to the boyfriend who goes out and kills somebody. Well, there are things we can do to change this. We need to close the gun show loophole. It makes no sense that we don't even check the backgrounds of people who fill their trunks and their cars with firearms and ammunition at these gun shows. And yet when it comes to Federal licensed dealers, there has to be a background check. This gap in coverage accounts for 40 percent of the crime guns in the most dangerous neighborhoods in Chicago. So the gun show loophole needs to be closed.

We also need to make it clear that if you are going to make a straw purchase of a gun and do so for the purpose of giving it to someone who is going to use it in the commission of a crime, you will pay a heavy price for that, too.

I grew up in a family with a lot of members of my family owning firearms in downstate Illinois. It was common for families to go hunting, to go out for target practice, and there was a gun cabinet in most homes. When a little boy, sometimes a young girl, reached a certain age, they were taken out in a rite of passage to go hunting for the first time. It is a part of the culture where I grew up, and it is an acceptable part of the culture when those guns are used responsibly and safely.

I don't know a member of my family who would object to the following statement: No one who is a convicted felon or mentally unstable should be allowed to buy a gun in the United States. I don't know of a member of my family who would object to the notion that if you are going to buy a gun so someone you know can use it to commit a crime and kill someone, you are going to be punished. Those are the two things that we should start with when it comes to reducing gun violence. Those two provisions are not going to hurt any legitimate, responsible, legal gun owner. But they are going to keep guns out of the hands of those who would misuse them.

We have to restore some sense of order in this country, and we have to realize that when we reach the point that 3- and 4-year-olds are being killed in larger numbers each year by guns than even those brave men and women who serve in our police departments—when it has reached that point—clearly, Congress has to act. For Congress to act, we need to hear from the American people. If they share these feelings—if they share the feeling—we need to move forward as a nation and stop this senseless tragedy.

I hope that after we gather today on the floor, Members of the Senate will come together and talk about this issue, and that across America people will join us in this effort.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:45 a.m., with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during this period, any time in a quorum call be equally divided between both sides before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. 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.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor as the ranking member of the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. In that capacity, I rise to oppose consideration of the fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water appropriations bill.

Let me be clear, I do this reluctantly.

In my view, this is a very good bill. Senator ALEXANDER and I have put forth a well-balanced bill within the allocation levels we were provided, which was a good level.

It has been a great pleasure for me over the years to work with Senator ALEXANDER. I have the utmost respect for him. We have always worked things out, but this year I think we have a bigger issue, and I wish to address that in my remarks.

First, 6 of the 12 appropriations subcommittees received base allocations lower than last year.

Another four subcommittees received nominal increases but were still forced to make cuts due to rising costs beyond their control.

That leaves only two subcommittees—Energy and Water Development and Homeland Security—that received real funding increases.

That is why I believe considering the Energy and Water bill in isolation as we are now, rather than debating larger funding issues, is misleading. That is why I can't support the motion to proceed to the bill.

We all know the vote today is not just about Energy and Water. It is about the entire appropriations process, and that is the debate we should be having.

Instead of debating just this specific bill, the debate should be focused on

eliminating sequestration, negotiating a budget agreement with the President and the House, and putting an end to the destructive cycle of continuing resolutions, omnibuses, and threats of government shutdown.

The Republican leader has already initiated budget negotiations. I am led to believe three meetings have been held. It can be done. It is what needs to be done. I fully support that effort. That is where we should focus our efforts.

Before I get into specifics of the Energy and Water funding issues, I want to take a step back and discuss two very disturbing issues I have seen from my seat on the Appropriations Committee, and I am not a newcomer.

I have been on that committee since I came to the Senate, which is more than 20 years ago. They are the negative effects of sequestration and the unravelling of the overall appropriations process.

The strict budget caps put in place by the 2011 Budget Control Act have been terrible for our country.

These spending caps, and the across-the-board cuts used to enforce them, were designed to be so devastating that Congress would do everything it could to avert them.

The problem is, the Supercommittee failed to reach the agreement in 2011, so those devastating cuts took effect.

These spending caps, which have essentially frozen spending levels for the last 3 years, do not account for the increasing requirements placed on the Federal Government.

The cost of veterans' health care is rising, insufficient, and has been roundly criticized. The cost of low-income housing is rising, the cost of educating our children is rising, and the cost of fighting natural disasters, such as drought and wildfires, is also rising. But the spending caps are not rising, meaning Congress is forced to make cuts to vital programs, and of course you get into the battle between the national security portfolio, such as defense, and the domestic portfolio.

My portfolio on Energy and Water is part national security, because of the nuclear weapons for our country, and the domestic part is the Office of Science, the Department of Energy, the Army Corps of Engineers, which is the only infrastructure program we actually have functioning.

Having a static budget like this year after year, which does not even account for inflation, is no way to run a country.

I am also disappointed by the collapse of the appropriations process. At one time—and I hope this is interesting to the Presiding Officer since he is a newcomer—it was the norm to pass each spending bill as a stand-alone piece of legislation. All Members could offer amendments, and each of us took ownership of the outcome. We haven't done that in a decade.

It used to be that the entire Appropriations Committee, members of both sides, would support bills drafted by each subcommittee chairman and approved by the full committee. We haven't done that in 5 years. It was heresy for a bill to come out on the floor and not have members of the Appropriations Committee support it. That is all gone today.

Everything changed in 2011. My Republican colleagues decided to vote against every appropriations bill to protest funding levels.

The die was cast, and we have had to cope with the consequences ever since.

Since fiscal year 2010, we have passed 24 short-term continuing resolutions, which do nothing but keep the government going at the funding levels of the year we were in at the time we passed the continuing resolution. That is nine more than in the preceding 5-year period. It is a 60-percent increase.

When Congress can't agree on funding levels, we end up putting Federal spending on autopilot.

Mr. President, 2011 also marked the year when Congress turned over the power of the purse to the executive branch. By banning the use of congressional adds, we not only admitted that we know less about our States than executive agencies, we also removed a key reason many Members voted for the appropriations bills.

And contrary to conventional wisdom, congressional adds were not out of control.

In 2010, the last year they were allowed, they totaled just one-half of 1 percent of spending approved by the Appropriations Committee. One-half of 1 percent were adds made by Members of this body and the other body to do public projects in their districts.

I believe every Senator knows a great deal about his or her State—I really do—and projects that are important for the State's survival, and I believe they evaluate them based on the importance to the public. I believe they know what vital projects need to be funded. Removing that ability has removed individual Member's stake in an appropriations process that functions, and so it is nonfunctional today. It has damaged our ability to govern, and I deeply believe that.

That is a long way of saying we need to return the appropriations process to the way it was handled in years past, and today's political vote on this bill doesn't move us in that direction.

Even though I do believe the Energy and Water bill represents an acceptable compromise under the circumstances, there are still significant issues with the bill caused by low spending caps.

The bill provides—and this is important—$35.4 billion. That is an increase over fiscal year 2015 funding of $1.2 billion for defense and $8 million for nondefense programs, and that is where you can see the problem. Those national security projects get an add of $1.2 billion—and it is largely the nuclear weapons—and all of our domestic projects, such as the Office of Science, all of the energy projects, all of the innovations, the Energy Department, the Army Corps of Engineers, fixing rivers, fixing dams, dredging, and everything the Army Corps of Engineers does only get $8 million as opposed to the $1.2 billion that is added for defense. But even with that increase, there are significant shortfalls.

I will give a few examples. For the past 4 years, California and the West have been suffering from a historic drought. I just came from the Energy and Natural Resources Committee meeting. Senator BOXER and I have put together a drought bill. We have worked on it for 2 years, and we finally have a bill with some short-term fixes and some long-term projects which can increase water supply in California.

Our reservoirs are at historic lows, and the Sierra Nevada snowpack, our major source of water, is at the lowest it has been in 500 years.

We have millions of dead trees littering the State, increased lightning strikes, big wildfires that go up like explosions into the air because it is so dry, and the State's agriculture sector, which feeds the country, has been heavily affected. This is a $43 billion industry that saw losses of $2.2 billion last year, has lost 17,000 jobs, and on and on and on.

Here are some other ways the Energy and Water bill is weakened by low spending caps. I will talk for a moment more about the Office of Science. This is money used to expand research at our National Laboratories, and we are $196 million below the President's budget request in this bill. Energy efficiency and renewable energy programs have seen an even bigger deficit with funding levels at $773 million below the President's budget request. This delays the development of vital technologies to reduce energy consumption and slash consumer spending.

Defense programs are also underfunded. With higher spending caps, we could be putting into place strategies to keep nuclear materials out of the hands of terrorists. We just heard about a cesium sale to shady people that I can't remember ever happening before, and whether this opens the door to more, I don't know, but I do know it is a real weakness we have.

If we had some money, we could secure radiological resources at medical and industrial facilities, we could install mobile and fixed radiation detectors at ports and border crossings. We could also use additional funds to modernize the nuclear reactor infrastructure that supports the Navy. This includes developing more efficient reactor designs that can last 40 years without refueling.

These are weaknesses we see in the funding picture and in our bill. As I said, I actually believe it is a good bill when you know the circumstances under which we are functioning.

But this isn't just about Energy and Water, and we can't view it in isolation. As I said, Energy and Water had a decent allocation, even with the overall budget restrictions. But cuts made

to other bills are far more dangerous, and we can't ignore these cuts.

I will highlight a few of them. The Subcommittee harmed by the current spending caps is responsible for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. The subcommittee received an allocation of $3.6 billion below last year. The Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education received cuts. These are draconian, and these programs affect our most vulnerable Americans. That is what the Presidential election is all about right now—the discontent over our inability to solve some of these problems.

There is a $331 million cut to employment and training services for youth, veterans, and the unemployed. There is an $87.8 million cut to teen pregnancy prevention programs. There is a $215 million cut to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—disease control. They are seeing diseases that I haven't seen since my childhood, such as measles, spring up all over the State of California, and we need to do these things to keep our people safe. Vaccinations are important.

There has been a $198 million cut to shelter and services for unaccompanied immigrant children, a $69 million cut to Federal student aid programs, and the elimination of a $250 million program to expand access to preschool. Expanding access to preschool is something everybody wants for low- and moderate-income 4-year-olds.

The Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee, on the other hand, did receive an additional $1.9 billion this year. However, the committee required a $3.4 billion increase just to maintain current services.

As a result, the Subcommittee was forced to cut funding for mass transit projects by more than $500 million below last year.

Affordable housing assistance is slashed by $834 million, and the Community Development Block Grant Program that I used as the Mayor of San Francisco a long time ago, which could always be counted on, was reduced by $100 million.

These cuts affected millions of Americans and hurt communities across the country. We should not have to choose between providing rental assistance to low-income families and providing transportation options so they can get to work.

I see the Presiding Officer is nodding. I have about 3 more minutes.

I ask unanimous consent to finish my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank my friend. I appreciate it.

The Commerce, Justice, and Science Subcommittee also received a misleading increase in its allocation. While the Subcommittee received an extra $965 million on paper, it actually needed $1.1 billion just to account for last year's credit from the Toyota settlement that is no longer available this year. As a result, the subcommittee was forced to cut numerous important programs below last year's levels.

They include the U.S. Marshals Service, which was cut by $141 million; legal representation for immigrant children, reduced by $55 million; and Federal assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies, cut by $139 million.

Here is my conclusion. My good friend and colleague Senator ALEXANDER is rightly proud of the work he and his staff have put into the Energy and Water bill, and, as I said, it is a good bill.

I sincerely wish the circumstance we find ourselves in today were different. Those of us on this side of the aisle should have a voice in what happens and how we can solve this problem.

So what I plead for is, in these negotiations that are starting, by Leader MCCONNELL, to move ahead, let's get it started and let's stop the CRs, let's stop the omnibuses, and let's stop the fights over the debt limit and shutting down the government. Let's go back to an appropriations process that this country did well by and that worked.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his forbearance, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a previous President of the United States once wrote that if he could add one amendment to the Constitution, it would prohibit the Federal Government from incurring more debt. That President's name was neither Bush nor Reagan but Jefferson. The 217 years since then have proven three things: The national debt crisis is growing, it is dangerous, and only the Constitution can compel Congress to act. We must act before it is too late.

The national debt was 19 percent of gross domestic product when Thomas Jefferson called for a balanced budget amendment. President George Washington told the House of Representatives that the regular redemption of the public debt was the most urgent fiscal priority. In his first report on the public credit in 1790, Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton warned that continuously accruing national debt interest would be a signal ''either of inability, or of ill faith, and will not cease to have an evil influence on public credit.''

The commitment to fiscal balance over the next 150 years was so strong that many referred to it as our unwritten fiscal constitution. Unfortunately, that commitment did not last. The national debt topped 40 percent of GDP for the first time in 1934, and 2 years later the first balanced budget amendment was introduced in Congress. Eighty years ago, Members of Congress began to realize that an unwritten constitution was no longer strong enough to limit the national debt. Good intentions are not enough to balance the Nation's checkbook.

Senator Millard Tydings, a Maryland Democrat, introduced the first balanced budget amendment to reach the Senate or House floor. The 1947 Appropriations Committee report on his proposal, S.J. Res. 61, opened with these words: ''In no other way except by an amendment to the Constitution can Congress be compelled to balance its budget in peacetime.'' The Judiciary Committee held its first balanced budget amendment hearing in 1956 on amendments introduced by Senator Harry Byrd, a Virginia Democrat, and Senator Carl Curtis, a Nebraska Republican. In current dollars, the national debt today is nearly five times what those distinguished Senators denounced as astronomical and staggering.

Here is where the national debt has gone as Congress has failed to propose a balanced budget amendment. Let me refer to this chart. As we can see, the national debt as a percentage of GDP is going up the charts today to the highest ever. The national debt was 32 percent of GDP when I first introduced a balanced budget amendment in 1979. It climbed to 34 percent of GDP in 1982 when the Senate—but not the House—passed a BBA; more than 62 percent of GDP in 1997 when we came within one vote of approving a BBA that I introduced; and 95 percent of GDP when the Senate voted on a BBA that I introduced in 2011. Today the national debt stands at 103 percent of GDP, literally swallowing the economy.

They say that the more things change, the more they stay the same. As the national debt continues to change in the wrong direction, BBA opponents make the same arguments they always have. First, they say the national debt is simply not a problem that needs a solution. The evidence, however, is all around us.

In a July 2010 policy paper, for example, the Congressional Budget Office outlined what it called the significantly negative consequences of our rising national debt and repeated those warnings in its latest budget outlook. Here are the consequences of a rising national debt—this is the Congressional Budget Office in 2015—reduced investment, resulting in lower national income and higher interest rates; Federal spending on interest payments would rise; less flexibility to address financial and economic crises; and increased likelihood of a fiscal crisis in the United States.

ADM Michael Mullen, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says this national debt crisis is a serious threat to national security—a conclusion echoed by experts from the Brookings Institution to the Heritage Foundation—or we can listen to the Government Accountability Office, which warned in 2009 that every year since

that ''the long-term fiscal outlook is unsustainable.''

A recent study published in the Journal of Economic Perspectives looked at periods in different countries over the last two centuries when national debt exceeded 90 percent of GDP for more than 5 years. The authors found that these periods not only lead to ''substantially slower'' economic growth but that ''even if such episodes are originally caused by a traumatic event such as a war or financial crisis, they can take on a self-propelling character.''

These findings are very important for us today because the national debt has been more than 90 percent of GDP since the recession ended in 2009. In fact, we are entering the longest period in American history with the national debt above this toxic level. CBO projects exactly what this study predicts—that the national debt will remain above 100 percent of GDP and that GDP will grow at a rate ''notably less'' than in the past. Our own actual experience already proves the same thing. In the 6 years since the recession ended, debt has been twice as high and GDP has grown at half the rate as during the same period after previous recessions. This really does look like a self-propelling crisis.

The second argument by BBA opponents is that even if the national debt is a problem, Congress can solve it by willpower. That willpower once existed, but it is long gone. The Federal budget has been balanced in only 7 of the 80 years since a balanced budget amendment was first introduced in Congress and total deficits over those years dwarf total surpluses by 23 to 1.

The third argument by balanced budget amendment opponents is that even if Congress won't solve the national debt by willpower, it can do so by legislation. In 1985 we enacted the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 when the national debt was 42 percent of GDP. We have enacted one law after another as the national debt has continued to climb. Most recently, we enacted the Budget Control Act of 2011 when the national debt had swelled to 95 percent of GDP, but it failed, as did all the others. Willpower and legislation have both failed to tackle this crisis.

The national debt today stands at nearly $18.2 trillion. In its most recent budget outlook, CBO projects that under current law the national debt will swell to more than $25 trillion in the next decade. GAO issued its latest ''Federal Fiscal Outlook'' report in August. Without significant action by Congress, GAO says, Federal debt as a percentage of GDP could in the next 25 years climb to four times its historical average.

New data show that the deficit for fiscal year 2015 will likely be lower than expected. If the best thing to say about our current fiscal condition is that it could be worse, we are really in trouble. In its June long-term budget outlook, CBO says that after a few years at a more modest level, deficits will once again increase, especially when interest rates start to rise.

Since President Obama took office, we have seen both the greatest buildup of debt and the lowest interest rates in history. This is the perfect fiscal storm. Even a small rise in interest rates will explode the cost of servicing this massive debt and contribute to higher deficits and greater debt. CBO projects that interest rates will indeed rise, and, as a result, ''the government's net interest costs are projected to more than double relative to the size of the economy over the next decade.'' Both CBO and the Concord Coalition anticipate that over the next decade, interest costs alone will approach $1 trillion a year—that is with a ''t''—$1 trillion a year.

The fourth argument by BBA opponents really amounts to plain old scare tactics. They figure that Americans may want a balanced budget but only if their own favorite spending continues. So BBA opponents claim that a BBA will automatically cut this or that program. Not only is this a cynical approach to a very serious problem, but it is not true. A balanced budget amendment will require that Congress finally get serious about priorities and decide which spending is the most important and the most cost-effective. Long-term fiscal responsibility is more important than any one spending item in the budget.

I introduced my first balanced budget constitutional amendment in June 1979. I said then and I repeat today that a balanced budget amendment ''requires that Congress think in order of budget priorities.'' Nothing short of the Constitution will make that happen.

One definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results. Neither willpower nor legislation can tackle the growing national debt crisis. It has been nearly 70 years and more than $15 trillion of debt since the Appropriations Committee declared in 1947 that only a constitutional amendment can compel Congress to balance its budget. That is the only option left.

The last gasp of BBA opponents isn't really an argument at all. They say that adopting a balanced budget amendment will not by itself solve the debt crisis. I have introduced 7 and cosponsored 20 balanced budget amendments since I was first elected. In all this time, during all the hearings and floor debates, I have never once heard anyone claim that adopting a balanced budget amendment will, by itself, magically make the debt disappear. Of course it won't. Neither did enacting all of those so called budget control acts. Congress will still have to make the decisions to determine whether we continue drowning in debt or chart a different course.

Congress cannot amend the Constitution by itself. Article V of the Constitution provides that constitutional amendments may be proposed by either two-thirds of Congress or by a convention called at the request of two-thirds of the States. In either case, a proposed amendment does not become part of the Constitution until at least three-fourths or three-quarters of the States ratify it. Congress can do nothing more than propose a balanced budget amendment so that the American people may decide whether they want to add it to their Constitution.

Government does not get to set its own rules. The Constitution is the law that governs government, and it belongs to the American people. It is the primary way the American people set rules for how their government must operate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to finish these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, Congress has proven, over decades of failure resulting in trillions of dollars of debt, that it will not exercise its fiscal authority properly. The American people must be given a chance to decide whether to make fiscal responsibility mandatory. It is the American people who ought to decide this. The only way they can is to propose a balanced budget amendment and send it to the States for consideration.

I have looked at dozens of national polls since I was first elected to the Senate conducted by major polling firms or national news organizations. Three-quarters of Americans supported a balanced budget amendment in 1976 and three-quarters supported it last year. Is it possible, however, that all of those polls over all those years are actually wrong? The American people might be content with the national debt swallowing the economy. They may not be bothered by being on an unsustainable fiscal path. Who knows, they might welcome soaring national debt interest payments crowding out other budget priorities. They might be OK with slower economic growth and a greater threat to national security. The American people might believe, with balanced budget amendment opponents here in Washington, that the national debt is no big deal or that Congress can solve it on its own. If so, then the American people will decline to ratify a balanced budget amendment, but the choice has to be theirs, not ours.

The Peter G. Peterson Foundation also does polling, each month compiling the Fiscal Confidence Index of Americans' opinions about the national debt. The results are both clear and consistent: 71 percent of Americans are concerned about national debt, as seen here—let me just define it a little bit—71 percent say their concerns about the national debt have increased; 63 percent say addressing the national debt is on the wrong track; 81 percent say addressing the national debt should be

among Congress's top three priorities; 83 percent say Congress should spend more time addressing the national debt; 62 percent expect the national debt crisis to get worse in the next few years.

Some of my colleagues may believe we have no obligation to handle the American people's money responsibly. They might still claim that Congress can get its fiscal act together on its own or they may deny that the American people should be able to set the fiscal rules for the government they elect, using the Constitution that belongs to them.

Those colleagues should remember what the American people think about Congress. Disapproval of this institution is 83 percent today, higher than 98 percent of the time since the early 1970s. The percentage of Americans with very little or no confidence at all in Congress is the highest since Gallup started asking in May of 1973.

I am continually amazed at the wisdom and foresight of America's Founders. Thomas Jefferson was right in 1798 that one of the most effective ways of keeping the Federal Government within constitutional principles is to require a balanced budget. The Appropriations Committee was right in 1947 that Congress will not balance its budget unless the Constitution requires it. After seven more decades of attempting to tackle the debt by willpower or legislation, the crisis is worse than ever.

Continued failure is not an option, and there is only one solution. We must act before it is too late.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 2028, which the clerk will report.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:30 a.m. will be controlled by the majority.

The Senator from West Virginia.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate came together in a bipartisan way to pass the National Defense Authorization Act conference report. This important legislation authorizes vital resources for our Nation's troops, our wounded warriors, and their families.

This NDAA provides for our national security needs and will meet our commitments to our allies. The defense funding bill also includes programs that will directly benefit the West Virginia National Guard, including our partnership program with Peru and the Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Program to fight the wave of prescription drug abuse that is all over our States and our State in particular.

This bill provides funding for STARBASE—I visited STARBASE just recently—an innovative program that provides hands-on learning opportunities for students in science, technology, and mathematics, and helps spur their interest in STEM. They were really excited that day.

On Monday when I visited the 167th Air Lift Wing in Martinsburg, I enjoyed the opportunity to personally meet and thank our servicemembers and learn about the challenges they face. These brave men and women deserve our unified support and should not be subject to the gridlock that has been too common in Washington.

Unbelievably to me, though, the President has threatened to veto this bipartisan legislation, even though it authorizes the same amount of spending for national defense that he asked for in his budget submission. Just recently the administration authorized tens of billions of dollars for Iran through sanctions relief, including money that will be used admittedly to further destabilize the Middle East. Now the President is threatening to veto funding authorization for our own troops.

We face great and growing threats to our national security. ISIS continues to advance. Syria's ongoing civil war is creating a flood of refugees in Europe, Russia is increasing its influence in the Middle East, and Iran will gain strength due to the sanctions relief granted in the nuclear agreement. It would be a mistake for the President to veto this funding for our national defense.

As the Washington Post editorialized this weekend, ''American presidents rarely veto national defense authorization bills, since they are, well, vital to national security.''

The editorial continues, ''Refusing to sign this bill would make history, but not in a good way.''

This is not the legacy the President wants to leave behind. He should reconsider his position and follow the lead of the 70 Senators who voted yesterday—including 21 Democrats—to put our national security before politics.

The Senate is now considering another bipartisan bill that has important implications to our national security. The Energy and Water appropriations bill funds programs that help us use our energy resources in the most efficient way possible.

I serve on the Appropriations Committee. I saw the bipartisan work that occurred between the chair and the ranking member. Continued innovation in our energy resources, whether it is coal, natural gas or oil, is absolutely a strategic asset to our national energy independence.

The benefit of innovation in our energy sector is reflected in the vast reserves of shale gas that are now being produced in West Virginia and elsewhere across the country. It was less than a decade ago, when I came to Congress, many of us were worried about a shortage of natural gas. Today, natural gas production is surging. In West Virginia alone, production has increased by over 500 percent in the last decade. It is exciting to watch. An energy economy is a jobs economy.

Not only does shale gas help us meet our domestic energy needs, we have an opportunity to expand our LNG exports, creating more jobs at home while helping to meet the energy and security needs of our allies in Europe and Japan.

Innovation and investment in clean coal technologies, not across-the-board regulation, should be our focus. The Energy and Water appropriations bill includes $610 million in fossil fuel development. This is a necessary investment in entities such as the National Energy and Technology Lab in Morgantown, so that they can use these dollars to develop the technologies to make coal, oil, and natural gas production cleaner and more efficient.

I strongly disagree with EPA regulations that require the use of technology that is not commercially available. That is what we see in these regulations. They increase the cost of energy and they decrease the reliability of electricity grid. The best way to provide that energy and improve our environment is to invest in the technologies that will help us and use those coal reserves in the most efficient way possible.

This bill also provides important funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission. West Virginia is the only State that is completely within the boundaries of the Appalachian Regional Commission, and the ARC plays an important role in helping West Virginians meet our economic challenges. The funding provided in this bill can help ARC promote rural broadband—something I talk a lot about on the floor of the Senate—and will expand rural health care services and offer opportunity to our State's workers.

Investments made in the Army Corps of Engineers through this bill will help provide the infrastructure we need to make sure American products can move to markets across the country and around the world.

The Energy and Water appropriations bill impacts every American. It was carefully crafted, robustly debated in committee, and passed the full Appropriations Committee with bipartisan support.

Mr. President and my fellow Members of the Senate, the Appropriations

Committee did its part. We passed all 12 government funding bills for the first time since 2009. Nine of these bills had bipartisan support. So far Democrats have chosen twice to block debate on the Department of Defense appropriations. Last week, the Democrats blocked debate on the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill. That obstruction is the reason the government is continuing to operate on a continuing resolution.

Let's get the bills on the floor. Let's debate them, make changes, and then vote again. That is what we are supposed to be doing. None of us was sent here to pass short-term continuing resolutions and allow the government to operate on autopilot. Let's do our job. That is what we are sent here for. We are here to advocate for our State and national priorities, and this Energy and Water bill reflects those priorities. The full Senate should have an opportunity to debate this bill, offer amendments to improve it, and pass a bill that will lead to energy security and improve our infrastructure. By contrast, voting to filibuster this and other appropriations bills will make the threat of a government shutdown more likely.

Americans deserve a government that makes wise and strategic investments to best meet our needs. Endless continuing resolutions are not the most effective way to meet those needs and can prove wasteful in dollars and time. I ask my colleagues to allow debate on this important legislation to move forward and to support investments in our energy and infrastructure priorities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I rise reluctantly to acknowledge that I am going to vote in opposition to moving to cloture on this Energy and Water appropriations bill—reluctant because I have supported every single movement to go to the appropriations act because that is what the Senate should be doing. However, I will not reluctantly but will passionately object for the following reason: included in this energy and water report is language that was circuitously placed into the bill that would disadvantage my State of Georgia and show a preference to other States that surround it. It is not our job as Members of the Senate to circuitously write language into a bill that directs what policy this country may seek to follow.

My State, Florida, and Alabama have been in litigation for 30 years over what is called the water wars in the ACF and the ACT Basins. There has been litigation and cases have been dismissed from the courts. We have settled law in terms of the disposition and responsibility of the Corps of Engineers.

It is my responsibility, as a representative of my State, to do what is right, but it is also my responsibility to ask you the rhetorical question as follows: Should any Member of the Senate be able in any way possible to circuitously place language into a bill that would disadvantage one State or advantage another without debate or without direction? If we become that type of a body in the Senate, we are no longer the most liberating body in the world; we are the most punitive body in the world.

I appreciate the job the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee has done in writing this bill, I appreciate the appropriations that benefit the State of Georgia, but I do not appreciate the use of an appropriations bill to direct the actions of the Corps of Engineers to disadvantage my State and advantage another State without debate, without any degree of direction, and in total conflict with the courts' decisions in the past. So I reluctantly will vote no on moving forward on cloture until we remove this language from the underlying bill.

I yield to the Senator from Georgia, Mr. PERDUE.

Mr. PERDUE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the bill before us, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2015, is an important bill, and I appreciate Senator ISAKSON's leadership in this matter. I hope this bill can be considered again in the near future but under different circumstances.

This bill currently contains language that you just heard that would prevent the Army Corps of Engineers from updating the Master Water Control Manual for the Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa River system. By blocking updates to the water control manual, this bill would give Alabama the power to veto any plan by the Army Corps of Engineers to use Federal projects to accommodate both States' water supply needs.

When we look at what is really happening, it should concern every Member of this body as well as every person in the United States. For the last 30 years, as the Senator just mentioned, the States of Georgia and Alabama have been in litigation about the use of water in the ACT River system. In instances like this, the court system is the best way to resolve these issues between the States, not the body we are in today. Instead, the senior Senator from Alabama has chosen to insert specific language in this bill to litigate this issue in the Senate instead of the courts. As anyone can imagine, with nearly 30 years of court cases and 60 years of water rights issues, the line between who is right and who is wrong can sometimes get blurry, but the fact is the Senate should not be intervening in a dispute between the States. This is an issue that should be decided by the courts, and the Senate certainly should not allow one Senator to invalidate progress on a multi-State water issue problem.

Several attempts have been made to get the Governors of Alabama, Georgia, and Florida to get together and once and for all solve this issue.

I want to applaud today Georgia's Governor, Nathan Deal, for his recent attempts to solve this issue and hope that one day we will reach a resolution to this problem that meets everybody's needs. But for now, it seems incredibly shortsighted to force any party in the negotiating process to give in and to tip the scales in one State's favor.

I have had my fair share of negotiations in my career, just as the senior Senator from Georgia has in his business career. I can tell you that forced negotiations never end well for anybody involved. I also know that the citizens of Georgia are not in favor of prolonging this issue any further. I know, Senator, that many of our colleagues in Georgia and many of our colleagues here don't like to be forced to decide issues between the States they don't represent.

With that, Senator, it appears that this bill incentivizes the State of Alabama not to negotiate, causing our colleagues to adjudicate this matter without all the facts.

I ask the Senator, can you give us your interpretation of this language one last time here? I appreciate the Senator's leadership on this.

Mr. ISAKSON. I thank the Senator for his leadership. Without reservation, the language benefits one State to the detriment of another. It is not the responsibility of the Senate to do so. It is inappropriate. I would ask this question of every Member of the Senate: If we became a body of equal representation, two Senators per State, that could secure that they write language into appropriations bills that disadvantages another State, would you want to be a part of that body or would you rather be a part of a body that debates, delegates, and then does what is right for the citizens of the United States of America and right for those they represent?

I appreciate very much the hard work of the Appropriations subcommittee. They have done a good job. We appreciate the priorities that Georgia has gotten. But I don't appreciate a body or the attempt to make this body a court of arbitration between somebody with seniority or somebody with cash versus somebody without, or somebody with a preference versus somebody without. We need to get back to the business of debating and doing what is right for America, not disadvantaging our neighbors or advantaging ourselves over someone else, other than to negotiate what is right for the country and right for the people we represent.

I commend the Senator from Georgia and appreciate his wholehearted support in this. I am going to ask every Member of the Senate to vote no on moving forward on the Energy and Water appropriations bill until the language advantaging one State over another is removed.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MENTAL HEALTH REFORM ACT OF 2015

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I am deeply saddened by the terrible tragedy that occurred in Roseburg, OR, last week that resulted in the loss of nine lives and injured many more. My heart goes out to the victims and their families, who are struggling to understand this senseless act of violence and are shouldering incomprehensible grief. Roseburg, Newtown, Aurora, Virginia Tech, the Navy Yard—these mass shootings are examples of tragedies that our country has experienced far too often.

The common thread that runs through all of these acts of violence is untreated or undertreated severe mental illness. The shootings in Roseburg should serve as a wake-up call that it is time—indeed, it is past time—for a comprehensive overhaul of America's mental health system.

A serious flaw in our current system is that it is simply far too difficult for families to get help for their adult children who are suffering from severe mental illness. Over the past several months, it has been my privilege to get to know Joe Bruce from Caratunk, ME.

Motivated by his own family's tragic experience, Joe has become a powerful advocate for mental health reform.

Let me share with you and with my other colleagues Joe's tragic story. In 2006, Joe's 24-year old son Will, who had a history of severe and persistent mental illness, was discharged from a psychiatric hospital and returned home without the benefits of any medication. Will had been advised that without his consent, his parents had no right to participate in his treatment or to have access to his medical records.

Will believed that there was nothing wrong with him and that he was not mentally ill, which can be characteristic of some individuals with severe bipolar disorder or paranoid schizophrenia. Will would not consent to his parents' involvement with his treatment, and because he was an adult, his father Joe and his wife Amy were barred from all access to his treatment or his medical records.

Tragically, the fears that Amy and Joe had voiced to Will's doctors that Will would hurt or kill someone came true. On June 20, 2006, Joe returned home to find the body of his wife Amy. His son Will was in a deep state of psychosis and, believing his mother to be involved with Al Qaeda, murdered her with a hatchet.

Because of that tragedy, Will was committed to the same psychiatric hospital, which had previously discharged him, by a criminal court. He is now doing well because he is getting the treatment and care he should have had before. As his father says: ''Ironically and horribly, Will was only able to get treatment by killing his mother.''

Joe also introduced me to a group of families from Maine, who are part of a group known as the Families of the 4%, a reference to the segment of our population that suffers from severe mental illness. All of them spoke of similar difficulties in getting needed treatment and care for their adult children suffering from severe mental illness.

This group of parents was distressed, exhausted, and so worried about their loved ones. One mother told me that she had made more than 60 calls seeking help for her son, whom she believed was dangerous.

Another mother described her son chasing her around the kitchen table with a butcher knife. A few of these families had more uplifting stories, because they had finally been able to get needed help for their children. One mother told me about her son who is currently receiving treatment and is in stable condition after being hospitalized more than 30 times in 10 years and spending time homeless and in jail.

Another father told me about his son who had been hospitalized more than a dozen times but is now living in an apartment and able to hold a part-time job because he too is finally receiving the care he needs.

While millions of Americans suffer from mental illness, only a very small number engage in unspeakable acts of violence against themselves or others. Yet many of the tragedies that we have witnessed in recent years—these mass shootings—might have been prevented had the proper resources been in place to support a timely diagnosis, early intervention, and effective treatment for those struggling with severe mental illness.

That is why I have joined with my colleagues, Senator and Dr. CASSIDY and Senator MURPHY, in sponsoring the Mental Health Reform Act of 2015. This bill is patterned on a bill that has been introduced by Congressman TIM MURPHY, a clinical psychologist in the House of Representatives. It will make critical reforms to address a lack of resources, to enhance coordination, and to develop real solutions to improve outcomes for families dealing with mental illness.

My hope is that this most recent tragedy in Oregon will provide an impetus for the Senate to consider our bipartisan bill, which has been endorsed by so many mental health groups, including the National Alliance on Mental Illness, the American Psychological Association, and the National Association of Psychiatric Health Systems. Passage of this comprehensive, bipartisan legislation would help to jump-start the much-needed conversation in this country about how to better care for people living with severe mental illness and to help their loved ones.

This bill addresses one facet, but a significant and ignored one, of the problem of mass shootings. I will continue to support other actions, such as the gun purchase background checks proposed by Senator MANCHIN and Senator TOOMEY. I hope we can come together to pass both bills to help lessen the chance that other families will have to endure the loss of a loved one to a mass shooting.

I urge all of our colleagues to join Senator CASSIDY, Senator MURPHY, and me in cosponsoring this important legislation to strengthen our mental health system, to help ensure that others in this country do not suffer, as far too many families have done, because of adult children suffering from severe mental illness.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

MENTAL HEALTH AND SAFE COMMUNITIES ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I know the President is traveling to Oregon tomorrow. There is a lot of focus, and appropriately so, on the tragedy that occurred last Thursday afternoon in Oregon. I want to start out my remarks this morning by offering, again, our deepest condolences and heartfelt prayers to the families and friends who suffered so much in what seems like a senseless act of violence.

Perhaps stating the obvious, that it is terrible for our Nation to experience yet another tragedy like this, what I hope is that we don't become numb to hearing these reports so we end up being frozen into inaction or dysfunction but that we actually look for ways to try to work together to try to make some progress to deal with the root causes of incidents like this.

For the family and friends of those who lost loved ones last week—like so many others who have lost children, their friends, and siblings in one of these shootings—we know the emotions are still raw and real. So it is with great deference to those who have suffered this loss that I wish to discuss what I believe to be one of the major contributing factors to these seemingly senseless acts of violence that have occurred across the country, and I will talk a little bit about some legislation which I have introduced which I think will actually help us address one of those root causes.

The legislation I have introduced is called the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act. I believe it would bring real change to our Nation and provide help to those struggling with mental illness. This bill would empower families with more options for their loved ones. I think about the mother of Adam Lanza, the shooter at Sandy Hook, and how she knew her son was suffering from mental illness, but basically she didn't have any options other than to let him continue to descend and become sicker and sicker or to go to court and seek an involuntary commitment for a temporary period of time.

So to make sure that families like Adam Lanza's and like the mother of

the Oregon shooter—she said her son seemed to be doing fine as long as he took his medication, but when he quit taking his medication, he would become a real problem because he would get sicker and act out.

The legislation I have introduced attempts to strengthen the safety of our communities by providing families with more options when it comes to treating people with mental illness and treating them different from common criminals.

We know the majority of inmates at our jails in America are people with mental illness. They may have committed some petty crime because of their mental illness, and frequently, because of their attempts to self-medicate with drugs or alcohol, they get in trouble with the law. But rather than just lock them up, wouldn't it be so much better if we could get at the root causes of their mental illness and the reason they show up there in the first place? That is actually the goal of some very innovative programs I will mention in just a moment, but the goal of my bill that I introduced in August is to support families before it is too late and to provide a path to recovery and healing for the mentally ill.

Proactively treating those with mental problems is a vital component to reducing the risk of violence in towns and cities across the country. This bill would help the whole community, including families, as I mentioned, and schools. Certainly teachers and administrators at schools are privy to information and know things or suspect things that could be very helpful in providing assistance to families and those suffering from mental illness. It would also help law enforcement, providing them the training to spot the warning signs of individuals who could become a danger to themselves and others.

Many of the provisions of this legislation are based on policies that have been proven effective in State and local jurisdictions around the country.

Recently, I was in San Antonio—my hometown and where I served as a district judge. In August I had an opportunity to visit with those in the San Antonio area who have taken a leading role in coming up with new and innovative ways to approach this issue, including one of the leaders of that effort, Sheriff Susan Pamerleau. She championed those reforms, made our community safer, and provided families with alternatives to an endless cycle of incarceration for people with mental illness who don't actually get their symptoms and the cause of their problems treated.

The mental health program in Bexar County, which is the county where San Antonio is located, is now touted as the national standard for how to think strategically about those suffering from mental illness in our criminal justice system. The legislation I have introduced will help institute some of these best practices at the national level.

This legislation would empower families who struggle to find help for their mentally ill loved ones and encourage the development of mental health awareness programs in schools to help educators identify students with mental illness and provide them with the resources and treatment they need. It also includes specialized training for those on the frontlines, such as law enforcement. I heard in San Antonio recently that because of the training law enforcement receives, they have been able to reduce, if not almost completely eliminate, the violence that occurs when a police officer arrives at a call and encounters someone who is mentally ill. By providing the specialized training, you can deescalate the violence and allow the officer to direct the person to a place where they can actually get some help.

This legislation would also encourage State and local governments to create pretrial screening and assessment programs to identify mentally ill offenders, provide need-based treatment, and develop post-release supervision plans so they don't become a danger to themselves and others.

This bill also strengthens the current background check system by incentivizing information sharing among the States so that law enforcement has appropriate information regarding individuals with adjudicated mental illness in the criminal justice system. One example that is pretty close to Washington, DC, is the Virginia Tech shooter, who actually had been adjudicated mentally ill, but the State of Virginia had not uploaded that information to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System maintained by the FBI. So when he purchased a firearm, it did not show that he was disqualified, as he would have been if that information had been uploaded to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. Trying to make it easier for the States to put information into the system is one of the goals of this legislation.

I hope my colleagues will view this as a commonsense attempt to try to make a significant step forward that will help not only those with mental illness get the help they need but also equip our Nation's law enforcement officers to perform their jobs.

Last week, more than 20 mental health organizations sent a letter to Members of the House advocating for mental health reform, calling the need ''urgent'' to ''improve the lives of tens of millions of Americans, their families, and our communities.'' We need to listen to them, and we need to act.

I know from reports that some of our Democratic colleagues have said they are going to introduce some gun control legislation that we all know has been tried before and cannot pass this Chamber. What we need instead is a broad consensus to try to get something done that can bring people together, and I believe my legislation can do that by addressing the root cause of some of these horrific events—again, mental illness.

So instead of calling each other names, as the minority leader did on the floor last week, I would invite our colleagues across the aisle to do something constructive and to work together on this legislation.

The Mental Health and Safe Communities Act is a serious proposal and will take important steps toward preventing additional tragedies across the country. I think many of us understand that mental health reform, generally speaking, is long overdue, and this is an issue many groups in the mental health community support.

I should point out that there are many other organizations that support this legislation as well. Just to make my point about this being consensus legislation, I will mention some of the organizations that are supporting the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act: the National Alliance on Mental Illness, the National Association of Police Organizations, the American Correctional Association, the American Jail Association, the Council of State Governments, the Treatment Advocacy Center, the National Association of Social Workers, and the National Rifle Association. Madam President, I daresay that you won't find a group like that coming together on many issues, but on this legislation, on which we worked very closely with them, they have actually been able to settle some of their differences and meet each other on common ground in a way that I think gives us hope that we can actually get some legislation passed and send it to the President. That will actually provide help to people like Adam Lanza's mother or the mother of the shooter in Oregon, who had nowhere else to turn, under the current state of the law, in order to get her son to comply with his doctor's orders to take his medication. Thanks to the miracle of modern medical science, there are miraculous medications that can help people suffering from mental illness lead productive and relatively normal lives.

I encourage my colleagues to consider how we can move this conversation forward in a way that results in real, positive change for our country—above the polarizing rhetoric and political gamesmanship that tends to characterize too much of what we do here in Washington and certainly on this topic.

Last week President Obama addressed the Nation after this horrific incident in Oregon. I believe his emotions were real, but unfortunately he didn't offer any concrete solutions to the problem. He said, among other things, that making our communities safer will require changing our laws. He went on to say that Congress needs to put forward such legislation, and that what is I have tried to do.

I am pleased that the President indicated his interest and concerns, but the real question is, Will the President

work with us on legislation that actually offers solutions or will it just be a matter of grandstanding? Will our Senate colleagues offer legislation that previously has shown it cannot move in the Senate and render us dysfunctional or will they work together in a bipartisan way to try to find common ground and real solutions? I think that is the question.

I would ask our colleagues who are offering legislation—sort of relitigating some of these issues on which we haven't been able to find consensus—which of these proposals would have actually gone on to address the root causes of some of these incidents in the past? I think that is a very important question because if you are interested in demagoguing an issue, you can talk about that and offer purported solutions which can't pass and which actually would not have changed the outcome. What I have tried to do is figure a way that—OK, given our differences on this issue, how can we find that common ground and offer solutions?

Through this legislation, we would give families a way to help their mentally ill family members. We would help schools appropriately identify and respond to someone with mental illness. We would improve the response of law enforcement and the criminal justice system to make sure that mentally ill individuals do not become dangerous to themselves and others. We would work to help the States fix the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. We would reduce the stigma associated with mental illness by protecting due process rights of the mentally ill.

I was somewhat taken aback and disturbed when I saw a story this morning in Politico: ''Dems ready sweeping new guns bill.'' One of the statements in the article jumped out at me. It says: ''Democratic leaders are wary that their rank and file could defect and begin supporting the Cornyn bill.'' So actually, according to this article, what is occurring is, rather than looking to find consensus or to join together to support legislation that might actually help solve the problem, some in the Democratic leadership are actively lobbying their own Members not to get on legislation or support legislation that might actually pass and might actually work. That strikes me as incredibly cynical and doesn't demonstrate an interest in actually solving the problem but, rather, political grandstanding.

I would encourage all of our colleagues, regardless of where you stand on this issue, let's try to figure out a way to move forward. We have a real opportunity to address the common element found in most of these mass shootings, and we don't have any time to waste. We can do better for the American people and get the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act done.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, following the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2028 on Thursday, October 8, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 123, 266, 267, 300, 325 through 328, 330, 331, and 335; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that following disposition of the nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I have come to the floor to speak in support of the fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water appropriations bill. I want to thank the senior Senator from Tennessee for his leadership in developing this bill, for doing his part to help the Senate return to a regular budgeting process, and I want to urge my colleagues not to filibuster when we vote on it.

The Appropriations Committee passed this bill with broad bipartisan approval in late May. The final vote in committee was 26–4, with all Republicans and 10 Democratic Senators supporting it. That means close to 90 percent of the Appropriations Committee voted to advance this bill—a very strong ratio that we should carry over here on the floor, instead of grounding it with demands for more and more spending.

There is a lot in here that the Senate should like. My colleague from Tennessee has developed a good, balanced bill that will provide funding and direction to the Department of Energy, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation. It will allow the Senate to advance our Nation's energy security, nuclear waste cleanup, flood control, and infrastructure development.

We hear a lot of talk about the importance of Federal energy policy around here. As the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, I certainly agree that energy policy and stewardship of our public lands are worthy of our time and attention. And that is one of the reasons this bill should be allowed to go forward. It will support research and development for our conventional energy resources, for renewable resources, for nuclear energy, and for many other promising technologies.

It includes a pilot program for the consolidated storage of spent nuclear fuel, a step in the right direction after years of stalemate that have placed our Nation's nuclear future in limbo.

It focuses on the legacy wastes from the Manhattan Project and provides considerable funding for environmental cleanup at legacy sites around the country.

It will also uphold our Nation's nuclear security, providing funds for nonproliferation efforts and weapons activities.

But that is not all this bill will accomplish.

It will also fund the Army Corps of Engineers, whose construction projects and maintenance operations are critical not only for Alaska's harbors, but for every port in the country. Dozens of communities in my home State depend on the sea for their livelihoods—it is a source of food, jobs, and income. Without a viable port, many Alaskans cannot maintain their traditional subsistence way of life, so this is particularly vital to our Alaska Native communities.

I don't have time to tick through what this bill will do for all 50 States—but I can tell the Senate a little about what it will do for Alaska.

It will fund general investigations in Craig, Kotzebue, Perryville, and St. George.

It will provide construction funds for Port Lions and fund the Continuing Authorities Program, which allows projects that are needed by small communities to take place far quicker than can occur through the usual congressional approval process.

Operations and maintenance funds will go towards dredging in Anchorage, Homer, Nome, and other cities to ensure their harbors are in good working order and able to handle maritime traffic.

This is a good bill. It spends a total of $35.4 billion—which used to be a big number around here. It makes important choices and wise choices and funds our priorities.

So if you care about the national lab system or university research programs, you should support this bill.

If you care about energy innovation and nuclear safety and nonproliferation, you should support this bill.

If you care about ports, roads, harbors, and other infrastructure all around the country, you should support this bill.

And if you think the Senate should lead in the Federal budgeting process—if you are serious about getting that back on track, serious about us playing a role instead of being a bystander—you should support this bill.

Again, I thank the senior Senator from Tennessee for his hard work and encourage the Senate to move to full consideration of this important bill.

Mr. CORNYN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that during the Democratic-controlled time, Democratic speakers be allowed to speak for up to 3 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak on an issue that hits far too close to home for far too many families in Washington State and across the country—in Roseburg, OR; in Blacksburg, VA; in Newtown, CT; in Seattle, WA, where a student at Seattle Pacific University opened fire just over 1 year ago; in Marysville, WA, where a teenager killed four students in a high school cafeteria before turning the gun on himself; and in so many other communities, too many to list.

Madam President, in the hours and days and weeks after those shootings in my State, the community showed incredible resilience and strength. But I can tell you that anyone who has been affected by gun violence understands all too well that all the strength in the world will never erase the pain of the parents who lost a child or the students who lost friends and teachers.

Today I echo the questions I have heard from so many people in Washington State: What will it take for this Congress to adopt simple, commonsense reforms? Why would this Congress hesitate at taking even the most basic steps to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous individuals? Why do we fail to act when children at school and young adults on campus and women in abusive relationships and so many others are so vulnerable to the threat of gun violence?

I know this is a complex issue, but that doesn't mean we should do nothing. It is long past time for us to improve background checks. It is long past time for us to end the illegal pipeline of guns that contribute to crime.

I think it is also important to note that too often those who commit terrible acts of violence needed help and intervention they did not get. To be clear, they represent a very small minority of the many people in our country who struggle with mental illness. But when so many lives are truly on the line, we need a comprehensive approach, and that should include strengthening our mental health care system so that it is available to anyone who needs it.

Madam President, this issue isn't going to go away. I wish it would. I wish we never had to have this conversation again. I wish we had never had to hear about the latest child killed, the latest school upended. I know we all wish that. Wishing will not make it happen. It is time for Congress to listen to the American people and act.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, Congress has failed to protect the American people from the tragic gun violence that is plaguing our Nation. The mass shooting in Roseburg, OR, was the 297th in the United States this year alone. That is more than one mass shooting per day so far this year in our country.

In fact, every year more than 30,000 Americans are killed by guns. Yet the Republicans have blocked any legislation to prevent future tragedies. It is past time for us to act. It is time for us to listen to the American people, who overwhelmingly support commonsense legislation on guns. Ninety percent of Americans support background checks before someone can buy a gun. Ninety percent of Americans support background checks before someone can buy a gun—90 percent of Americans.

So let's close the loopholes that allow online gun sales and sales at gun shows without a background check. Ninety percent of Americans want background checks. Let's close the loophole that allows already proven domestic abusers to buy guns. That is overwhelmingly supported by the American people. Let's close the loophole that allows straw purchasers to buy guns and flood our streets with them. Overwhelmingly, Americans don't want these kinds of illicit sales with no background checks to be conducted across our country. Let's close the loophole that allows a gun sale before a background check is completed. At least let's complete it. Let's take our heads out of the sand on the causes of gun violence and how to prevent it.

We have the power here on the floor of the United States Senate to pass legislation that pretty much all of America expects us to pass. It is time to end the NRA's vise-like control of this Chamber. The NRA says it is the National Rifle Association. Well, our goal should be, on this floor, to say that the NRA stands for ''Not Relevant Anymore'' in American politics.

We should do this now. There is an epidemic of gun violence in our country. It is not preordained; it is preventable. I am proud to join with my colleagues in support of these commonsense gun safety measures.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. McCASKILL. Madam President, I was born in a small rural community where deer season was as much a part of fall as football and falling leaves. I was raised in a household where my dad taught us that hunting was part of our culture in Missouri. I don't know any of my dad's friends, but I certainly know that my father, were he still alive, would be shaking his head about the massacres, about school shootings—45 school shootings in one year—of innocent children, innocent college students being mowed down. It is horrific and it is tragic.

The American people want us to respect gun rights, but they want us to use common sense. They don't want terrorists to be able to buy a gun at a gun show. We should not be selling AK–47s to terrorists at gun shows. We should not be allowing someone who is convicted of stalking the ability to buy a gun.

That is the only thing we are talking about, the principles of common sense that run deep in my State. Close the gun show loophole. Make background checks more effective in order to keep guns out of those hands that should never hold them.

No one is trying to do anything other than protect the innocent. No one is trying to remove a gun from lawful citizens of the United States, but if we do nothing, if we shrug our shoulders and do nothing when an overwhelming majority of our country want us to try to close these loopholes and make background checks more effective, then we are part of the problem. We really need to look in the mirror at the billions we are spending to fight terrorists who are not mowing down our citizens, our innocent children sitting in classrooms, and the billions of dollars we are spending to try to make sure illegal immigrants don't come in this country when, among us, we allow terrorists to buy guns at gun shows, and we allow convicted stalkers to get a weapon. Fifty percent of murder victims in domestic violence have been stalked.

I hope that Americans rise up and call their Congressman, call their Congresswoman, call their Senator, and get busy because we have to take action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise today to join my colleagues in calling for commonsense action to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people who should not have guns, including domestic abusers, and to close loopholes in existing laws that are now being exploited by criminals who are prohibited by law from possessing guns.

Like the Presiding Officer's State, my State is a big hunting State. We are proud of that tradition, so whenever I look at any of these proposals, I think: Would this somehow hurt my Uncle Dick in his deer stand? Would it do anything to take away the rights of those who hunt, the rights of legal gun owners? That is how I look at each proposal, and the proposals we are talking about today would not do that. I wouldn't be supporting them if I thought they did.

We know that no single policy can prevent every tragedy that has been caused by gun violence, but there is one area—what I call the silent victims—the women and the children who

are killed in their homes every single day due to acts of domestic violence. According to domestic violence experts, more than three women per day lose their lives to their partners. More than half of those are killed—are shot—with a gun. This means that thousands of women—thousands and thousands of women in the United States—were murdered by an intimate partner using a gun between 2001 and 2012 alone. These crimes don't discriminate. They impact people across all backgrounds, ethnicities, and income levels. They are serious crimes, and the numbers tell the story of the work left to do.

I am a former prosecutor. Before I came to the Senate, I spent 8 years running an office of 400 people. We made prosecuting felons in possession of guns one of our major priorities, and I am proud of the work we did. I will say that some of the disturbing cases that were murders, that were shootings, did not always involve felons, but they involved criminals. They involved people who, over a series of crimes, had racked up a number of convictions, maybe in the misdemeanor area, maybe for restraining orders and other things.

I remember one case where a woman was shot to death by her boyfriend. He killed her and then killed himself while both of their children were still in the house. It was ultimately his 12-year-old daughter who went to the neighbors for help. The worst part of the story: It could have been prevented. In the 2 years leading up to the murder-suicide, the police had been called at least five times to resolve domestic disputes. Yet somehow this man managed to have a gun in his hands that day and kill his girlfriend.

Consider the police officer who was called to a domestic scene. The guy there had mental health problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I ask unanimous consent for 30 more seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. The man there shot the police officer in the head—shot him in the head. I was at that scene, and what I will never forget are the three little kids, including the little girl with a blue dress with stars all over it, going down the aisle of that church after being in that church a week before for a nativity play with her father. That is what we are talking about, and we are very glad that this proposal will be in the package of proposals along with the background check.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I am very proud to stand up with my colleagues and say: It is time to act. Enough is enough. Close loopholes that are being used by people who are not following the law, unfortunately resulting in death and injury to children and families across the country.

Like a lot of my colleagues, I grew up in a small rural town in Northern Michigan. My family members are all hunters. We enjoy the outdoors and gun ownership. I purchase and own guns myself. That is not what this is about. My family goes through background checks. We don't want people being able to use loopholes and not to have to follow the law. So this is simply about making sure that the law makes sense and that we are enforcing it.

I also think it is very important to stress the fact that we know there are tremendous mental health needs in this country. In fact, Senator BLUNT and I offered legislation—the Excellence in Mental Health Act—before this body that was passed as a pilot project to get started about 18 months ago. If we had the full support of our Republican colleagues in the House and the Senate, we could quickly make comprehensive quality mental health services available all across the country. Instead, because we have not yet—I hope we can get that support. I would love to see that support. If we had that support, we would have more than eight States that are going to have emergency mental health services available, 24-hour services available, so families or law enforcement or individuals have a place to take someone or someone can go in themselves and ask for help—24-hour psychiatric services available on an emergency basis.

That is what is in the Excellence in Mental Health Act. We have begun the process to make sure it is available in these States. It needs to be available in 50 States. We need to make sure comprehensive services are available in the community for behavioral health just as we have for federally qualified health centers.

We came together on a bipartisan basis to extend funding for federally qualified health centers. We now have a new category called federally qualified behavioral health clinics, and funding will be available to comprehensively provide those services in eight States under our pilot project. It needs to be in 50 States.

I welcome colleagues coming to the floor and talking about what we need to do in mental health. We have colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. STABENOW. If I may ask for 15 more seconds.

We have colleagues on both sides of the aisle on bipartisan proposals on a number of different issues. Let's get that done, too. Let's fully fund comprehensive community mental health services. Let's work together on the other issues. It is time to pass commonsense gun safety laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, today Democrats, from the most moderate and conservative Members of our caucus to the most liberal, are united around a series of principles. They are principles that are overwhelmingly supported by over 90 percent of the American people—universal background checks. They are principles that are supported, according to Pew, a nonpolitical poll, by 85 percent of gun owners. They will save tens of thousands of lives without impinging on the rights of any legitimate gun owner.

The gun owners know it. That is why 85 percent of them support it. Gun owners don't want felons to get guns. Gun owners don't want people who have been convicted of stalking and abuse to get guns. We know that. Yet our colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to move on anything. Senator CORNYN—I know Senator STABENOW and Senator MURPHY and others have done great work on mental health. Senator CORNYN came to the floor today and talked about mental health. First, we want to do things on mental health. We should. It is a huge problem. I would like to see my good friend from Texas support the money that is needed—not a pilot program, but the money that is needed.

The more important point is this: Doing things on mental health—which we should—is not a substitute for closing the gun show loophole. Some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are feeling the heat, but instead of taking the action they should, supporting closing the gun show loophole, they say let's focus on mental health without giving any good reason why we shouldn't close the gun show loophole. Let's do both.

Today we are calling on the American people to create a groundswell. President Obama was exactly correct. The gridlock in Congress on guns—which befuddles almost all American people in every State, purple, red, or blue—is because the overwhelming support of the American people is not translated into action here. We are calling on the American people to raise their voices in the next few months. We are calling on the American people to write. We are calling on the American people to call. We are calling on the American people to tweet. We are calling on the American people to post on Facebook. We are calling on the American people to march and tell Washington: Enough—enough of these terrible shootings that all of us grieve over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Let's put the other side on notice. We will get a vote on this legislation. We will use all the procedural means in our ability. Once the groundswell occurs and people on both sides of the aisle have to study the issue, they will have to vote. We will do it either toward the end of this term

or early in the next term of this Congress, and we believe we have a chance to win. The American people have said enough. A small group in the House and Senate, who are so unrepresentative of the views of their constituents, will not hold things up any longer. That is my belief. I hope and pray it becomes a reality.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, democracy doesn't work like this. Democracy doesn't work such that 90 percent of the American public can support the pretty simple concept that you should not get a gun if you are a criminal and have Congress ignore its will. Democracy doesn't work like that.

As Senator SCHUMER said, this is really about making sure the American public are engaged at the highest level and are making it absolutely clear that silence in the face of these mass murders, silence in the face of young men and women—predominantly young men getting gunned down in the streets of our cities every day—isn't acceptable.

We are hopeful that over the course of the next several weeks and months Congress is going to hear loud and clear that our silence has effectively become an endorsement for these murders. I know that is hard to hear. But the reality is that when the Nation's most esteemed deliberative body does absolutely nothing in the face of this slaughter—we don't even hold one single public hearing—those whose minds are becoming unhinged start to think that those in charge have quietly endorsed it, because if they didn't, they would be doing something about it.

The outline that we have laid before our colleagues today is reasonable, commonsense, and exists side by side along with the protection of the Second Amendment, and we should adopt it as quickly as possible. But at the very least, we should get started on a conversation about how we can end our silence on this issue.

I live every day with the memory of standing before the parents of Sandy Hook Elementary School on that morning on which 20 first graders were gunned down. I live every day with the thought of a young man, disturbed in his mind, walking in with a military-style assault weapon, and in less than 5 minutes, killing every single little boy and girl that he shot. Twenty little boys and girls were shot in under 5 minutes. Every single one of them was dead because of the power of that gun, because it was being loaded by cartridges of 30 bullets at a time. It is something no hunter needs in order to enjoy his sport or his pastime.

I talked to my first grader this morning as he was heading off to school. I told him that I was coming to talk about keeping guns out of the hands of criminals. He looked at me with this vision of puzzlement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 3 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. He didn't understand why it was already the law of the land. A 7-year-old had enough common sense to know that criminals should not be able to own guns. As he went off to his first grade classroom—not unlike the first grade classroom that those little boys and girls walked into in December of 2012—I was reminded of the fact that if little boys and girls in a quiet town in Connecticut or young men and women in a quiet town in Oregon are not safe, then my son is not safe either. In the face of political opposition, which is real, that is why we are coming together to say: Enough is enough. It is time for us to understand that without a change in the law, the reality on the ground for those who are being affected by this plague, this epidemic of gun violence, will not end either.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, we are saying today not only enough is enough but also: Rise up, America, and demand action from this Congress, which for too long has been complicit—in fact, an aider and abettor in the mass killings that have taken place at Virginia Tech, Columbine, Charleston, Sandy Hook, and now Roseburg.

If America rises up, Congress will hear and heed that message, just as it would in any public health crisis, and today we face a public health crisis as real and urgent as a contagion of flu or tuberculosis or, yes, Ebola. The same kind of urgency and immediacy in response is necessary—commonsense, sensible measures to fill gaps, close loopholes, and expand existing law to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people. One of those principles should be this: no background check, no gun; no check, no sale.

Let us close the gap that permits countless criminals to buy guns because the background check isn't complete within the required 72 hours. One of the 15,729 ineligible purchasers over the last 5 years—people who were barred by law from buying guns—was Dylann Roof in Charleston. He used his gun to kill nine people in a church in Charleston. He was ineligible to buy a gun, but the background check was not completed within 72 hours.

We are igniting and activating a silent majority in America. More than 90 percent of the American people want background checks on every gun buyer, along with other commonsense measures, such as a ban on illegal trafficking and straw purchases and a mental health initiative in school safety. Let us give America its say, and this moment is one we should seize to say: Rise up, America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, it wasn't long ago that towns such as Columbine, Aurora, Blacksburg, Newtown, and now Roseburg were unknown outside their States. But today, these towns have witnessed the worst kind of tragedy: mass shootings, bodies torn to pieces, families shattered. The common element in each has been an unstable individual who had easy access to deadly weapons.

I stood here 2½ years ago to argue for restrictions on the manufacture, transfer, and importation of military-style assault weapons and high-capacity ammunition magazines. That vote failed.

I stood here to argue for universal background checks. It makes sense that there be a process to ensure a firearm isn't purchased by someone who can't legally possess it, such as a felon. Even that bill, supported by the overwhelming majority of the public, failed.

Here we are once again, standing on the Senate floor, demanding action in the wake of another deadly shooting. As frustrated as I may be, I have not lost hope that the American people will rise up and force their elected representatives to take real action to help stop these senseless murders. I hope they pick up their phones and call every Senator, every Representative, and every Presidential candidate and demand to know where they stand.

President Obama noted this week that the United States is the only country—the only country—that so frequently suffers these deadly attacks. Let me quote some figures. In 2013, we had 33,636 people killed by guns. In 2011, there were 146 gun deaths in the United Kingdom and 698 in Canada. In 2012, Australia saw 226 gun deaths. Last year, there were 6 gun deaths in Japan. Our number is 33,636.

We cannot let that continue. Gun laws work in other countries, and they can work here too. There are simple actions that Congress can take to make a difference. An individual should not be able to buy any weapon they want online or at a gun show with no background check. An individual should not be able to purchase weapons and then immediately resell them, without background checks, to criminals. An individual who has committed domestic violence should not be able to purchase firearms.

These are not drastic changes. In fact, all of these proposals are already law in some States. Congress simply must take some action. The longer we delay, the more innocent people, including children, will be killed in our schools, our office parks, our movie theaters, and our streets.

I wish to conclude with a story written by blog writer Glennon Doyle Melton. She offers up a powerful tale, and I would like to read a portion of it.

''Two weeks ago, my second and fourth grade daughters came home from school and told me that they'd had a code red drill.''

She recalled her daughter saying:

[The drill was] in case someone tries to kill us. We had to all hide in the bathroom together and be really quiet. It was really scary but the teacher said if there was a real man with a gun trying to find us, she'd cover us up and protect us from him. Tommy started crying. I tried to be brave.

Glennon continues:

My three-year-old nephew had the same drill in his preschool in Virginia. Three-year-old American babies and teachers—hiding in bathrooms, holding hands, preparing for death. We are saying to teachers: arm yourselves and fight men with assault weapons because we are too cowardly to fight the gun lobby.

We are saying to a terrified generation of American children—WE WILL NOT DO WHAT IT TAKES TO PROTECT YOU. WE WILL NOT EVEN TRY. So just be very quiet, hide and wait. Hold your breath. Shhh.

This is chilling. To hear what our children and grandchildren must endure, even in their earliest years. I wish to say to all of us that we must have the courage to stand up and do what it takes to provide some commonsense protection for our constituents and for our country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I rise to talk about the topic of gun violence. Time and again we have heard calls in this Chamber for tougher gun safety laws. We have debated ideas that have ultimately fallen short of passage. These were basic reforms that would better protect all Americans, and every time these proposals have failed, more of our communities have fallen victim to gun violence. There are more and more vigils, more funerals, and more questions about how these tragedies keep happening.

Today lawmakers in Washington put forward a set of general principles to guide us as we work to stop the enormous amount of gun violence and gun deaths in our country. These principles include more thorough background checks, which the vast majority of Americans support. They include closing the various loopholes that make it so easy for criminals—not law-abiding citizens—to buy guns, and they include cracking down on gun trafficking and making it a Federal crime.

I have introduced a bipartisan bill with Senator KIRK. The bill called the Hadiya Pendleton and Nyasia Pryear-Yard Gun Trafficking and Crime Prevention Act of 2015. It was named after two young girls who lost their lives when stray bullets from gang violence killed them.

This bill is bipartisan. My main cosponsor is a Republican. Gun trafficking is recognized all around this country as a major source of fuel for American gun violence. Our bill would finally make gun trafficking a Federal crime. It would give law enforcement the tools they need to get illegal guns—we are not talking about legal guns—off the streets and prosecute those who make money dealing in trafficked weapons.

Right now there is no Federal law that prevents someone from loading their truck in Georgia, driving up I–95, and reselling those guns to gang members in New York. These guns go to dangerous criminals. They are not going to our law-abiding citizens. They are not going to hunters in upstate New York. They are going to gang members in New York City, Chicago, and big cities across this country.

We need to make it possible for our law enforcement to do their jobs. I have said it over and over again, nothing ever happens in Washington until regular people stand up and demand action. They want this nonsense to stop. They want innocent lives not to be lost because of criminals and the mentally ill who can so easily get access to weapons. It is insane that we cannot do commonsense gun reform that the vast majority of Americans and gun owners actually support.

If you, God forbid, are a parent who has lost a child, we need to hear your voice. If you are a member of law enforcement, we need to hear from you about what has worked and what has not worked. What resources do you need for us to help you do your job? If you are a law-abiding gun owner, we need to hear your ideas about how to prevent criminals from getting their hands on guns. If your life has been affected by gun violence, we need to hear your ideas about how to prevent other people from having to live through the horror you have lived through.

The only way we are going to make our country safer from gun violence is through Federal action. Right now, we are stuck with a patch of State and local laws which make it very hard for law enforcement to do their jobs to keep us safe. We urgently need Federal gun safety reform. Month after month, year after year illegal guns tear apart communities in New York and across our country.

According to the last Federal data, there were 8,539 firearms recovered and traced in my home State in 2013 alone, and of those more than 8,500 guns, nearly 70 percent of them came from out of State.

I cannot say this more strongly: We have to make gun trafficking a Federal crime. Give law enforcement the tools they need to keep our communities safe. Stop handing guns over to criminals. We can do this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 338

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I come to the floor to urge my colleagues to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This has been a very important program for preserving our outdoor spaces and the beauty of our country. It is particularly important to my home State of New Hampshire, where this fund actually comes from leasing revenues from oil and gas, and so these are dollars that are supposed to be designated for this purpose since the law was passed in 1965. I am very disappointed that this body has allowed the LWCS authorization to expire.

We have a bipartisan bill, which is cosponsored by Senator BURR, Senator BENNET, and myself—the Burr-Bennet-Ayotte bill, which is one that I will seek unanimous consent on in a moment. It has a number of cosponsors. This is a very bipartisan bill. Senator TESTER, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator ALEXANDER, Senator COLLINS, and Senator KING have also cosponsored this bill. This bill would permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

We know from a previous vote in the Senate, we have 60 votes for permanent reauthorization. People on both sides of the aisle feel very strongly about preserving our great outdoors in this country.

In New Hampshire, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been used on 650 projects, from every aspect of our State—from Sunapee to Ossipee, to Berlin, to Seabrook, to my home city of Nashua, and the Mine Falls Park that I run in every day whenever I am home.

According to travel officials, 660,000 visitors are expected to travel to New Hampshire this weekend over the Columbus Day holiday. We welcome them, but they are coming to experience the beauty and iconic fall foliage of New Hampshire, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund has given them opportunities to enjoy our great outdoors, whether it is hiking, bicycling or hunting, whatever they like to do in the great outdoors.

Protecting our treasured outdoor spaces is not a partisan issue. We should work together on this issue and extend this important fund. I urge this body to immediately take up and pass the reauthorization for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to continue to preserve our great outdoors, this beautiful country, and my beautiful State of New Hampshire. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has helped to preserve our beauty not only in New Hampshire but across this country and our Nation.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 10, S. 338; I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I want to be very clear about what it is we are

talking about today. We are discussing the expiration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund's ability to accrue additional revenues to the fund and nothing more.

According to the Congressional Research Service, the Land and Water Conservation Fund currently has an unappropriated balance of around $20 billion that can be appropriated in implementing LWCF projects. If you assume the current rate of appropriations is roughly $300 million per year, it would take around 60 years before that fund is exhausted.

Meanwhile, we have both the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and its House counterpart, the House Natural Resources Committee, working on reforms to the LWCF to address some of the issues that are causing a lot of people to be concerned with the LWCF. These issues involve, for instance, the maintenance backlog that we have with regard to many of our national parks and public lands and also with regard to the manner in which the Federal Government acquires new land. This is of concern to many of us, especially those of us who come from a State like mine where the Federal Government owns nearly 70 percent of the land.

On that basis, Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I am obviously disappointed that an objection has been rendered by my colleague from Utah, but I will say I appreciate his interest in making sure we maintain our public parks and lands, and this is certainly an interest that we all share together. It is my hope that we reauthorize this program—I know there are some very important projects that can go forward not only in New Hampshire but across the country—because you can't do anything new unless you reauthorize it.

I am disappointed that there is an objection, but I am hoping this is something we can overcome and make sure we can work together and get this reauthorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, just to clarify. We have two committees, one in the Senate and one in the House, looking at the possibilities for reforming this program. I am confident we can find agreement on how this program ought to be reformed. That is my goal, and I will continue to work toward that end. I want to make sure we have reforms put in place as we reauthorize this.

In the meantime, I want to be clear: This doesn't do anything to halt the program as a whole. This just deals with the accrual of revenue to a fund that has an accumulated unappropriated balance of $20 billion. We certainly have time. This shouldn't be rushed through. We need to give the committees the time they need in order to work out the reforms needed.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I join the Senator from New Hampshire, Ms. AYOTTE. I thank her for her leadership on the Land and Water Conservation Fund. She has been out front on this, she cares about it, she is effective, and works well with other Members of the Senate. My bet is that she will succeed before very long.

In 1985 and 1986, at President Reagan's request, I was chairman of the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors. It was our job to look ahead for a generation and try to see what kind of recreational facilities Americans would need in the next generation. Our principal recommendation was that we fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It was created in the 1960s and has worked with States, as well as through the Federal Government, to create city parks and opportunities to enjoy one of those aspects of the American character that makes us exceptional; that is, the great American outdoors.

Senator BURR of North Carolina and Senator AYOTTE of New Hampshire have been among the most vigorous supporters of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I join with them, and I look forward to their success.

Now, on another subject, Madam President, in about 15 minutes, the full Senate will have an opportunity to vote on whether we want to consider the Energy and Water Appropriations bill this year. We are voting on the motion to proceed to the bill.

I will try to put that in plain English. That means our Appropriations Committee, which consists of 30 Members of the Senate, has finished its work on the Energy and Water Appropriations bill. In fact, we finished it on May 21. We voted in a bipartisan way, 26 to 4, to send it to the floor of the Senate.

Senator FEINSTEIN, who is a wonderful partner to work with from California, is the ranking Democrat on the Energy and Water Subcommittee. She helped write the bill. I helped write the bill. Thirty other members of the Appropriations Committee helped write the bill. This will be an opportunity for the other 70 Members of the Senate to get involved in our first responsibility, which is the Senate appropriations process.

So the question is that a ''yes'' vote means yes we want to debate the bill.

As a Member of the Senate, I would like to be involved in the Energy and Water appropriations process. I would like to have a say about where we put our nuclear waste. I would like to have a say about our National Laboratories and what they are doing to create new jobs for our country. I would like to have a say about whether we will be first or whether we will be in the middle of the pack on supercomputing. I would like to have a say about whether the harbors along our coasts are dredged and deepened so that the big ships from the Panama Canal, which is being widened, will come to the United States and bring cargo and jobs here instead of other places. I would like to have a say about nuclear weapons. I would like to have a say about whether to move ahead with a new class of submarines.

All of that is in this bill. All 30 Senators on the Appropriations Committee have had our say, but the other 70 Senators have not. The way the Senate works is this is the time for Senators to stand up and say yes or no. I want to have my say on behalf of my State about national defense and about growth, about jobs, about our country. Why wouldn't a Senator want to do that? It is hard for me to understand this.

The Democrats are saying: No, we don't even want to talk about it. They are saying: No, we don't want to debate it.

That is our job. It is our job to debate it. They say: Well, we have a difference of opinion over spending. Do my colleagues know how big our difference of opinion is? Three percent. This bill that we are about to vote on spends 97 percent as much money as the Democrats want to spend. They want to spend 3 percent more. I actually think this is a pretty good way to appropriate. That means we at least been able to squeeze 3 percent out. And if later on, in a few weeks, we have a way of negotiating an agreement that says we will spend 3 percent more, we can add that 3 percent in 24 hours. It would not take long at all. That would be the way to do it.

The way we are supposed to do an appropriation is to bring the bill to the floor and let all 100 Senators vote on it—not just the 30 who are on the Appropriations Committee—and have a conference with the House of Representatives. They have had their say. Then we send it to the President and he has his say.

Now, the President has said he will veto it because it needs to spend 3 percent more. That is his prerogative under the Constitution. It is the prerogative of the minority Democrats in the Senate to say we will uphold the President's veto because we agree with him on spending. But we don't start the process at the beginning and not even allow the full Senate to do its appropriations job. We go through the whole process and let the President have his say and then we sit down and talk about what to do.

This is a very bad precedent that really insults the Senate. What this means is that if the Republicans are in the minority of the Senate in the next Congress and we have a difference of opinion with the Democrats over how much to spend, we won't have an appropriations process, some might say. They will say: We have a difference of

opinion, and since we have 41 Senators, we will just stop the appropriations process at the beginning. We won't let the rest of the Senate have its say.

That is not the way we are supposed to do our job. We are sent here to have our say on behalf of the people.

Let me give an example or two, if I may. Senator FEINSTEIN and I worked very hard on this bill. It provides a total of $35 billion; $1.2 billion more than last year and $668 million below the President's budget request. The bill is consistent with the Federal law that is called the Budget Control Act. We didn't just make up out of thin air how much to spend. The law tells us how much to spend. That is the law of the Senate, which the House and the Senate all voted for, passed, and signed, and which governs what we spend. Our friends on the other side would like to spend more. That is their prerogative and they can vote to spend more. But why would they stop us from having a discussion about spending more?

Half the bill is nondefense spending that supports scientific research and laboratories, harbors, locks, and dams. Half the bill is defense spending. It funds nuclear weapons, life extension programs. It maintains our nuclear weapons stockpile. As I said earlier, the Senate Appropriations Committee fully considered it and approved the work that Senator FEINSTEIN and I had done, 26 to 4, on a bipartisan basis. Defense spending is higher this year, primarily because of an agreement we made a few years ago when we enacted the START treaty to modernize our nuclear weapons program. It funds several other important agencies, including the Department of Energy, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the National Nuclear Administration. It reduces wasteful spending because of our oversight. Every year, Senator FEINSTEIN and I cut out of our budget at least one program that we consider low priority. We did that again this year. And if the Senate would allow us to have the bill on the floor and discuss it and vote on it and approve it, we could save $150 million from the U.S. contributions to the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor in France. But, no, we are not going to discuss that, say our friends on the other side.

The bill helps our economy. Former Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke wrote a good column in the Wall Street Journal earlier this week. He said: Don't count on the Fed alone to make the economy better. We have to do some other things.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thought I had until 12:45 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democrats have 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am sorry. If I may have 30 more seconds to wind up—no one told me that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Chair.

So I would say to my friends on the other side, if you want to have a say about nuclear waste, about nuclear defense, about National Laboratories, about flood control, about waterways, and about locks and dams, then vote yes, because that will give you a say and you will be doing your job. Voting no sets a dangerous precedent for the Senate that says we are not interested in doing our job on appropriations.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise as the vice chair of the Appropriations Committee to urge my colleagues to vote no on the motion to proceed to the Energy and Water appropriations bill.

I wish to comment about the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee. First of all, I have such admiration for him and for his advocacy for Tennessee, the skilled legislator that he is. He has been an advocate for his State and for the United States of America. He is an outstanding chair of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development. I know he and my colleague, the ranking member, Senator FEINSTEIN, have worked very well together.

I don't dispute many of the things the Senator said in terms of what impact this would have on the economy. Certainly, if one is the Senator from Maryland, the Corps of Engineers is part of our economy, particularly because of the role it plays in helping to keep our waterways open and able for the Port of Baltimore to be viable and accept the new Panama Canal shipments. We could go through item after item.

We need a bipartisan budget agreement. While the Senator says he wants to have his say, which I appreciate, we have been trying to get budget negotiations going since May. In the committee I voted to move this bill forward because I wanted to move the process forward. I was hoping that the leadership of both bodies would move to a new top line 302(b) allocation and lift the caps. We need leadership on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the dome. We wanted that five months ago, yet here we are for yet another parliamentary maneuver that just pits well intentioned, hard-working people against each other over process. We need a new top line so we can have a better bottom line for our national security and our economic security.

I am deeply worried that the trajectory we are on is hollowing out our America, that we are hollowing out the much-needed infrastructure that we need, part of which comes from the Army Corps of Engineers, which includes our waterways.

Look at the whole issue of dam safety. Our colleagues in South Carolina now are worried about the rivers. The Corps of Engineers is working 36-hour days with Governor Haley to really try to help South Carolina. But we need investments in our infrastructure, not only for crisis response. And by the way, of course we are going to stand with the people of South Carolina to help them. We need to be able to cancel sequester, and we need to be able to do it for defense and for nondefense.

In the Energy and Water bill that is before us, the increases are in the defense side. Some of the national security issues have been outlined by the Senator from Tennessee. But in the area of nondefense, it has just gone up a couple of hundred million dollars—excuse me, $8 million. The bill is short on infrastructure and it is short on research funding.

Now, I believe we should have a sensible approach to spending. I know that we agree with the budget caps, but these budget caps are placing a cap on our national security. They are placing a cap also on our compelling infrastructure needs that every State is crying out for. The Senator from Tennessee knows the requests have come his way, along with Senator FEINSTEIN.

We are also capping innovation. We need to be able to have more breakthroughs, whether it is in life science—we had a wonderful hearing yesterday that we both attended regarding the breakthroughs at NIH, but we need breakthroughs in energy.

We need to maintain our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We need the Corps of Engineers to have the resources it needs for flood control, waterways, and harbors. My port depends upon it.

We also need adequate funding for the cleanup of uranium enrichment plants such as in Portsmouth, OH, where 500 workers will lose their jobs.

We need to stop talking and engaging in parliamentary dueling.

My hope is to encourage our leadership to come up with a new budget deal that lifts the caps so that the Senate appropriations committees can get on with their job.

I have worked now with our colleague, the full committee chairman, Senator COCHRAN. The Senator from Mississippi, a gentleman of the old school, has done a good, solid job running the committee. As to the chairman that we have worked with, we feel we have good relations. But it is not how well we get along; it is how much we get done. And the way to get it done this year is to be able to lift the budget caps, come up with a sensible agreement with appropriate offices, and then let's let the appropriators do our job.

I wish to say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we do look forward to working with you, but when all is said and done, we want to get more done than we get said.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, we yield back any remaining time on our side.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, we yield back our remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 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, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 278 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alexander	Enzi	Murkowski
Ayotte	Ernst	Paul
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Gardner	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sessions
Coats	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Sullivan
Collins	Kirk	Thune
Corker	Lankford	Tillis
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Cotton	Manchin	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Wicker
Cruz	McConnell	
Daines	Moran	

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Cardin	Franken
Bennet	Carper	Gillibrand
Blumenthal	Casey	Heinrich
Booker	Coons	Heitkamp
Boxer	Donnelly	Heller
Brown	Durbin	Hirono
Cantwell	Feinstein	Isakson
Kaine	Murphy	Shaheen
King	Murray	Stabenow
Klobuchar	Nelson	Tester
Leahy	Perdue	Udall
Markey	Peters	Warner
McCaskill	Reed	Warren
Menendez	Sanders	Whitehouse
Merkley	Schatz	Wyden
Mikulski	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—4

Graham	Rubio
Reid	Scott

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 47.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MARIO CORDERO TO BE A FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSIONER

NOMINATION OF SARAH ELIZABETH MENDELSON TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR

NOMINATION OF SARAH ELIZABETH MENDELSON TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

NOMINATION OF W. THOMAS REEDER, JR., TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

NOMINATION OF LUCY TAMLYN TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF BENIN

NOMINATION OF JEFFREY J. HAWKINS, JR., TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

NOMINATION OF DAVID R. GILMOUR TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE TOGOLESE REPUBLIC

NOMINATION OF EDWIN RICHARD NOLAN, JR., TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SURINAME

NOMINATION OF CAROLYN PATRICIA ALSUP TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE GAMBIA

NOMINATION OF DANIEL H. RUBINSTEIN TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TUNISIA

NOMINATION OF SUSAN COPPEDGE AMATO TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE TO MONITOR AND COMBAT TRAFFICKING, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR AT LARGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider en bloc the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Mario Cordero, of California, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 2019; Sarah Elizabeth Mendelson, of the District of Columbia, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador; Sarah Elizabeth Mendelson, of the District of Columbia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations; W. Thomas Reeder, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation; Lucy Tamlyn, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Benin; Jeffrey J. Hawkins, Jr., of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Central African Republic; David R. Gilmour, of Texas, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Togolese Republic; Edwin Richard Nolan, Jr., of Massachusetts, a Career Member of the Senior

Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Suriname; Carolyn Patricia Alsup, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of The Gambia; Daniel H. Rubinstein, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Tunisia; and Susan Coppedge Amato, of Georgia, to be Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, with the rank of Ambassador at Large.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Mario Cordero, of California, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 2019; Sarah Elizabeth Mendelson, of the District of Columbia, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador; Sarah Elizabeth Mendelson, of the District of Columbia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations; W. Thomas Reeder, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation; Lucy Tamlyn, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Benin; Jeffrey J. Hawkins, Jr., of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Central African Republic; David R. Gilmour, of Texas, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Togolese Republic; Edwin Richard Nolan, Jr., of Massachusetts, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Suriname; Carolyn Patricia Alsup, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of The Gambia; Daniel H. Rubinstein, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Tunisia; and Susan Coppedge Amato, of Georgia, to be Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, with the rank of Ambassador at Large?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator WYDEN and Senator MURRAY be added as cosponsors to S. 2165, a bill introduced earlier today to permanently authorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2165

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2165, which is a permanent extension of the Land and Water Conservation Fund; that the bill be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, this Land and Water Conservation Fund has been around for 40 years. It has $20 billion built up in reserve. The authorization, as it is expired at this point, only changes the amount of money coming into it.

We are still doing the same projects. Literally, this fund has 65 years worth of reserve built into it.

What we are trying to find is some way to be able to help protect the lands that we already have. We are adding more lands. We are not doing maintenance on the lands. We have an $11 billion maintenance backlog just in our national parks.

So I do have a concern that we are continuing to add more lands, and we are not taking care of what we have. There is not an immediate emergency need for this because the fund continues to operate. We are just not adding new dollars into it in the days ahead.

But, again, we have about 65 years of reserve currently in it. So we are not in a hurry. We do want to be able to get this right, though, on how we actually maintain our lands as well as actually do purchasing or State entities do—whatever it may be—so I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, if I could continue, because I am very disappointed that these objections are now proceeding. Just to be clear, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been around for 51 years, and this is the first time in the history of the Land and Water Conservation Fund that it has expired. So I hope that sportsmen, I hope that fishermen, I hope that everybody who loves the outdoors and participates in the outdoor economy will call their Senators and make sure they understand that these are important bills to pass.

We don't want to become the holdup Senate where you cannot get the Export-Import Bank finally past the finish line, where you cannot get the Land and Water Conservation Fund—things that have worked for decades and decades, that are bipartisan, and that the majority of Members on both sides support—and it is about making sure they can get a vote.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has supported more than 6 million jobs nationwide as part of outdoor recreation, and it is credited with over $900 million from, basically, Outer Continental Shelf drilling. So those gas receipts paid for this open space that then generates more to our economy by having outdoor recreation opportunities.

So every State, I am sure, will hear from cities, from counties, from organizations, and sportsmen who will say: Let's get this bipartisan legislation passed; let's continue our efforts as a conservation country to invest in the things that will help grow our outdoor economy.

I hope my colleague from the other side of the aisle will stop coming to the floor and objecting to this. I know there are Members on both sides of the aisle who have tried to get this passed. I hope that when we return in a week, we will find a path forward to say that this is a priority, that after 51 years of this legislation, we haven't lost our mind as it relates to how important outdoor recreation economies are to our country.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

TRAGEDY AT UMPQUA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I am on the floor of the Senate with my colleague from Oregon, Senator WYDEN, to share a few thoughts about the tragedy that has occurred in our home State.

One week ago today, a madman turned a quiet fall day in Roseburg, OR, into a day of horror and terror.

What occurred on the grounds of Umpqua Community College is an unspeakable, senseless innocent tragedy—nine innocent lives cut short.

Lucero Alcaraz was just 19 years old. She graduated from Roseburg High School this past year. She had received scholarships that would cover her entire college costs, and she had hopes of becoming a pediatric nurse working with children.

Quinn Cooper, 18 years old, also just graduated from Roseburg High School. Quinn loved dancing and voice acting. He was just on the verge of taking his brown belt test in martial arts.

Lucas Eibel, 18 years old, was a third graduate of Roseburg High School. He was studying chemistry. When he wasn't in school, he played soccer and volunteered at Wildlife Safari animal park and a local animal shelter.

Treven Anspach was 20 years old. He was a talented athlete, and he worked with the Douglas County Fire District when he wasn't in class. His parents referred to him as the ''perfect son.''

Kim Dietz loved the outdoors, her 18-year-old daughter, her two Great Pyrenees dogs, and she worked as a caretaker at the Pyrenees Vineyard.

Jason Johnson was 33 years old. Jason recently turned his life around. After completing a 6-month drug rehab program with the Salvation Army, he decided to continue his education. As his mother said, he had ''finally found his path.''

Sarena Moore. Sarena was in her third semester at Umpqua Community College, studying business. She was an active member of the Grants Pass Seventh-day Adventist Church and the proud mother of two adult sons.

Lawrence Levine was the professor teaching the writing class that was assaulted by the gunman. He loved the blues. He loved fly fishing. Writing was his passion.

Rebecka Carnes. Rebecka graduated just last year from South Umpqua High School. In this picture she is holding a graduation cap, and the graduation cap says ''the adventure begins.'' She was full of zest for the life to come.

These were nine upstanding citizens of the community, nine promising lives cut short. Yet even in tragedy we saw in Roseburg examples of resilience and heroism. The law enforcement officers, the first responders proceeded to act quickly and to act competently.

There were students like Chris Mintz, who was shot five to seven times seeking to stop the gunman. The sheriff, the county commissioners, the mayor, the city manager all made decisions in a flash to respond and to address the unfolding crisis, and they did an incredible job, but there is no job that can repair the damage done, the tear in the fabric of the community or the broken hearts of the families and the community and all Oregonians. This mass shooting will be seared into our memories.

The name Roseburg will be added to a list that includes Charleston, Newtown, Aurora, Oak Creek, Virginia Tech, and Columbine. This is a list of communities and schools that no community or school ever wants to be on.

I was born in Douglas County, in the town of Myrtle Creek. I spent my early childhood there and then in Roseburg. That area is an incredibly beautiful place. It is home to one of the most beautiful rivers in the world, the Umpqua River, and a town that is just the right size, where everyone knows each other and everyone helps each other. I am shocked when I think of the community, that this could happen there.

If this can happen in Roseburg, it can happen anywhere in our country. That is something that becomes evident day after day, week after week. In the course of 2015, there have been 45 shootings in our schools across the country, 18 mass murders, or roughly 1 every 2 weeks. So we grieve the lives lost at Umpqua Community College in Roseburg, and we grieve the lives lost in assaults across the country. We will search our souls to ask ourselves how we might diminish the odds of this occurring in another community, and that conversation will take place here in this Chamber in the weeks ahead.

I want to close with recognizing that if we can diminish the opportunity of a disturbed individual to get hold of a gun and we can increase the opportunity for them to get help, there will be fewer tragedies like this.

With that, I turn the floor over to my colleague, Senator WYDEN.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague, Senator MERKLEY, a son of Douglas County, and reflect for a few minutes on the horrendous events of the last week. My colleague has eloquently talked about this, and I am grateful for that.

Senator MERKLEY and I will be returning home tomorrow, but I want to talk a little bit about some of what was inspiring last Friday. My colleague and I and our colleague from the House, Congressman DEFAZIO, went to Mercy Medical Center, and we saw all of the staff. My own sense is that there is no way you can truly prepare for something like this. You can go through as many training programs, have as many drills, have as many handbooks as anybody can invent, but you are never truly prepared for it. When Senator MERKLEY and I and a colleague from the other body, Congressman DEFAZIO, walked into that mayhem, there were probably 150 staff there, and I said: This is the face of Douglas County. These are the people—the doctors and the nurses and the pharmacists and the volunteers—who were there in a time of extraordinary stress giving those individuals the very best of care and that little extra touch of Douglas County caring that my colleague knows much more about than anyone else here in the Senate.

I so appreciated what we saw at Mercy Medical Center because it told me that even at a time of such pain and after such carnage, we know Douglas County is going to come back. Roseburg is going to come back. The reason we know that is because of what we saw there at Mercy Medical Center—all of those committed, wonderful advocates who, against all odds, came through.

There is one other part of Douglas County I want to reflect on because it says so much about the community. My colleague and I have townhall meetings around the State. We have both been in Douglas County. I was at a townhall meeting at UCC just a couple of months ago. As I was driving in, all of the log trucks were parked out front because it is a community that cares a great deal about sensible natural resources policy. We had a spirited town meeting, as most of the town meetings in Douglas County are, because people have strong views, but on that day I saw much of what I saw at the Mercy Medical Center when my colleague and I visited—people who care about their friends and neighbors, who care about a whole host of issues, from the economy to charity to what the Congress is doing, that might actually be relevant to them.

I bring this up by way of saying I am so grateful my colleague made the presentation he did so that we understand what a huge loss this has been, but I also wanted to touch on what I saw with my friend at Mercy Medical Center and what I saw at the Umpqua Community College townhall meeting just a couple of months ago. Because at a time of great loss, we can also be inspired by what we saw at that medical center and the friends and neighbors of goodwill coming together to deal with some of the biggest challenges the community and our country face.

I look forward to going home with my colleague tomorrow, to once again talk about the challenges that are ahead after Roseburg. We talked a little bit about that on the steps, but I mostly want to say that what we saw last Friday in the middle of tragedy and great stress ought to send the message to all concerned that Douglas County is going to be back. Douglas County is a special place, and as horrendous as these losses were, those are people who embody the best of our State and the best of our country.

I look forward to working with my colleague and, with his leadership, providing whatever solace we can in the short term and then moving on to tackle the community's bigger issues in the days ahead.

I thank my colleague, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. KING. Mr. President, on September 11, 2001, 3,000 people were brutally killed in this country. The response of our Nation was overwhelming. We changed our laws, we increased our intelligence community's capacity dramatically, we fought two

wars, and we imposed vigorous inspection regimes at airports and in connection with transportation. We made huge changes in order to see that such a thing did not happen again. Why? Because we love each other. We are a compassionate people, and when American lives are threatened, we react. In that case, we reacted in an overwhelming way.

In 2014, we lost one American to a potential Ebola epidemic. One life was lost. Even though it was only one life, millions of dollars were spent across the country, and our entire health system was mobilized, again, because we love each other and we want to protect each other.

Over the last 10 years we have had disasters in this country that have affected our neighbors, most recently in South Carolina. Of course, the two great disasters of the last decade are Katrina and Sandy. Again, we responded. In money, $100 billion was allocated for relief from those two storms. Why? Because we love each other and we take care of each other.

When we see a problem in this country, particularly a problem that threatens fellow Americans, we act. We do something. When there is a risk to our colleagues and our friends and our families, we address it. Yet we have one epidemic in this country, one disaster that we are deliberately ignoring. It is an epidemic which takes over 30,000 lives a year, 30,000 American lives a year, and that is gun-related violence. The breakdown on that 30,000 figure is over 10,000 homicides committed with guns and 20,000 suicides committed with guns.

Maine is a gun-owning State. Of any State, I think my State has the second or third highest percentage of gun owners in the country. Yet we have one of the lowest levels of gun violence. Why is that? I think it is because of our deep tradition of respect and care for firearms and the idea that is passed down from generation to generation that firearms are to be treated responsibly and with respect and with an understanding of their destructive capacity.

Thinking about this issue has made me reflect upon what is the proper response from what level of government. I do not think all problems in this country need to be solved by the Federal Government. I think this is one of them. I think there is an important role to be played by States and localities because they can adjust their rules and laws according to the needs in their States. The needs, responsibility, and the importance of this issue in Maine may be different than it is in New Mexico or Texas or Illinois or New York. Therefore, under the genius of our system, the principle responsibility should rest at the State and local level. However, I do think there are minimum standards the Federal Government can impose that will enable the States then to work within those standards to meet the requirements that they see are most important for their citizens. This is a true role of federalism.

In our Federal Constitution we have the Second Amendment, and I respect and support it. It is a basic part of our governing document, but the Second Amendment, to me, not only imparts rights but responsibilities. Guns are dangerous instrumentalities. Anybody who has ever used one knows that, and there are responsibilities which come with the right to keep and bear arms.

Justice Scalia in the Heller decision—where the Court struck down the District of Columbia's total ban essentially on handguns, saying it overreached and violated the Second Amendment—was very clear and explicit where he said: The Second Amendment, like all other amendments in the Constitution, has limits. Interestingly, specifically he mentioned in that opinion—and nobody ever accused Justice Scalia of being a liberal. Justice Scalia pointed out: Of course you can limit the ability of felons and the dangerously mentally ill to obtain handguns. The government can limit it. And also, the government can reasonably place limits on the commercial transaction, the sale and purchase of guns.

We are here today because of one more in a depressingly familiar series of mass shooting incidents: Columbine, Newtown, and now Oregon. All over the country this is happening in a repetitive way. It is important to use this occasion to reflect upon the dangers we are ignoring, the epidemic we are ignoring, but I think we also have to realize that mass shootings, as horrendous as they are, are not the bulk of the crimes committed with guns and the deaths dealt by guns in this country; that those are everyday criminals, abusive spouses, and, sadly, people taking their own lives. Don't forget that those 30,000 deaths a year of our fellow citizens are not all in mass shooting situations, but they involve many other circumstances.

So what is the solution? A friend of mine in Maine coined the term, which I think aptly applies—in fact, it probably applies in this case more than any other: There is no silver bullet. There may, however, be silver ''buckshot''—a multiplicity of solutions, no single solution. Nothing we do today in the way of background checks or anything else is going to solve this problem entirely. We must recognize that. So we must move in a comprehensive way—not only on the Federal level but on the State level as well—not to compromise the Second Amendment, not to take guns out of the hands of law-abiding citizens, not to make it inherently more difficult for law-abiding citizens to maintain them but to put into place commonsense solutions to deal with this epidemic of gun violence.

The first, of course—and I commend my colleague from Maine for emphasizing this today; that is, we have to deal with the failures of our mental health system. In all of these mass shooting incidents, it appears that the perpetrators had some significant mental health issues. We have to deal with that. We have to have a better system that finds people in advance, before they act out their violent fantasies. We have to try to intervene and help those people before violence occurs.

So mental health has to be a part of this, but it is not the whole answer because people with those kinds of proclivities, whether they are violence-prone felons or people with dangerous mental health issues, we simply have to keep guns out of their hands.

That brings us to the second commonsense solution, which is background checks, which we already have. We have had them for 15 or 20 years. Some people say: Well, we are worried about background checks because it will lead to a Federal registry, and they will know who has the guns and then they will come and get them. We have had the background checks for a number of years. That hasn't happened. In the Manchin-Toomey bill that we voted on a few years ago, it was a felony for any Federal official to create a registry that would be available to the government.

The simple, basic, commonsense idea of a background check is to see whether someone is a convicted felon or has demonstrated a dangerous mental illness that should disqualify them from having a firearm. That is common sense. That has been supported—is supported—by a majority of gun owners and by the vast majority of the American people. It was even supported by some of the national gun organizations as recently as 10 or 15 years ago but no longer, for reasons I don't understand.

Another part of the package I think will be introduced in the next week or so is to add convicted spousal abusers to the list—which, again, is common sense. I mentioned in Maine we have a very low level of gun violence, but much of it involves spouse upon spouse. If we have a case where someone has been convicted of spousal abuse, to me, again it is common sense that they should not be able to obtain a gun.

Finally, if we are going to have a system of background checks that is nationwide—that, by the way, should be efficient—in this day and age, there is no reason it has to take any kind of long period to check, but if we have such a system, then it doesn't make sense to turn a blind eye to trafficking and straw purchases, which are essentially designed to get guns into the hands of people who otherwise couldn't buy them.

That is a modest package. To the express language of Justice Scalia, it doesn't violate the Second Amendment, and it will not solve the whole problem. Nothing is going to solve the whole problem. We are a human society, and humans, sadly, are often prone to violence, but it can make a difference. It can make a difference. Remember, we are talking about 30,000 people a year—30,000 people a year.

The American people send us to address issues, to address problems. On September 11, Congress acted. After Sandy and Katrina, Congress acted. During the Ebola crisis, Congress and the American health system acted. Why? Because we love each other and we value each other. It seems to me this is exactly the same case. We look out across the country, and one of the problems with this issue is it is slow motion and small. Every now and then we have one of these incidents, like we did last week, where a significant number of people are killed in 1 day, but the truth is, 10,000 people a year are murdered in the United States—10,000 people a year—not necessarily in a mass shooting. But 30,000 people a year altogether, if we include suicides, is a small American town disappearing every year. If all of these deaths occurred in one town or in Iowa or Illinois or Chicago or California, we would be on this. We would find the cause. We would be at least trying to prevent it, but because it happens in slow motion in small ways across the country, in small towns and large cities, we are ignoring it.

The incident in Oregon gives us an occasion to remind us once again of how serious this is and that we have an opportunity to do something about it, not by overreaching, not by violating the Second Amendment, not by impinging on the rights of law-abiding gun owners—of whom we have many in Maine—but simply by the commonsense imposition of a nationwide system to be sure that people who are felons or dangerously mentally ill can't get guns. I don't understand how anybody can object to that goal because I care about my fellow Americans, I love my fellow Americans, and I want to protect them from harm.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE EXCISE TAX

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to share my concerns with the devastating impact of the Cadillac tax, enacted as part of the Affordable Care Act. The Cadillac tax is a 40-percent excise tax set to take effect in 2018 on employer-sponsored health care plans around the country. This is precisely why I have authored the only bipartisan piece of legislation that would fully repeal this onerous tax. The reason I did so is that in Nevada, 1.3 million workers who have employer-sponsored health insurance plans will be hit by this Cadillac tax. These are public employees in Carson City. They are service industry workers on the Strip in Las Vegas, small business owners, and retirees all across the State. Hardly anyone in Nevada will be shielded from the devastating effects of this Cadillac tax.

What I am most proud of on this piece of legislation is the fact that we have 14 other cosponsors here in the Senate. It is also sponsored and supported by 75 other organizations across the country. Some of those organizations include unions, chambers of commerce, small business owners, State and local government employees, and retirees, and they are all saying the same thing: The Cadillac tax needs to be fully repealed or our employees will experience massive changes to their health care.

We are talking about reduced benefits. We are talking about increased premiums. We are talking about higher deductibles. Over 33 million Americans who use flexible spending accounts, FSAs, and 13.5 million Americans who use health savings accounts, HSAs, may see these accounts vanish in the coming years as companies scramble to avoid the law's 40-percent excise tax. HSAs and FSAs are used for things such as hospital and maternity services. They are used for dental care, physical therapy, and they are also used for mental health services—something we badly need today. Access to these lifesaving services could all be gone for tens of millions of Americans if the Cadillac tax is not fully repealed.

I have heard from employers—from big business, to unions, to small businesses from all over Nevada—who are saying that they will inevitably have to eliminate services their workers currently enjoy. They will have to cut certain health care providers out of their networks.

This goes to the heart of the broken promises of ObamaCare; that is, if you like your health care, you can keep it; if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor.

Earlier this week, I held a telephone townhall meeting with thousands of Nevadans from all walks of life. During the meeting, I asked the participants on the call ''Should the Cadillac tax be repealed?'' One of the best parts about these tele-townhall meetings is that you can do these surveys. We do this weekly. The question this week was ''Should the Cadillac tax be repealed?'' Almost 70 percent of them said ''Yes, the Cadillac tax should be fully repealed.'' Let me repeat that. Almost 70 percent of Nevadans supported the repealing of the Cadillac tax. They see this as a burdensome and costly tax that will hurt hard-working Nevadans, hard-working Americans.

The onerous tax targets Americans who already have high-quality health care. No one claims that our health care system ever was or is perfect. The goal of health reform should be to help those who do not have health care coverage and lower costs for those who already have insurance. This tax does not achieve either one of these goals.

It is very rare these days to see this much agreement in Washington. Organized labor, the chamber of commerce, local and State governments, and small businesses have all come together with a bipartisan group of Senators putting forth a solution to fix a problem affecting so many hard-working Americans and their families.

Some Members on both sides of the aisle have tried to make this a partisan issue for different reasons, but this is not a partisan issue, which is evident by the fact that the companion legislation to my bill in the House enjoys more Democratic cosponsors than Republicans.

Fully repealing the Cadillac tax is an opportunity for Republicans and Democrats to join forces and work together to repeal a bad tax for one purpose; that is, to help 151 million workers keep the health care insurance that they like.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

GUN VIOLENCE

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, for 20 years one of the biggest billboards in America was next to Fenway Park, facing the Massachusetts Turnpike. It had a giant number counter on it.

When I was running for the Senate in 2012, I would drive past that billboard sometimes three or four times a day. Each time, I would look up at the counter to see how it had changed since the last trip—up 2, up 6, up 12. The billboard was from Stop Handgun Violence, and it showed the number of children killed by guns in the United States.

When the tragedy happened at Sandy Hook Elementary School, my first thought was of the 20 little children who would be added to the count on that billboard. I thought about how we, the grownups, had failed to keep safe the thousands of children counted there.

There are mass shootings, everyday shootings, drive-by shootings, random shootings, sometimes with big headlines and mostly with no headlines at all.

The facts are simple: Eighty-eight Americans die every day from gun violence. Seven of those people are children or teens. That is seven a day, every day, young bodies piling up by the thousands year after year. What has happened to us? If seven children were dying every day from a mysterious virus, our country would pull out all the stops to figure out what had gone wrong and to fix it.

Gun violence is an epidemic—an epidemic that kills children, kills them in schools, on playgrounds, and in our neighborhoods. But day after day, month after month, tragedy after tragedy, the Congress has done nothing—nothing. Republicans in the Senate have blocked even the smallest steps to protect our communities and keep our children safe.

This must stop now. Today, Senate Democrats are calling on Republicans to join us in supporting three measures

to reduce gun violence. First, end the gun show loophole. Everyone gets a background check. Second, end straw purchases. The one who gets checked has to be the true owner. Third, close holes in the background check database and stop domestic abusers from purchasing guns, period.

Look, let's be frank. These three steps will not be enough to stop all handgun violence in our communities, but these are meaningful steps in the right direction—steps that huge majorities of Americans support, steps that are calm and sensible. These three steps are a test—a test for every single Member of Congress. These three steps put the question to everyone in Congress: Whom do you work for? Do you represent the people who have lost children or sisters or cousins to gun violence and who have stood at gravesides and sworn that we will make change? Do you represent the people who don't want their loved ones to be the next victims? Do you represent the people who want some sensible rules about gun safety? Or do you represent the NRA? It is time to make a choice right here in Congress—the American people or the NRA.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I withdraw the motion to proceed to H.R. 2028.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

STOP SANCTUARY POLICIES AND PROTECT AMERICANS ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 252, S. 2146.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 252, 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.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 252, 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.

Mitch McConnell, David Vitter, John Barrasso, Dan Sullivan, David Perdue, Bill Cassidy, Ron Johnson, Steve Daines, James Lankford, James E. Risch, John Boozman, Mike Lee, Richard C. Shelby, John Cornyn, Jeff Sessions, Johnny Isakson, Patrick J. Toomey.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived and that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture vote occur at 2:15 p.m., on Tuesday, October 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Senators will soon travel to their home States for the State work period. I ask colleagues to consider some important questions as they meet with constituents and take time to reflect.

In a time of limited Federal resources and tough choices, is it fair to treat localities that cooperate with Federal law enforcement or work hard to follow Federal law no better than localities that refuse to help or actively flout the law? When a deputy sheriff puts her life on the line every day, is it fair to make her live in constant fear of being sued for simply trying to keep us safe? When felons enter our country illegally and repeatedly, is it fair to victims and families to not do what we can now to stop them? The answer to all of these questions is no. No, it isn't fair—not to citizens and governments that do the right thing, not to law enforcement officers who risk everything for our safety, not to victims and their families.

The proponents of so-called ''sanctuary cities'' seem to callously disregard how their policies can hurt other people. That is not right. The bill I just filed cloture on this afternoon aims to ensure more fairness on this issue.

The ideas underpinning the Stop Sanctuary Policies and Protect Americans Act are supported by a great many Americans. The bill is supported by many law enforcement organizations as well. They have had some really positive things to say about it, such as this letter:

Thank you for introducing the Stop Sanctuary Policies and Protect Americans Act which will empower Federal and local law enforcement officers' cooperative efforts to better protect our communities and our citizens. Your proposal will ensure we do not dishonor the memory of Kate Steinle and the immeasurable grief her family is enduring.

The letter went on:

Ms. Steinle was killed in San Francisco by an illegal immigrant who had previously been deported from the United States five times, and had been convicted of seven felonies. The shooter chose to live in San Francisco because he knew it was a sanctuary city that would shield him from Federal immigration law. Tragically, his ''sanctuary'' gambit proved fatal for the Steinle family. Federal officials requested that San Francisco detain the shooter until immigration authorities could pick him up, but San Francisco officials refused to cooperate and released Sanchez three months before Kate's murder. We owe it to Kate and the American citizenry to fix this community safety issue now.

That is what the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association had to say about the bill that we will be voting on when we get back. Groups like the National Sheriffs' Association and the National Association of Police Organizations have sent letters in support as well.

I thank the sponsors of this legislation for all their hard work on this bill. I hope Senators will reflect on the questions I have raised over the State work period. The Senate will consider this bill when we reconvene.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF CRISPUS ATTUCKS CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, earlier this year I was incredibly fortunate to be part of the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, a moving and meaningful experience in Selma, AL. Fifty years ago, during the marches from Selma to Montgomery, civil rights leaders and everyday citizens of this country put their lives at risk in a passionate, nonviolent demonstration for a more equal and more just society. The passion and courage for equality reflected in the historic marches in Selma were the culmination of decades of struggle shown by men and women across this country.

In my home State of Indiana, a place that takes great pride in high school basketball, it is fitting that 60 years ago the civil rights movement played out on the hardwood of Indiana basketball courts. On March 19, 1955, at the Butler Fieldhouse, the Flying Tigers of Crispus Attucks High School became not only the first all-African-American high school team to win a State championship in Indiana but the first all-African-American high school athletic team to win a State championship in the United States. Led by future NBA Hall of Famer—and maybe the best basketball player of all time—Oscar Robertson, the Flying Tigers finished their 1955 season with a 30-and-1 record, capped with a 97-to-74 victory over Gary Roosevelt High School in the State final.

Before Crispus Attucks' historic 1955 season, no Indianapolis basketball team had won a State championship in the tournament's 45-year history. Attucks' win was a source of pride, particularly for the African-American community.

Crispus Attucks High School was founded in 1927 as a segregated high school for Black students. The Indiana High School Athletic Association initially refused to grant Crispus Attucks membership, and the school could not play in the State tournament until 1942. Even then, many of the all-White schools refused to play Crispus Attucks. The Crispus Attucks team would often have to travel dozens or even hundreds of miles to find teams willing to play against them. Because the school's gym was built too small for home games, every game was an away game for the Flying Tigers.

Despite the segregation and racism, Crispus Attucks thrived. African-American educators could not teach in White schools, so Crispus Attucks attracted an elite African-American community. Nearly every teacher had either a doctorate or master's degree. Teachers at Crispus Attucks included former Tuskegee Airmen and members of the Golden 13, the first African-American U.S. Naval officers.

One of those teachers was Ray Crowe. A native of Johnson County, IN, Crowe became head coach of the basketball team in 1950. He instituted a new fast-paced style of offense and was a coach who cared deeply about his players. Crowe's coaching style brought enormous success to the team.

Soon, the same White schools that refused to play Crispus Attucks wanted to schedule games with them. Lacking a home court, the team would frequently play at Butler Fieldhouse on the campus of Butler University. The Flying Tigers packed the house, regularly attracting 10,000 fans or more to a high school basketball game. Still the team was not treated fairly. When traveling for games, the players were unable to stay at hotels or to eat in restaurants that only served White people.

That wasn't the only challenge the Flying Tigers confronted. They also had to contend with bias from the referees. Coach Crowe used to tell the team they had to play against seven people every game—the five players and the two refs. Yet the Flying Tigers kept winning. In 1954, the team made it all the way to the State semifinals, even with several key players missing from injuries. The stage was set for the 1955 season, when a junior forward named Oscar Robertson was ready to lead the team. He had some of the most amazing teammates you could ever find.

Coach Crowe and the Flying Tigers finished the regular season with one loss. They breezed through the first four games of the tournament, winning by an average of 28 points per game. Then they faced Muncie Central, another powerhouse basketball program, and the Flying Tigers won by a single point—but all you need to win by is one point. Over 15,000 fans came to the Butler Fieldhouse to watch Crispus Attucks beat New Albany in the State semifinal and then again to witness history as Crispus Attucks defeated another all-African-American team, Gary Roosevelt, 97-to-74 to become State champs.

The trailblazing players who made it possible included Johnny Mack Brown, Bill Brown, Willie Burnley, John Clemons, John Gipson, Bill Hampton, Willie Merriweather, Sam Milton, Sheddrick Mitchell, Stanford Patton, Oscar Robertson, and Bill Scott.

It was a crowning achievement. The ''Big O'' Oscar Robertson said:

> I remember that night. They called us Indianapolis Attucks, not Crispus Attucks. . . . To me, that sort of meant we arrived. They just wanted you to win; they didn't care what color you were.

There was a tradition in Indiana that after every State championship the winning team would climb onto a firetruck and then be taken around the city of Indianapolis for a victory parade. The parade route always included a stop at Monument Circle for pictures and celebration, followed by a tour of downtown Indianapolis, but as the firetruck carrying the Flying Tigers approached Monument Circle, it didn't stop, and it didn't continue through downtown. Instead, the firetruck brought the players and fans to a park in the city's African-American neighborhood.

Crispus Attucks, the team that had just made American history, didn't receive the celebration they deserved simply because of the color of their skin. When Attucks repeated in 1956 and again won the State championship, the firetruck took the same detour.

Change did not come overnight, but the Crispus Attucks basketball team inspired many schools to begin recruiting African-American players along with starting to end their long-held policies of segregation. Oscar Robertson later said:

> By us winning, it sped up the integration. I truly believe that us winning the state championship brought Indianapolis together.

In March, members of the Indianapolis-based Family Girls Youth Mentoring Program honored the seven living members of the 1955 championship team and the celebration included the traditional victory tour through the streets of Indianapolis, an honor that was denied to these players 60 years ago.

At this year's Indy 500, the 1955 Crispus Attucks basketball team served as the grand marshals of the Indy 500 Festival Parade. For the first time in the parade's history, there was a stop at Monument Circle, where the Flying Tigers got the celebration they had rightfully earned so long ago.

Today I am proud to join my friend Congressman ANDRÉ CARSON in honoring the legacy of the 1955 Crispus Attucks basketball team. As Indiana's Senator, on behalf of Hoosiers, I want to recognize the Crispus Attucks team not only for their amazing accomplishments on the court but for the powerful message they always sent throughout the State of Indiana and for the pride that is still present in Indianapolis today for them and for all their accomplishments and for all they mean to us.

The members of the 1955 State championship Crispus Attucks basketball team, their coaches, the teachers who taught them, the community that supported them, and the families who loved them—they were an inspiration in 1955 to all of us, and they are an inspiration today. God bless all of those young players, God bless Indiana, and God bless America.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELLY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. I graduated from high school in 1952. I was the captain of the high school basketball team. I followed this Crispus Attucks team. It was fantastic, almost every player.

Mr. DONNELLY. Extraordinary people.

Mr. HATCH. They were extraordinary, and they inspired all of us, especially in the way they conducted themselves and carried through. What a bunch of great athletes they were.

Mr. DONNELLY. To my colleague, the leader of the Senate, our President pro tempore, I am so honored for you to speak of our fine young men that way. Every citizen of Indiana is grateful. They were an extraordinary group. I met them when I was back home. As fine a people as they were when they were young, they are even more extraordinary citizens for our State and for our country.

Mr. HATCH. Thank you. They were all winners, I will tell you that.

Mr. DONNELLY. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The Senator from Utah.

DEFEND TRADE SECRETS ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an important form of intellectual property: trade secrets. I am pleased to be participating in this colloquy with my friend from Delaware, Senator CHRIS COONS.

Earlier this year, we introduced the Defend Trade Secrets Act, a bill that will create a harmonized Federal standard for protecting trade secrets. Trade secrets such as customer lists, formulas, and manufacturing processes are an essential form of intellectual property, yet trade secrets are the only form of U.S. intellectual property where misuse does not provide the owner with a Federal private right of action. Instead, trade secret owners must rely on State courts or Federal prosecutors to protect their rights. The multistate procedural and jurisdictional issues that arise from such cases are costly and complicated, and the Department of Justice lacks the resources to prosecute many trade secret cases. Those systemic issues put companies

at a great disadvantage since the victims of the trade secret theft need to recover information quickly before it crosses State lines and leaves the country.

At a time when cyber theft of trade secrets is at an alltime high, particularly as it involves Chinese competitors, it is critically important that U.S. companies have the ability to protect their trade secrets in Federal court. Senator COONS, trade secret theft has hit some of the nation's best known companies, including Delaware-based DuPont and its popular Kevlar synthetic fiber products.

I would like to ask how trade secret theft has impacted DuPont.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I thank Senator HATCH for his leadership on this important issue. As the Senator from Utah has mentioned, trade secrets are the only form of intellectual property not protected from theft under Federal civil law, which is particularly striking when one considers the value of trade secrets to the economy. According to some estimates, they are worth $5 trillion for the U.S. economy, on par with IP protected by patent. The scope of the loss due to theft or misappropriation is huge, somewhere between $160 and $480 billion annually.

I submit that there is not a State in the country that has not been affected by this problem, and Delaware is no exception. In the 1960s, DuPont—one of our signature manufacturing chemistry-based companies—invented Kevlar, a para-aramid fiber with extraordinary strength that is also very lightweight. These properties make Kevlar versatile, but its best known use is in lifesaving body armor worn by our police officers and the brave men and women in the American Armed Forces. It has saved thousands of lives, including more than 3,000 police officers here in the United States whose lives have been saved by Kevlar vests.

About 10 years ago, DuPont developed the next generation of Kevlar, which is even lighter and better able to withstand penetrating trauma from a broader range of rifle rounds and IED-generated shrapnel. It represented a real breakthrough in safety, but it cost millions of dollars to develop.

Chemically, para-aramid fibers are not that complicated, but the fabrication method, the manufacturing technique, which is what gives them their strength and flexibility, is actually incredibly difficult to develop and implement. So one day about 6 years ago, a rogue employee of DuPont took the know-how behind DuPont's creation of next-generation Kevlar and began to work with a rival manufacturing company in Korea, using DuPont trade secrets. The potential loss to DuPont alone from this one instance of trade secret theft or misappropriation approaches $1 billion.

So I ask Senator HATCH, if you were a CEO and your employees were ripping off your trade secrets, your intellectual property, and taking it to another country at the cost of $1 billion a pop, would that affect your willingness to invest the resources in future R&D here in the United States that are needed to make similar lifesaving technological breakthroughs?

Mr. HATCH. Well, of course it would. I thank Senator COONS. He has asked what really is the critical question. If I were a CEO responsible to my shareholders, I could not, according to my fiduciary duties, make those investments if rogue employees could just take off and render those investments worthless.

Trade secret theft does not just affect manufacturing. I read recently an interesting article in the New Republic titled ''Corn Wars'' that provides a detailed account of how China is stealing proprietary corn seeds from America's farms.

Most corn in China is used as a feed for livestock. That was not a problem until the country's middle class acquired an appetite for meat. Given this new demand, China is trying desperately to increase corn production amidst its water shortage and lack of arable land.

That is where our country's intellectual property comes in. Rather than spend the time and resources to develop a hybrid corn seed of its own, China would rather steal, literally right out of the ground, America's high-performing seeds. Experts from America's top seed producers confirmed that acquiring the technology behind a specially designed line of seed is equivalent to 5 to 8 years of research and at least $40 million. You better believe the Chinese know the value of the seeds they steal and the numerous crimes they are committing while in our country.

Let me read an excerpt from the New Republic article that details an encounter a DuPont Pioneer field manager had with industrial spies from a Chinese agricultural company:

> It was early May 2011 and Mo [Hailong] and Wang Lei, vice chairman of Kings Nower Seed at the time, were driving roads in Tama County, Iowa, allegedly searching for a DuPont Pioneer test field. But apparently uncertain if he was in the right place or unsure of what kind of seed DuPont Pioneer was testing, Mo had Wang pull to the edge of the field, so they could question a farmer in the midst of spring planting. . . . How had these two men chanced upon his field on the very day he happened to be planting an experimental and top-secret seed under development by DuPont Pioneer?
>
> The next day, a DuPont Pioneer field manager spotted the same car. He watched Mo scramble up a ditch bank, and then kneel down in the dirt and begin digging corn seeds out of the ground. When confronted by the field manager, Mo grew flustered and red-faced. . . . But before the field manager could question him further, Mo fled.

There is no doubt that China and other foreign competitors are working furiously to steal American innovation not just from manufacturing and agriculture but from all sectors of the economy, including high-tech, life sciences, aeronautics, financial services, and the energy sector. That is why Congress must act now to pass the bipartisan, bicameral Defend Trade Secrets Act.

I ask Senator COONS, what exactly does this bill that you and I are cosponsoring do?

Mr. COONS. I thank Senator HATCH for the opportunity to go into more detail about this terrific bipartisan, bicameral Defend Trade Secrets Act. It is actually relatively simple. It creates a Federal private right of action for misappropriation of trade secrets. It uses an existing Federal criminal law, the Economic Espionage Act, to define trade secrets. It draws heavily from the Uniform Trade Secrets Act which has been enacted by many States to define what is misappropriation.

Simply put, our bill harmonizes U.S. law. Each State has a different trade secret law, and they vary in a range of different ways. Not all of these differences are major, but they affect in small but real ways the definition of a trade secret, what an owner must do to keep a trade secret a secret, what constitutes misappropriation, and what damages are available.

So our Defend Trade Secrets Act creates a single, national baseline or a minimum level of protection and gives trade secret owners access to both a uniform national law and our excellent Federal courts, which provide nationwide service of process and execution of judgments. It is important to note that this bill does not preempt State law because States are free to add further protections on top of what is in this bill. The proposed legislation does one more thing, and trade secret owners tell us this is a critical component of the law not available in States. It creates an ex parte seizure ability. Trade secrets are different from other forms of intellectual property because they are protected under the law only if they remain a secret. Once the public learns of a trade secret, even if it does so wrongfully, the trade secret loses its legal protection. So this bill provides a limited right of action for the owner of a trade secret to go to court ex parte and get it back before the misappropriator, the thief of the trade secret, has a chance to share it with a competitor or the world, thus exposing it.

This is a commonsense idea to help address a very serious problem, but when talking about Federal private rights of action and ex parte injunctive relief, we had to be very careful to avoid any unintended consequences. So, Senator HATCH, would you address how you took concerns about unintended consequences into account as we worked together to draft this bill?

Mr. HATCH. Sure. I want to thank Senator COONS for that helpful overview. As a Republican, I was initially cautious when he approached me about expanding Federal civil law to create a new private right of action for trade secret theft. After all, some have suggested that State law is sufficient, but

after consulting with many in the business community, I was convinced that creating a Federal trade secrets law is the right approach.

Soon after its introduction, the Heritage Foundation confirmed the need for Federal legislation. Mr. Alden Abbott from the Heritage Foundation writes:

> The lack of a federal civil remedy for victims of trade secret theft precludes owners of trade secrets from vindicating their rights under certain circumstances. Enjoining and sanctioning trade secret thieves who cross state lines is often difficult. . . . [A] federal civil statutory remedy would make Federal tribunals instantly available to aggrieved businesses that seek injunctions, which is particularly important when time is of the essence due to flight risks.

Another problem we faced was ensuring that the ex parte seizure authority could not be used abusively or for anticompetitive purposes.

When we began the drafting process last Congress, we started from scratch and asked for input from all interested stakeholders, especially in regard to the ex parte provision. We received many helpful suggestions and included them in the bill. That is correct, isn't it, Senator COONS?

Mr. COONS. Yes, it is, I say to Senator HATCH. After all that work together, all that consultation, when we introduced this bill last Congress, we wanted to make sure the ex parte provision couldn't be used for abuse, so we required that the party seeking ex parte review must make a rigorous showing that they owned the trade secret, that the trade secret had been stolen, and that third parties would not be harmed if an ex parte order were granted. We also included damages for wrongful seizure, including attorneys' fees. And with that whole combination of important measures to ensure that the ex parte seizure capabilities under the statute are not misused, I think we achieved real consensus at that time. Isn't that right, Senator HATCH?

Mr. HATCH. That is right, I say to Senator COONS.

As we prepared to reintroduce our bill in this Congress, we were fortunate to join forces with Senator JEFF FLAKE of Arizona. He was invaluable in fine-tuning the ex parte seizure language.

Because of Senator FLAKE's good work, I believe the ex parte provisions are where they need to be—strong, fair, and not susceptible to abuse.

Would the Senator agree with that?

Mr. COONS. Yes, I would, thanks in no small part to you, I say to Senator HATCH, and to Senator FLAKE, who insisted both last Congress and this Congress that we put everything on the table and invite all stakeholders to come forward and share their concerns. We worked together, we did that, and we found an incredible consensus.

In addition to talking with industry, we have gone to think tanks and academic institutions about this bill. Some people with whom we have spoken raised concerns that our bill, as previously drafted, could harm employee mobility.

So, Senator HATCH, I don't want to restrict employee mobility, and I don't think you want to either; is that right?

Mr. HATCH. That is right, I say to Senator COONS. I never thought our bill harmed employee mobility. But when I heard these concerns, I wanted to make sure that we addressed this particular issue. So we included language in the bill this Congress that states explicitly that a person cannot be prevented from accepting an offer of employment because of his or her prior exposure to trade secrets.

I think we have struck the right balance with this bill. I am not aware of any stakeholder opposition to this bill. Those who operate businesses in the real world and have to protect their trade secrets on a regular basis are strong supporters of the Defend Trade Secrets Act.

The list of companies and associations that have endorsed the act is diverse and impressive. Let me read the names of some of the businesses and organizations that support this bill: Adobe, AdvaMed, American Bar Association Section of Intellectual Property Law, American Intellectual Property Law Association, Association of Global Automakers, Biotechnology Industry Organization, Boeing Company, Boston Scientific, BSA-The Software Alliance, Caterpillar, Corning, DuPont, Eli Lilly and Company, General Electric, Honda, IBM, Illinois Tool Works, Information Technology Industry Council, Intel, International Fragrance Association of North America, Johnson & Johnson, Medical Device Manufacturers Association, Medtronic, Michelin North America, Micron, Microsoft, National Alliance for Jobs and Innovation, National Association of Manufacturers, New England Council, Nike, Pfizer, Philips, Intellectual Property Owners Association, Procter & Gamble, Semiconductor Industry Association, SAS, Software & Information Industry Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and United Technologies Corporation. And let me mention just one more, but there are others: 3M.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters of support from these organizations.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
October 5, 2015.

Re S. 1890, the Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2015

Hon. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington DC.
Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRASSLEY AND RANKING MEMBER LEAHY: I write to express the views of the American Bar Association Section of Intellectual Property Law on S. 1890, the ''Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2015.'' These views have not been submitted to or approved by the ABA House of Delegates or Board of Governors, and should not be considered to be views of the Association.

There is no generally applicable federal private cause of action whereby an owner of a trade secret can seek redress for misappropriation of a trade secret. Relief must be sought under state law, and most states and the District of Columbia have in effect some version of the Uniform Trade Secrets Act (UTSA).

Congress recognized the need for federal protection of trade secrets when it enacted the Economic Espionage Act of 1996. That law authorizes criminal penalties of imprisonment for up to 15 years and a fine of not more than $10,000,000 for the theft of trade secrets for the benefit of a foreign government or other foreign interest. Lesser penalties are provided for misappropriation not benefiting foreign interests but which relate to products in interstate or foreign commerce. The Attorney General of the United States has the authority to seek injunctive relief against the theft of trade secrets, but the Act does not contemplate a private cause of action by the owners of those trade secrets. The Section of Intellectual Property Law supports establishment of such a cause of action, and urges the enactment of S. 1890 for this purpose.

Currently in the United States, trade secrets are protected under an un-harmonized patchwork of trade secret laws that is ill-equipped to provide an effective civil remedy for companies whose trade secrets are stolen. Not all states have adopted the UTSA, and many differ in the interpretation and implementation of existing laws. For instance, many states define protectable trade secrets differently and also have different requirements for the maintenance of claims for trade secret misappropriation. To give but two examples, some states have found a novelty requirement for information to be considered a trade secret, and some are more protective than others of customer lists.

States have differing statutes of limitations for trade secret claims, and there are also significant differences in the availability of monetary relief. Many states have not enacted Section 8 of the UTSA, which calls upon each state to construe and apply the law to achieve uniformity among states. Moreover, victims of trade secret theft can face lengthy and costly procedural obstacles in obtaining evidence when the misappropriator flees to another state or country or transfers evidence outside the state.

S. 1890 is the product of several years of congressional consideration and development. The Section of Intellectual Property Law has followed these developments and, in doing so, has identified essential components that should be included in a bill to establish a federal private cause of action for misappropriation a of a trade secret. These components include:

a definition of trade secret that is clear and effective and not unduly restrictive or overly technical;

a clear delineation of the requirements for a federal cause of action;

the availability of remedies that are comparable to those available under the UTSA, including provisions providing for injunctive relief and monetary relief in the form of royalties, disgorgement of the proceeds of unjust enrichment, and exemplary damages;

provisions for seizure orders that adequately limit the circumstances in which they may be issued and executed and that provide for the custody, security, and access to seized property; and

confirmation that the bill's enactment will not preempt state trade secret laws.

Because S. 1890 contains these essential components, the Section of Intellectual Property Law supports its enactment.

Very truly yours,

THEODORE H. DAVIS JR.,
Section Chair, American Bar Association, Section of Intellectual Property Law.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2015

RESOLVED, that IPO supports the enactment of legislation, such as the Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2015, to establish a federal civil cause of action for trade secret misappropriation to protect trade secrets from domestic and foreign theft, including an *ex parte* seizure provision, while providing adequate safeguards against improper use of such *ex parte* seizure provision.

July 29, 2015.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senator, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHRISTOPHER COONS,
U.S. Senator, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. JEFF FLAKE,
U.S. Senator, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH, SENATOR COONS, AND SENATOR FLAKE: The undersigned companies and organizations write to express our support for the Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2015. We appreciate your leadership on this issue.

The Defend Trade Secrets Act will create a harmonized, uniform standard and system for companies to protect their trade secrets. Your bipartisan legislation will establish a strong standard for trade secret protection.

Trade secrets are an essential form of intellectual property. Trade secrets include information as broad-ranging as manufacturing processes, product development, industrial techniques, formulas, and customer lists. The protection of this form of intellectual property is critical to driving the innovation and creativity at the heart of the American economy. Companies in America, however, are increasingly the targets of sophisticated efforts to steal proprietary information, harming our global competitiveness.

Existing state trade secret laws are inadequate to address the interstate and international nature of trade secret theft today. Federal law protects trade secrets through the Economic Espionage Act of 1996 (''EEA''), which provides criminal sanctions for trade secret misappropriation. While the EEA is a critical tool for law enforcement to protect the clear theft of our intellectual property, U.S. trade secret owners also need access to a federal civil remedy and the full spectrum of legal options available to owners of other forms of intellectual property, such as patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

The Defend Trade Secrets Act will create a federal remedy that will provide a consistent, harmonized legal framework and help avoid the commercial injury and loss of employment that can occur when trade secrets are stolen. We are proud to support it.

Sincerely,

Association of Global Automakers, Inc., Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO), The Boeing Company, Boston Scientific, BSA/The Software Alliance (BSA), Caterpillar Inc., Corning Incorporated, Eli Lilly and Company, General Electric, Honda, IBM, Illinois Tool Works Inc., Information Technology Industry Council (ITI), Intel, International Fragrance Association, North America.

Johnson & Johnson, Medical Device Manufacturers Association (MDMA), Medtronic, Micron, Microsoft, National Alliance for Jobs and Innovation (NAJI), National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), The New England Council, NIKE, Pfizer, The Procter & Gamble Company, Siemens Corporation, Software & Information Industry Association (SIIA), U.S. Chamber of Commerce, United Technologies Corporation, 3M.

SEMICONDUCTOR INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, October 7, 2015.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHRIS COONS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. DOUG COLLINS,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. JERRY NADLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH, SENATOR COONS, CONGRESSMAN COLLINS, AND CONGRESSMAN NADLER: On behalf of the Semiconductor Industry Association (SIA), I am writing to express our support for the Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2015 (S. 1890; H.R. 3326).

The U.S. semiconductor industry supports the strong protection of all forms of intellectual property, including trade secrets. Our industry invests 18 percent of revenue on average on research and development—the highest of any U.S. industry. Protecting the valuable intellectual property that results from this significant investment is critical to our industry's continued success.

In the semiconductor industry, trade secrets include essential intellectual property such as manufacturing processes and techniques, circuit designs, software source code, and business strategies and customer lists. The ability to protect these types of trade secrets has contributed to advances in semiconductor design and manufacturing that have helped enable technological advancements in sectors throughout the economy.

Unfortunately, existing laws are inadequate to address the theft of trade secrets in today's environment. Federal law currently provides criminal sanctions for trade secret misappropriation, but owners of trade secrets currently lack a federal civil remedy for the theft of their trade secrets. State laws provide a civil remedy, but the state courts lack the authority to act effectively against trade secret theft that crosses state and national borders.

The Defend Trade Secrets Act would strengthen the protection of trade secrets by providing for a federal civil cause of action. The bills would provide a consistent, harmonized legal framework and help avoid the commercial injury, diminished competitiveness, and loss of employment that can occur when trade secrets are stolen.

We appreciate your leadership in introducing this bipartisan legislation that will strengthen U.S. competitiveness and innovation.

Sincerely,

JOHN NEUFFER,
President & CEO.

Mr. HATCH. I ask Senator COONS, don't you think it is time that Congress acted on trade secret theft?

Mr. COONS. Absolutely, Senator HATCH, I do. I think when you talk about an important issue such as trade secret theft, which poses such a great threat to American innovation, economic growth, and competitiveness, it really is past time that we act on this issue.

This bill is truly bipartisan. I was the lead sponsor in the last Congress, and you are the lead sponsor in this Congress. Along the way we have worked closely together and undertaken an inclusive and iterative process to make sure we have heard from all stakeholder perspectives so that we have legislation that creates winners only, not winners and losers.

Senator HATCH, it has been an honor to work with you on this. You have been a big part of the reason we were able to undertake such a successful and constructive process.

I would ask, Senator HATCH, in your view, has this process now produced a bill that is ready to move in the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which we both serve?

Mr. HATCH. First, I thank you for your work on this bill, Senator COONS. You have been a great partner in advancing this bill.

I agree with you that the Defend Trade Secrets Act is ready to move—not just through the Senate Judiciary Committee but also on the Senate floor. In fact, I think this is the type of bill that could move by unanimous consent.

At the same time, we are not closing the door or turning a deaf ear to anyone who has thoughts on this legislation. Let me say, if my of my colleagues have concerns or questions about the bill, come talk to me or Senator COONS. Now is the time to resolve your concerns, and we will resolve them.

If you talk to any of the companies that were initially on the fringes and that are now supporters of the bill, I think they will agree that you and I are willing to address all legitimate concerns. So work with us.

I am pleased with the momentum we have already seen on this bill through industry support and in the Senate. One way that is happening is that Senators on both sides of the aisle want to support this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators JAMES RISCH, MIKE CRAPO, and ROY BLUNT be added as cosponsors to the Defend Trade Secrets Act, S. 1890.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. I am pleased with the support we have already seen and encourage many more of my colleagues to support and help us pass this bill. Help us make this happen. It is the right thing to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

SENTENCING REFORM AND CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, over the past several months, law enforcement officers across our country have been shot, shot at, and killed without provocation, too often simply because they wear a badge. Violent crime and murders have increased across the country at almost alarming rates in some areas. Drug use and overdoses are occurring and dramatically increasing. It is against this backdrop that we are considering a bill, or will be, to cut prison sentences for drug traffickers

and even other violent criminals, including those currently in Federal prisons.

So we need to be asking about this carefully and with real caution, because as a prosecutor for a number of years, I know there are reasons we have people in jail. One is that it is just desserts. When somebody assaults another person, breaks into their house and robs them, uses weapons to rob a person of a thing of value, steals their automobiles, murders, rapes, and those kinds of things, they have to have a certain punishment or there is no real justice in the world. Just desserts is a legitimate reason to have punishment. It is not all economics. It is not all about whether they might or might not commit another crime. If you do a serious crime, you should do some time for it.

Another one is incapacitation. This is too little appreciated, but when you take a person who is committing crimes—and many of them commit many crimes—a study in California of their State prison system showed there was a huge number of those criminals who admitted committing as many as 170 crimes a year. We say that is not possible, but people would break into two or three cars a night. They would break into businesses, break into Coke machines, break into other things and cause all kinds of issues, such as lost time from work, costs to repair, disrupting lives, making people change the very nature of their business affairs because they are afraid of being robbed or burglarized. So those are things that occur.

Rehabilitation is a factor. The original idea was that in prison—we called it a penitentiary—where people do penance and hopefully they try to change their lives.

So I would just point out that those are some of the things we need to be aware of when we are talking about sentencing and what is appropriate, particularly in a time of rising crime.

People want Congress to represent their best interests and to protect them—people who do the right thing. They want their children to be able to play in the streets, walk around the block, see their friends, and not be afraid of some drug dealer or some gang member. Too often that is not possible in America. It got better, but it is getting worse, and we need to be aware of that as we consider legislation to improve our criminal justice system.

According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, the amount of heroin seized at the southwest border has increased nearly 300 percent from 2008 to 2013, and I suspect the numbers are still going up. Heroin overdose deaths have increased 45 percent. That is huge. We went through a period of decline in all of this. It took 20 years. I was there. I worked with the Coalition for a Drug-Free Mobile, the Partnership For Youth. They volunteered hours and hours—teachers, school systems, gave their time and effort. We went from a period when 50 percent of high school seniors in 1980, according to a University of Michigan study, admitted to using an illegal drug, to less than 25 percent. It was cut by half. How many young people's lives stayed on track? How many people's lives were not led astray and destroyed by drug addiction as a result of that significant decline in drug use?

I think it needs to be said that the President should never have said smoking marijuana is like smoking cigarettes: Oh, I wish I hadn't done it. That is the kind of message people hear. Now we have States legalizing it, and they are already talking about decriminalizing it. It is a mistake. We have seen that experiment before. Lives are at stake.

The Drug Enforcement Administration called me recently and told me that 120 people a day are dying of a drug overdose in America. How many of them have serious brain injuries as a result of those overdoses? Our Presiding Officer, Dr. CASSIDY, has been around emergency rooms. How many people are taken to emergency rooms and at what great cost to our communities? How many lives are disrupted? How many children are in broken homes? How many people had to leave their home because one spouse or the other has spent all the family money on drugs to support a habit? How many children have been abandoned, went to bed without food because of addiction in their family?

These are serious matters. We made tremendous progress. The murder rate in America dropped by over 50 percent since the 1980s when Ronald Reagan said ''just say no'' and started a War on Drugs. He appointed me as the U.S. attorney in Alabama. I know what we did. And the Federal Government led the way with tough sentencing, eliminating parole, targeting dangerous drugs in effective ways, and States and local governments followed.

I am worried about it. It is just tragic to me that we are making the same mistakes we made in the 1960s and 1970s. According to new data, 4.3 million people abuse or are dependent on marijuana. Marijuana is stronger today—several times stronger—than the marijuana of the 1960s, and it does impact people adversely.

The American Medical Association has issued a report that is unequivocal about the danger and the ramifications of the use of marijuana. According to the 2014 ''Monitoring the Future'' study, since 2007, lifetime, past year, past month, and daily drug use among 8th, 10th, and 12th graders combined have all increased.

Meanwhile, over the last several years, Congress, the President, the Supreme Court, and the U.S. Sentencing Commission all have taken steps to lessen punishment for, or altogether stop, the enforcement of laws that we passed over the years that led to this decline. They have been eliminated and weakened. I supported one of the big ones in Congress. I worked with Senator DURBIN and we passed a bill that I think was justified and would not have done anything other than make the system better, in my opinion, and fairer, but now we need to ask ourselves, what do we do next, if anything?

In 2005, the Supreme Court ruled that the sentencing guidelines that were enacted by Congress were not mandatory. This was a huge thing. In the early 1980s we passed sentencing guidelines and, depending on the severity of the crime and what the aggravating factors were at work, a person got more time or less time. It involved aggravating factors and mitigating factors, and it ended this idea that if you went to one judge, he would give you probation and if you went to another judge for the same crime, you would get 10 years, 15 years in jail.

So I think that is to be noted. This is a very significant reduction as a practical matter in the amount of time that a person would serve because of eliminating the mandatory requirement of the sentencing guidelines.

Then in 2010—this is a bill I worked on, the Fair Sentencing Act, which reduced the disparity between crack cocaine and powder cocaine and made other changes that in many ways reduced sentences overall. It reduced sentences. It was designed because minority groups, particularly the African-American community—the drug of choice too often was crack and that had much higher sentences and it seemed to be unfair, and we fixed that to a large degree. It eliminated the mandatory 5-year minimum sentence—the mandatory 5 years without parole for possession of crack cocaine. I didn't think that was legitimate, Congress agreed, and we eliminated that requirement. It was being gotten around, and not many times were people being sentenced for simple possession of a small amount of cocaine. That was changed, and the Sentencing Commission then implemented an amendment to the sentencing guidelines that applied this retroactively. So people who had been sentenced under the previous procedures had those procedures reversed and then they got out of jail early—and a lot of people did. It resulted in early release of thousands of offenders.

In August of 2013, in a dramatic event too little appreciated, Attorney General Eric Holder ordered Federal prosecutors not to charge certain drug offenders with mandatory minimums, regardless of the quantity of drugs involved. He directed the prosecutors not to follow the law. Under the law, if you have a certain amount of drug use, you are supposed to serve at least a minimum mandatory sentence. This is different from the guidelines. This is a statutory requirement. And Attorney General Holder reversed previous attorneys general memoranda which directed that prosecutors should charge the main offense and they should be

subject to the main penalty. That further reduced the number of people convicted and the amount of time they served.

Then the administration has declined to enforce Federal drug laws regarding marijuana in Colorado, Washington, and Oregon. It is still a Federal offense to deal marijuana in the United States. So even though a State doesn't have that law, the Federal Government does. They said: Well, if you don't enforce it, we won't enforce it—another relaxation of Federal law.

Then, according to the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts, prosecutions for drug trafficking—the number of people actually tried and prosecuted for drug trafficking under the primary drug law, 21 U.S. Code section 841, has declined over 16 percent since 2009, and since President Obama took office, prosecutions under 21 U.S. Code section 960, the Import-Export Act, have declined by 30 percent over that time period.

We haven't had those kinds of reductions in drugs that are imported into the United States. We don't have fewer drug distribution networks. We have more. Those prosecutions shouldn't be declining. We didn't reduce the number of prosecutors working in the U.S. Attorneys' offices.

Attorney General Holder ordered Federal prosecutors to refrain from objecting to defendants' requests in court for shorter sentences. He said: Don't object to their requests for shorter sentences. Less than a month later, the Sentencing Commission voted to reduce sentences for an estimated 70 percent of Federal drug trafficking offenders, including those who possessed a firearm, committed a violent crime or had a prior conviction, decreasing their sentence an average of 11 months—almost 1 year. An estimated 6,000 will be released from Federal prison beginning November 1, and about 40,000 will be eligible for early release in the coming years.

President Obama has commuted the sentences of 89 Federal drug offenders, including crack cocaine distributors—some convicted of dealing more than 10 pounds of crack, which is hundreds of thousands of dollars in value, while others were convicted of possession of a firearm in relation to a drug offense.

One of the things my office always did was it was sure to prosecute drug dealers who used guns while they were doing their nefarious crimes. I think it had an impact on the murder rate in America. Fewer dangerous drug dealers were carrying guns on a regular basis because they knew if they got caught, they would be taken to Federal court and be held another 5 years without parole for carrying a gun on top of their drug offense.

The President has announced that he plans to continue to grant clemency to Federal drug offenders through the end of his Presidency. Are we talking about thousands more?

All of this has led the Federal prison population to fall.

Now you have heard it said that we have this ever-growing number of people in the Federal prisons and that somehow it is wrong—there are about 200,000 people in Federal prisons.

We should talk about that. It is OK to talk about it, but we have to be careful. What I would say to you and what is too little appreciated, colleagues, is that we have already seen dramatic reductions in sentences in the last several years, far unlike what we had done in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s.

So the prison population has now started dropping. It has reached the lowest levels since 2005, 10 years ago. According to the Bureau of Prisons, the prison population of 200,000 has decreased over the last 2 years—by 5,300 in fiscal year 2014, last year. They project the population to ''further drop by 14,987 between FY2015 and FY2016''—another 15,000 decline—''particularly as a result of the retroactive sentencing guidelines change.'' Admissions to Federal prisons have declined every year since 2011. The number of people being admitted to the Federal prisons is going down, driven, I suspect, by the prosecutorial policies set by Attorney General Holder. They will continue to decline given the President's policy of directing prosecutors not to charge certain criminal offenses.

This is a very serious matter. We need to be careful as we analyze the legislation today. Crime is already rising at an alarming rate, so much so that it has prompted an emergency meeting of the Major Cities Chiefs Association in August. The New York Times recently reported that murders have increased sharply in many cities across the country since 2014, including Atlanta, up 32 percent—these are murders—Baltimore, up 56 percent, nearby; Chicago, up 20 percent; Houston, up 44 percent; Los Angeles, up 11 percent; New York, up 9 percent; Milwaukee, up 76 percent; Minneapolis, up 50 percent; New Orleans, up 22 percent; Philadelphia, up 4 percent; Dallas, up 17 percent; and Washington, DC, where we are, up 47 percent—murders. This trend, in my opinion, will continue.

Property crimes have also risen sharply throughout the country and even in small cities such as Abilene, Carson City, Portland, Ithaca, and Binghamton, NY.

I am afraid we are watching a repeat of history. A couple of generations ago, when we had an indeterminate sentencing system with no guidelines or required minimum sentences, virtually identical defendants received totally different sentences depending on the judge, and many received little or no incarceration. A nationwide crime wave ensued. It was a revolving door. People were arrested. They were released on bail. They came to court, and the case got continued. It got continued again, it got continued again, and the witnesses disappeared. They had a plea bargain, they got a little bit of time, and they served less than a third of the time they got. That is what was happening.

People say: Prison makes them worse. Do you remember those arguments? Well, in 1980, one out of four households in the United States had suffered a rape, robbery, burglary, assault, larceny or auto theft in the previous year. Crime was increasing in double-digits per year in the 1960s and 1970s, and we did not respond to it.

So then the Congress passed legislation that imposed mandatory minimum sentences on criminals convicted of the most serious Federal crimes and drug crimes to ensure that these perpetrators served at least a fixed amount of time in prison. Every drug dealer knew it and came to know that if they were caught, they were going to serve real time and they were not going to talk their way out of it. The Anti-Drug Abuse Act was passed, and the Armed Career Criminal Act, which had mandatory 15-year penalties. Career criminals carrying guns and committing serious crimes were hammered. It targeted career criminals—the kind of people who kill people to carry out their crimes. Drug trafficking fell into that category. Congress also established sentencing guidelines that required judges to sentence within certain ranges and calculate factors and create objectivity, so that one poor person got the same sentence as some rich person with a highly paid lawyer. The rationale was and remains three-fold: to deter offenders from engaging in further criminal behavior, to ensure that a meaningful period of time elapsed for the offender to become rehabilitated, and to incapacitate the offender from harming law-abiding citizens.

How many people do you know that would rape someone? How many people do you know that would likely take a gun and murder somebody? The more of those that are in jail serving time, the less people are going to get murdered. It is mathematics, and that is really what happened since 1980 with the increasing number of people being incarcerated. This idea worked.

According to the FBI statistics, the rate of violent crimes—murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault—was reduced by more than 50 percent from 1991 to 2013. That is when these sentences were beginning to be understood and were impactful. Property crimes, burglary, murder, larceny, and motor vehicle thefts dropped by a similar measure.

Over time, prison penalties fairly and systematically applied mean that less crime and fewer innocent people are burglarized, robbed, raped or murdered. Scholars have estimated that the increase in the size of our prison population has driven down crime rates by at least 25 percent.

Professor Matt DeLisi of Iowa State University testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that criminal justice research shows that ''releasing 1 percent of the current [Federal prison] population would result in approximately 32,850 additional murders,

rapes, robberies, aggravated assaults, burglaries, thefts, auto thefts, and incidents of arson.''

Well, we have had more than a 1 percent increase already. The great criminologist and Professor James Q. Wilson said:

A high risk of punishment reduces crime. It just does.

If you are talking about the classroom or on the football field, if the flag is thrown every time somebody clips, they quit clipping. If it is not thrown, you will still see it.

In 2011 the Supreme Court upheld a lower court ruling in Brown v. Plata, that California was required to reduce its prison population to ease overcrowding. In dissent in that case, Justice Alito recalled a prisoner-release program in Philadelphia in the 1990s:

Although efforts were made to release only those prisoners who were least likely to commit violent crimes, that attempt was spectacularly unsuccessful. During an 18-month period, the Philadelphia police arrested thousands of these prisoners for committing 9,732 new crimes. Those defendants were charged with 79 murders, 90 rapes, 1,113 assaults, 959 robberies, 701 burglaries, 2,748 thefts, not to mention thousands of drug offenses.

I wish it weren't so. I wish we could have these programs. I have seen them since my time in law enforcement in 1975, as a young prosecutor. Year after year, people have come forward with plans that sound so good, and they have been tried before. But they never work out nearly as well as people promote. Trust me. If there was any quick fix, it would already have been done all over America. People don't—States don't want to spend money on prisons. But the truth is that people who tend to be criminals tend to continue to be criminals and commit crimes. We ignore too often the pain, the destruction and the damage it does to innocent people who are afraid to have their children experience the turmoil of crime.

Now is not the time to move too fast to further reduce penalties without careful thought. Before we rush to judgment about undoing Federal sentencing laws, we must consider the results of what has already happened—how much reduction we have already seen. We have a responsibility to the public to examine every aspect of the legislation that may be coming forward and be introduced in committee, which could greatly impact the everyday lives of Americans for years to come. To that end, we must have a good hearing on it. We need to study what experts have told us and what history tells us about crime.

It would be so wonderful if we could do a drug treatment program and people would not commit crimes again. It would be so wonderful if we could have an in-prison educational program that people could take and somehow have a significant reduction of crime rates. There are all kinds of ideas that have been tried over the years, and some of them may have a benefit. Some of them have some benefit, but none of them have produced dramatic alterations in the rate of recidivism or repeat of criminal acts. One study a number of years ago concluded that when a person comes out of prison, they make a decision. It is an individual, personal decision about whether they are going to continue with criminal activity or not. Some of them make it because the prison was a bad place and they don't want to go back. Some of them make it because they have had a religious experience. Some of them make it because they took advantage of an online or education course and decided they are going to do something better for their lives. But it is an individual decision, and we have not found it possible to somehow impact the psyche of people in prison so that we can consistently reduce the likelihood that they will return to crime. We have to understand that.

If somebody has a plan that shows me that, I would like to see it.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for allowing me to share these thoughts. We are at a very important time in criminal justice, and we need to get it right.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

PENSION PROTECTION

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to speak on the floor today about something that is incredibly important to families all across Michigan and all across the country—what we have talked about in terms of the importance of having a middle class in this country. Folks who are working all their lives, who get a good wage, and who pay into a pension and expect it to be there. Those fundamentals are falling apart for far too many people. Specifically, I want to speak about what is happening regarding pensions and pension protections in this country.

I think all of us would agree that a pension is a promise and it is earned. A pension is earned over a lifetime of hard work, and it is the foundation of retirement security for tens of millions of American workers who have a pension and for their families. There is no question that a number of pension funds in our country are suffering, due largely to factors that they cannot control, such as what happened with the Wall Street financial crisis, which took billions of dollars and wasn't the fault of any of the workers involved or of the businesses, for that matter, that found themselves going out of business because of what happened during that financial crisis.

This took a huge toll on middle-class families. We have focused on homes and the loss of homes, which was a disaster. But a second disaster is now beginning to be felt, and that is the question of pensions and the loss of pension benefits. Workers are now at risk of losing their pensions because of cuts that are beginning to be announced. This already includes 30,000 workers in Michigan—30,000 workers in Michigan.

I understand the dilemma the pension funds are facing. Their funding is in critical status. They are becoming increasingly insolvent over time. I understand the tough decisions they are having to make, but they would not have to be making those decisions if protecting pensions were a priority for Congress. This is a matter of whether we are going to continue to have a middle class in this country.

Frankly, it is an issue of fairness for the people who have paid in their whole lives and expect, as they come to retirement age—or they are already retired—as a matter of fairness, that their funds are going to be available for them, and they should be.

One of the things that is so outrageous when we look at the lack of fairness around priorities in this country is that we see companies taking advantage of tax loopholes to move jobs overseas and avoid paying taxes. I have a bill called the Bring Jobs Home Act, which simply closes one of those loopholes and says: If you are going to move, at least you should not be able to write off the cost of the move, and the workers who are losing their jobs and taxpayers should not have to pay for the cost of the move.

We have not been able to close that loophole, so we see tens of millions of dollars, billions of dollars, going overseas sometimes because companies stay here, they just move overseas on paper. So they are still breathing the air and drinking the water and driving on roads, but on paper they have moved so they don't have to pay taxes, and we have another gigantic tax loophole.

On the one hand, while we see the system rigged over and over again for the wealthy and the well connected who pay less in taxes, we have hardworking citizens—whether they are truck drivers or teachers or police officers or men and women in uniform or people all across our country—who are paying into pension systems, and we have not been able to get the support to fully fund those systems, to fully fund the PBGC, the pension guarantee fund. So there is an issue around pensions and people knowing their pensions will be protected going forward.

I believe it is up to us in Congress to put in place the resources necessary to help protect the financial security of workers and retirees and their families. This is a matter of priorities. There are ways for us to do that—by closing tax loopholes for special interests, for the wealthy, for folks who want to avoid paying their taxes in a wide variety of ways. Take those dollars and make sure we shore up pension protection in this country. It is pretty basic. People are counting on us to take action. We need to fully commit to make sure every worker gets the pension benefits they need, they deserve, and, most importantly, they have earned.

That is why I am cosponsoring important legislation that Senator SANDERS has put forward. There are a number of us who are cosponsoring this. Let me mention a few of the cosponsors. We have a number of different people: Senator BALDWIN, Senator BROWN, Senator FRANKEN, Senator JACK REED, and others. I know my colleague Senator PETERS cares deeply about this as well.

There are a number of us who are coming together on legislation that would prevent the proposed cuts to workers' earned pension benefits. This bill would set our priorities straight by closing the tax loopholes, many of which I have talked about, to make sure we have the resources to put back into protecting workers' pensions. It would also make sure workers and retirees in the Central State Pension Fund system, the largest pension fund facing severe and growing financial difficulties, would be able to receive the full benefits they have earned—again, the full benefits they have earned.

It is outrageous to me to think that a promise as basic as a pension, a lifetime of work paying into a pension—that that pension would not be there and that we would not as a Congress consider it a priority to do everything possible to protect pensions people have earned.

I am going to keep doing everything I can, looking for ways to stop these cuts to the earned pension benefits. It is a basic issue of financial security. We have legislation, if passed right away, that would make a big difference. We need to get that bill passed so we can put in place the pension protections and send a message to people across our country that we get it, that we understand what is at stake for so many families.

A pension is a promise that needs to be kept. We have a way to do that in legislation before this body. I hope the leadership—the Republican leadership—will view it as a priority and take it up so we can get this passed as soon as possible.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I have come to the floor—I don't come to the floor every day, but every day that I come here you are presiding. Either I am coming here more often than I thought or you are presiding more than most people do. Maybe you just drew the short straw, but at the end of the day, I enjoy having these conversations with you, even when most of our colleagues have packed up and headed for places near and far—mostly far.

I have a couple of charts here today I would like for us to go over. The first one is—I like these bar graphs. This is an interesting one. We have Great Britain on this axis right here. We have information about the relative amount of fuel taxes countries have. Great Britain is the world champ. They have the biggest fuel taxes of anybody, and they have had for quite a while.

All the way over here is the U.S.A. There is an outfit called the OECD, which I would say is the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. It doesn't have 41 nations; maybe it has about 37 or 38. They are arrayed right here. There are Russia, India, and Brazil. This gives you some sense of how different nations pay for their transportation infrastructure.

A bunch of nations, like Great Britain, use their fuel taxes to help balance the budget. Great Britain is here, and then we have these other countries—Luxembourg, Spain, Argentina. You get all the way down here, and there is Brazil. They are like off the charts. They must not have any fuel taxes to pay for their transportation infrastructure at all. We are pretty close to them. We are right here, the United States. We are right between Canada and Mexico.

I wanted to show that to give people a sense of—people think: Boy, we charge a lot of money for a gasoline tax and diesel tax. Well, as it turns out, not so much.

Some people think we spend a lot of money in the Federal budget on foreign aid. A lot of time in my townhall meetings, people complain and say: Well, we spend way too much money on foreign aid.

I say: Well, what percentage of the budget do you think actually goes to foreign aid?

People say about 20, 25 percent. And the answer is 1 percent. So that is a misperception.

I think the perception here is that we charge very high fuel taxes compared to the rest of the world. No. We have among the very lowest fuel taxes when you combine State and local with all of the developed nations of the world.

Let's see what is next here. It says: How much do we pay in fuel taxes? This is the cost of regular gasoline right here, August 2015, about a month and a half ago. This right over here is diesel fuel in about August of this year, a month and a half ago. The retail price at that time, I guess on average across the country, was about $2.64 for gasoline, and the retail price for diesel was about the same, $2.60 a gallon.

It is interesting to see how much tax is collected in a $2.64 gallon of gas. In our State, in Delaware, I pulled up for gas last week. I went to Wawa. I paid about $2.11 for gas. There are a bunch of stations—probably 1,000 or more—several thousand stations across the country last week where people paid less than two bucks a gallon. But this was the average. We have a couple of big States where the prices are higher, California among them.

Anyway, what makes up the price of gas at $2.64? This was back in August. About 40 percent of that was the cost of crude oil. About another 25 percent of that $2.64 was attributable to refining costs. Another almost 20 percent—19 percent, actually—was for the cost of distribution, for distributing and marketing. Add that all up, and it adds up to about 82 percent, 83 percent of the cost of gasoline was crude oil, and refining, distribution, and taxes was about 17 percent.

Again, when you look at our taxes in this country, State and local, we have among the lowest in the developed world. We just saw that in our first chart.

The numbers on diesel are pretty much the same—40 percent of the cost of the diesel when you fill up tanks if you have a car or a truck that uses diesel. It is about 18 percent for refining and another 22 percent. So about 80 percent of the cost for a gallon of diesel fuel 1½ or 2 months ago was, again, crude oil, the cost of crude, the cost of refining, and the cost of distribution and marketing.

Let's see what is on our next chart. It strikes me that gasoline prices are going down nationwide. Well, are they or are they not? Let's look. The average price of gas on October 5, 2015—what is today? Today is October 8, my sister's birthday. Three days before that birthday—October 5—gas nationwide was about $2.32 a gallon. Compared to last year, it is down by 98 cents again.

On the east coast, the price of gas where I come from in Delaware—I said I bought gas last week at Wawa for $2.11. The average price up and down the east coast is about $2.17 a gallon, and that is down by over $1 from a year ago. In New England, the price is just about the same as the Northeast—$2.23 a gallon. The Central Atlantic is pretty much Virginia, Maryland, and maybe North Carolina and South Carolina. In the Central Atlantic, it is $2.22 a gallon. These are all down by over $1 a gallon from last year. The Lower Atlantic is pretty much the same. The Midwest is a little bit more. Gulf Coast States—down very close to $2 here. The gulf coast is down to $2.03 a gallon. That is down by roughly $1 from a year ago. Go out to the Rocky Mountain States—if you move farther to the West, prices go up a little bit. The Rocky Mountain States are $2.47, $2.48. That is down by $1. The west coast is about $2.79. That is almost $1. Finally, the Pacific Northeast is about $2.50, again, down by $1. So I would say prices are down by about a third across the country.

I like this poster. For folks who can't read it, there are a couple of guys who are sitting in a gas station. The passenger says to the driver, ''I just found some loose change in the cup holder.'' And the driver says, ''Awesome. Fill 'er up.'' Well, we are not quite at that point, but we are getting a lot more for the loose change we find in our cup

holder than used to be the case. Now the question is, Is that going to continue?

Look at this next chart and see what it shows. It shows that the global price of oil continues to drop. Again, keep in mind that about 40 percent of the cost of gas—40 percent at the pump, 40 percent of the cost of diesel at the pump—is attributable to the price at the wellhead. This is the price of crude oil over a few years—2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015. Here we are. This is starting at about the middle of 2014. There is a precipitous drop, some recovery, and then another precipitous drop.

This is even better. This is the price of crude oil over the past 6 months. There is a big drop starting about in June. You see what we have down here. It is about midforties per barrel.

That is history. The question is, Looking forward, what can we expect prices to look like?

I don't have a magic solar ball or anything like that, but I do know this: The world in which we live is awash in oil, and the United States has been a big contributor to that because of what we are bringing up out of the ground, on the land, and in the seas beside us, beside our country.

But there is another country that is, I think, No. 4 in the world in terms of their strategic reserves compared to the rest of the world. It is a country that has not been pumping a lot of late, but it is a country that has the ability to pump a lot of oil, and that country is Iran. Today, this month, next month, they can pump maybe 100,000 barrels a day, maybe 200,000 barrels a day. But if they abide by the agreement we struck with them, the Brits, the French, the Germans, the Russians, the Chinese, and us—if the Iranians keep their agreement, which is designed to ensure they don't end up with a nuclear weapon—if they keep that agreement and the sanctions are lifted, they will be able to, probably starting more next year than this, begin to pump more oil out of the ground. They have a lot of it to pump. They have a big reason to want to pump a lot of it because, as bad as our transportation and infrastructure is, theirs is a whole lot worse. They need to generate the money, and one of the ways they are going to do it is to pump a lot of oil.

Looking forward, can we say the price of gasoline is going to go down? Is it going to stay the same? I would just say this: One of the big factors for us to consider is that the fourth biggest oil reserve country in the world is going to start—all things being equal, they are going to start pumping a lot of oil, and that is going to come into a world market of oil where, frankly, we are awash in oil. It is not going to drive the price up, I can assure you. It may keep it steady. It could actually drive it down further.

All right. Let's take a look at the next chart. This is a chart that focuses on what we are investing as a nation in our transportation systems, our roads, our highways, our bridges. We are looking at, actually, some numbers provided by an outfit called the American Society of Civil Engineers. These are people who make a living by building infrastructure and helping design and figure out what we should build and how we should build it. It is not just transportation, it is all kinds of infrastructure, but it certainly includes transportation.

They actually grade how we are doing on transportation in this country on roads, highways, and bridges. I think the last time I saw, the grade they gave us was a D-plus. The only thing I can say was good about that is it was not a D-minus. But it hasn't been a C or even a C-minus for a long time. It certainly hasn't been a B for a lot longer. And one of the things that happens is when you have a transportation system—when our investments are at about a D-plus—''d'' as in ''dog''—we end up spending a lot of time in traffic just sitting there.

Every year, Texas A&M comes up with a study that says how much time we spend in traffic just pretty much sitting there, barely moving. The average across the country for the average driver is 42 hours a year. Think about that. That is pretty much almost 2 days that you just sitting there, maybe moving a little bit but not much.

For the bigger cities, such as Washington, DC; Houston, TX; Dallas; Denver; or L.A., the numbers are more like 82 hours per year. That is almost 4 days just sitting there in traffic in your car, truck, van, big truck, your diesel, rig, whatever, waiting to move.

The American Society of Civil Engineers says our investment needs are about $228 billion. Is that per year? That is per year. That is a lot of money. If we were pumping that kind of money into roads, highways, and bridges in our transit system, we wouldn't have a D-plus anymore; we would have a B-plus—''b'' as in ''bravo'' as opposed to ''d'' as in ''dog.'' So that is what $228 billion a year would get us. That would be new revenues on top of the current revenues we are already generating from roads, highways, and bridges.

Over at the U.S. Department of Transportation, they have said their magic number is $171 billion per year. They are talking about $171 billion per year. They say that is just enough to begin to improve our transportation system. Instead of seeing it continue to be degraded, if we put in about $171 billion, we would see that is just enough to begin to improve our transportation system.

Over here, these are our civil engineers. These are smart people who help design roads. This is the U.S. Department of Transportation. One says we need to put in about $228 billion a year and the U.S. Department of Transportation says about $171 billion a year. Our current highway trust fund spending out of our trust fund is $50 billion a year. It is not even 20 percent, maybe not even 25 percent of what the engineers who build these systems are telling us, and it is not even a third of what the Department of Transportation says we ought to be doing. We could begin—just begin to improve our transportation system.

What this chart says to me is we are going nowhere fast and we are woefully underfunding. If we want to get better; if we want to reduce the amount of time we are just sitting, going nowhere; if we want to reduce the amount of money we are spending to replace our tires or have our front ends aligned and other repairs on our vehicles—that adds up to about, on average, between $350 to $500 per driver. That is what we are spending now.

Let's see what this poster says:

The U.S. highway trust fund running out due to political gridlock.

Where the highway ends.

Let me just say that we have had over the last, I don't know, 5, 6, 7, 8 years any number of blue ribbon commissions that have been commissioned. We commissioned them in the Transportation bill we passed maybe 6 years ago. We said to all these smart people: We want you to go out and figure out how we ought to pay for transportation.

They came back and said: Well, here is why we think a big part of it ought to be user fees, some for tolling and some for figuring out how many miles are actually traveled, vehicle miles traveled, kind of migrating toward that of system, but for the most part it should be user fees.

A big piece of that, at least for now, should be user fees for the amount of gas we buy and for the amount of diesel fuel we buy because that generally ensures that the folks who are using our roads, highways, and bridges are actually paying for them.

So there has not really been a lot of question among people a lot smarter than I and even smarter than my colleagues—most of them, at least—the folks who are most knowledgeable about this say this is the way we ought to pay for it, and it should be a user-fee approach.

The reason we are not doing that is because of political courage—not an overabundance of that; maybe a lack of it.

All right. Let's see what is next. The TRAFFIC Relief Act, which is the Tax Relief And #FixTheTrustFund For Infrastructure Certainty Act of 2015—that is a mouthful—was introduced by a fellow from Illinois named Senator DURBIN and a fellow from Delaware. That would be me.

DICK DURBIN and I came to Washington. I was a Navy guy for many years before I was treasurer of Delaware, Congressman for a while, Governor, and now in the Senate. DICK came to Washington in 1982. We both were elected to the House in 1982. We found out on the first day on the job—we were sworn in January 3, 1983—the

Social Security trust fund was about to run out of money, I mean entirely. But in 1983 we were not going to be talking about reducing Social Security benefits by 5 percent, 10 percent, or 20 percent; by the end of 1983, we were going to run out of money and we wouldn't be able to pay anything for Social Security benefits.

Fortunately, in 1982 some very smart people got together. A blue ribbon commission was chaired by Alan Greenspan, who went on to became Federal Reserve Chairman. They said: Here is how we ought to pay for it.

DICK DURBIN and I—a lot of Democrats and a lot of Republicans—all of us together said: That makes sense. Let's do it.

It was a combination of reductions in benefits and additional revenues. We got the job done. Social Security is not set forever, but it has lasted for another 30 years, 40 years. We need to do some more to fix it, but that is the kind of bipartisan resolve we need.

The legislation Senator DURBIN and I introduced in this instance—maybe a little more than a month ago—raises about $220 billion for the highway trust fund over 10 years, and that is on top of the amount of money we are already going to spend anyway over the next 10 years. I think that would be another maybe $400 billion, roughly, $450 billion, $350 billion. Add that to $220 billion, and that gives us $570 billion.

Does this get us from D-plus to an A or A-minus or even a B-plus? No, it doesn't, but it moves us in the right direction. It moves the needle in the direction it needs to go. It provides for $90 billion to fully fund the highways and transit programs and about $130 billion for new investments in repairs and upgrades. We need to do those new investments, and we certainly need to do the repairs and upgrades.

Let me close by thanking Senator DURBIN for joining me in this effort. People vote for us to come to Congress and to make tough decisions. People expect us to work together. People especially expect us to get things done. People especially expect us to do things that help strengthen the economic recovery, which is underway, to make it more robust going forward in the future. We can do that. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out how.

A lot of smart people on these blue ribbon commissions have been telling us for years that the way to do it is move toward tolling, eventually move toward some kind of vehicle-miles-traveled system where based on the actual miles we travel we pay some find of fee. But they have also said for now, because those other two ideas are not fully realized—and especially for vehicle miles traveled, we are not going to be there for probably 10 years, 20 years. In the meantime, we have all this work that needs to be done and to be paid for, and they have said the best way to do it is to ensure that we pay—those of us who are using the roads, highways, and bridges pay for that, and we have been using gas taxes and diesel taxes to do that.

I will close with this. I am not a big coffee drinker, but I stopped by a carryout we have downstairs in the basement. They are open whenever we are in session, and you can go get a sandwich or some soup or yogurt or something, and they also sell coffee. Some days, especially when we are in session late at night—we have not been doing that much lately—but at night when we are in session late, they sell a lot of coffee. The coffee is anywhere from the smallest cup costing like 70 cents, and the middle-sized maybe $2, $2.50, and the largest cups are maybe $3 or something like that. If you go to Starbucks you pay a lot more for a cup of coffee than that. You pay as much as $5 at Starbucks, I am told by a friend of mine who buys his coffee there, but I bought a cup of coffee here today and it was a little more than $2 for a middle-sized cup of coffee.

As it turns out, if we actually raised the user fee—the gas tax and the diesel tax—for 4 cents a year, which is what DICK DURBIN and I are calling for, 4 cents a year for 4 years, and the Federal gas tax has been 18 cents for 22 years. Since 1993 it has been 18 cents. It is not worth 18 cents anymore because of inflation. It is worth less than a dime. The diesel tax is about 23 cents. It is not worth 23 cents anymore. It has been that since 1993. It is worth less than 15 cents. In the meantime, the price of concrete is up, asphalt is up, steel is up, labor is up, and the major way, the principal way we pay for roads, highways, bridges, and transit frankly has greatly diminished in value.

If we were to actually raise, as Senator DURBIN and I are suggesting, the price of these user fees—gas tax, diesel tax—by 4 cents a year for 4 years, that would add 16 cents to the price of gasoline. For the average driver, that turns out to be on a weekly basis just about the price of a cup of coffee. It works out to be just about the price of a cup of coffee.

Here is a question I would ask. I think if we asked most drivers in this country of ours today when they are sitting in traffic trying to get someplace—whether here in the Mid-Atlantic area, up in the Northeast, out on the West Coast or other places—would you be willing, 4 years from now, to be paying an amount of money equal to the price of a cup of coffee in order to spend a lot less time sitting in traffic going nowhere or running into potholes that destroy your tires and your front-end alignment? Would you be willing to pay on a weekly basis the amount of money you spend on a cup of coffee? My guess is most people would say that doesn't seem like a bad deal. You know what. They would be right because it is not a bad deal.

I will close with this. I am from Delaware. People here are from all over the country representing their States. Guess what 12 of the 50 States have done in the last 2 years—2013, 2014—and those States are mostly red States, with Republican Governors and Republican legislatures. One dozen of those States have raised their user fees. They have raised their user fees and not by a dollar all at once or even a half dollar or a quarter, but they have raised them in some places by pennies, a nickel or more over a couple of years.

Then last November in those 12 States they had elections. This is an interesting story. Guess what happened to the State legislators who voted to raise their user fees to actually pay for their roads, highways, and bridges. When they ran for reelection they got reelected. Amazing. They showed political courage. They did the hard thing. Ninety-five percent of them, Republicans, who were running for reelection last November, in those States where they raised the user fees—gas tax, diesel tax—they got reelected.

Do you know who didn't get reelected in some of those States? The legislators who voted against raising the user fees, who did not support making investments in transportation.

How about the Democrats in those States? Well, the Democrats in States where they raised the user fees to pay for their transportation investments, almost 90 percent of them won their primary last November, won the general election, and they got reelected too. They did better than the legislators who voted against those increases. Think about that.

I like to quote Thomas Jefferson from time to time, and Jefferson used to say: If people know the truth, they won't make a mistake. I would like to think the same thing is true here. If my colleagues and I know the truth, we won't make a mistake either. People think it is political suicide to vote to raise these user fees and you can't get reelected by doing the right thing. But you know what. You can. You can, and there is a lot of evidence to show it can happen.

I will close not with the words of Jefferson but of Mark Twain, who said a lot of things—a lot of funny things—and one of the things he said that I think is especially appropriate is: In the end, tell the truth. You will confound your critics and amaze your friends.

The truth is we need to make these investments. The other truth is this is not political suicide. At the end of the day, we are actually going to get, I think more often than not, rewarded for doing the hard thing and the right thing. My hope is we will do that, and I will continue to make that case.

One last great quote, Mr. President. Wayne Gretzky—I don't know if you play much hockey down your way, we play some in Delaware—but Wayne Gretzky said a lot of memorable things in his life—a great hockey player, now retired—and when people would say to him: Mr. Gretzky, why are you such a good hockey player? He would say: I go

where the puck will be, not where the puck is. Think about that. I go where the puck will be, not where the puck is.

One of the other things Wayne Gretzky said that I especially like is: I miss 100 percent of the shots—talking about taking a shot on the goal—he said: I miss 100 percent of the shots that I never take. Think about that. I miss 100 percent of the shots I never take.

I am convinced this is a shot worth taking. I am going to push very hard to make sure somebody is here, and DICK DURBIN and my guess is some others, too, will come along and will encourage folks to join us in this effort. This is a just cause.

I don't see anybody else waiting in line to speak, so with that, 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. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

TRIBUTE TO SIEGFRIED AND ROY

• Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to recognize two incredible entertainers and individuals in the Las Vegas community, Siegfried Fischbacher and Roy Horn, better known as Siegfried and Roy.

For more than 35 years, this duo shared their captivating magic show with visitors and residents of Las Vegas. Their stage presence and the participation of their trained white tigers kept audiences coming back for performances unlike any other. Siegfried and Roy's award-winning show at the Mirage Hotel and Casino was enjoyed by children and adults, and it opened the door to family entertainment on the Las Vegas Strip.

Through their celebrity and love of animals, Siegfried and Roy have been working to raise awareness for animal conservation and are educating others about endangered species. The white tiger, an animal that became an icon of Siegfried and Roy's performances, is among those listed as endangered and facing extinction. By establishing the Siegfried and Roy Masters of the Impossible Foundation, they are taking their efforts to educate, protect, and conserve animals that are endangered and threatened across the globe.

For the first time in 5 years, Siegfried and Roy's Secret Garden at the Mirage is welcoming four tiger cubs, Hirah, Maharani, Liberty, and Justice. Siegfried and Roy are calling these cubs ''ambassadors of conservation,'' as they hope these animals will help them share the important message that we must continue to work together to protect endangered species.

I appreciate Siegfried and Roy's dedication to the Las Vegas community and animal conservation. I wish them the best in their future endeavors.•

POLITICAL PRISONERS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, much of our international focus in recent months has understandably been on Iran and Syria. Both will require further attention as we make sure Iran complies with the nuclear agreement and try to bring an end to the catastrophic human suffering in Syria. And we must continue to insist that Russia abide by the Minsk agreement in territory it so brazenly seized in eastern Ukraine.

But amid these important foreign policy challenges, I would like to make sure we do not lose sight of smaller but also important battles for human rights occurring around the world.

First, let me start with a small nation straddling the lines of Europe and Asia, which many had hoped would strengthen its ties with the community of democracies—Azerbaijan. Since 2014, the government has arrested close to a hundred political prisoners representing some of the strongest voices for democracy and transparency in the country.

Many of those who currently sit in prison on trumped-up charges such as tax evasion, fraud, and even treason include noted human rights defenders like Leyla and Arif Yunus, Rasul Jafarov, Intigam Aliyev, and Anar Mammadli. They worked tirelessly before their arrests on issues trying to strengthen the country's democratic institutions.

Just recently, the Organization of Security and Co-operation in Europe, or OSCE, announced that it is canceling its mission to monitor the upcoming parliamentary elections due to restrictions imposed by the government. Without the OSCE's mission, the likelihood for free and fair elections in November is obviously diminished.

The Azeri Government has been particularly aggressive in quashing freedom of the press, notably arresting in 2014 Khadija Ismayilova, one of the country's top investigative reporters. For years she exposed secret connections between President Alivey's immediate family and business dealings, including the privatized state airline, the nation's biggest telecom provider, and massive construction projects.

As a result of her work, she faced repeated threats, hidden cameras in her home, and even attempted blackmail by crudely posted videos of private moments with her boyfriend; yet as the Washington Post recently reported on its front page, she pressed forward, believing that the Azeri public had a right to know about corruption at the highest levels of their government.

Two weeks later, Khadija's employer, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, was raided and shut down. Its staff has faced repeated harassment and some have even left the country out of concern for their safety. Recently she was sentenced to 7.5 years in prison on what can only be seen as a blatant attempt to halt her work.

The U.S. State Department, the OSCE, and the European Union Parliament have all called on Azerbaijan to release its political prisoners. And in July, 15 of my Senate colleagues joined me in a letter to Azeri President Aliyev expressing concern that the space for civil society and the freedom of press within the country is diminishing. I call on Aliyev here today to not further jeopardize his ties to the West by continuing these authoritarian actions against his own people.

Next, let me turn to Latin America where we continue to see democratic backsliding in a number of countries.

First, Ecuador, where President Correa has seemingly no tolerance for criticism and a troubling habit of harassing the media and restricting freedom of association and the press. It is not clear why Correa, who has a large majority in the parliament, has to take such draconian and undemocratic measures.

For example, over the years, the police have raided the homes of journalists working to expose government corruption and shut down an environmental organization critical of the regime's extractive policies. Government thugs have harassed and intimidated Twitter users who criticize the government. And Correa recently seemed set to force the closure of Fundamedios, a respected NGO that promotes freedom of the press.

The NGO's crime? Tweeting links to two political editorials critical of the Ecuadoran government.

Facing strong international condemnation, it now appears Correa has decided to back off this ill-suited vendetta against Fundamedios.

And in Venezuela the other week, leading opposition figure Leopoldo Lopez, who had already been sitting in jail for 19 months on absurd political charges, was sentenced to almost 14 years.

Equally troubling is what the Venezuelan regime has done to Judge Maria Lourdes Afiuni, who tried to maintain a semblance of judicial independence. She was shamelessly jailed after releasing a defendant who had been detained for 3 years without charges and swiftly charged with corruption and abuse of authority. Afiuni sat in jail for 2 years next to violent prisoners she had once sentenced.

While in prison, she was brutally raped and became pregnant—her body terribly destroyed by the violence. She was granted house arrest to recover from emergency surgery. And today

she must still report to the authorities every 15 days and cannot leave the country or speak to the news media. Incredibly, Venezuela's Attorney General denied in Geneva there was a complaint for sexual abuse and torture involving Afiuni.

I know U.N. Ambassador Samantha Power has taken on this case. I want to join that effort and call for her unconditional release and exoneration.

Venezuelan President Maduro is presiding over the near collapse of his once proud nation, manufacturing internal and external enemies to explain his own government's economic mismanagement.

Not only has his government sentenced Lopez to jail, but it has also started a border dispute with Colombia, embarrassingly trying to further deflect attention from its own disastrous policies.

Furthering more division and repression will only make things worse. I know this administration and others in the region have tried to offer paths forward for Maduro, but I fear he is heading in the opposite direction with Lopez's sentencing.

Now, some of you may remember the international outrage that occurred when writer and activist Raif Badawi was sentenced to 1,000 public lashes and 10 years in prison on blasphemy and apostasy charges in Saudi Arabia.

You may also recall his brother-in-law and lawyer, human rights activist Waleed Abu al-Khair, who was sentenced to 15 years in prison by Jeddah's specialized criminal court for inciting public opinion and undermining the state.

These imprisonments—and both their dubious charges and inhumane punishments—were denounced around the world by reputable human rights organizations, foreign governments, and many others.

Our State Department called for the release of both Raif and Waleed, and in Congress, I was joined by seven of my Senate colleagues in writing to the late King Abdullah urging their release. Sixty-seven of my colleagues in the House did the same months later when King Salman became the new leader of Saudi Arabia. And just the other day, Badawi was awarded the PEN Literary Award.

We have a longstanding friendship with the Saudi regime, and friends do at times disagree. But it is because of the nature of our friendship that I believe we have an obligation to encourage Saudi Arabia to do better—to uphold basic human rights for free speech, for women, for religious minorities, for foreign workers, and countless others.

I hope the new King, King Salman, will show compassion and bring an end to Saudi Arabia's troubling human rights record.

And last, let me mention some hopeful steps in Belarus, where recently the last candidate who ran in 2010 for President against strongman President Lukashenko, was finally released from jail.

Michael Statkevich was released after nearly 5 years and, coincidentally, just days after he had passed the deadline to be an eligible opposition candidate for the next Presidential election.

You see on the eve of the 2010 election—an election that could have brought an end to the distinction of being the last dictatorship in Europe—Lukashenko had seven candidates arrested and thrown in jail—not much of an incentive to be a candidate.

Sadly, such repression and election manipulation has been the norm in Belarus which incredibly still operates its own KGB to enforce political repression.

However, Belarus has another election coming up next week on October 11. I want President Lukashenko to know that the world is watching and hoping that this time it will be a free and legitimate election worthy of the Belarussian people.

REMEMBERING PAT JOHNS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last month, Illinois—and America—lost a legend. Pat Johns passed away at the age of 66. Pat Johns was from my home State of Illinois. He was born in Aurora and raised in Plano. Known as the ''Master of Disaster,'' Pat was employed with Catholic Relief Services, based in Baltimore, for 30 years. In that time he was on the ground in some of the world's most dangerous war zones and humanitarian emergency areas.

Pat Johns was a soldier, but not in the traditional sense—he didn't even carry a gun. He was a soldier of peace, armed only with the virtue of his mission. And his mission took him to places like the killing fields of Cambodia, the Ethiopian famine, the Rwandan genocide, Somalia, Kosovo, and Eritrea. And when natural disasters occurred like the Asian tsunami, Hurricane Katrina, or the earthquake in Haiti, Pat Johns was there—with energy, hope, and solutions.

In 1974, Pat joined Catholic Relief Services and was posted in Cambodia. Two years later, he was managing a staff of 400 people. To say that Pat faced a challenge in Cambodia would be a gross understatement. The Khmer Rouge Army was storming its way toward the capitol of Phnom Penh and the Vietnam war was raging next door. Pat's job included working shifts of 50 hours or more and getting food and supplies to nearly 2 million refugees seeking safe haven from the Khmer Rouge's advances. He endured miserable tropical weather and survived malaria, all while keeping tens of thousands of refugees alive. When asked about the experience, he said, ''The whole experience, in Cambodia really drove home my niche in life.''

Many may have quit, but not Pat Johns. Instead, he dedicated his life to serving those in desperate need in the most dangerous parts of the planet. In doing so, Pat Johns saved millions of people from war-torn countries, fed the starving, and promoted peace and justice all over the world—what an inspiration.

Last spring, I gave the commencement address at my nephew's high school graduation. I asked the students to think about what they wanted people to say about their lives. I asked them, ''What will you be remembered for? What service did you render to your community? Your nation? Your world?'' The great thing about living in America is we can choose the answers to those questions.

Pat Johns will be remembered for many things: living through war, famine, natural disasters, incredible human suffering; and for bringing hope to victims everywhere he went. But Sean Callahan, chief operating officer for Catholic Relief Services, put it best. He said, ''Perhaps the greatest thing about Pat was that he was a gentleman and a greatly caring person. He could work nonstop for 50 hours in terrible conditions, but still have the heart to offer comfort and friendship to those around him.'' That's a legacy to be proud of.

Today, the best way we can honor Pat Johns is by continuing his life's work. We need this generation of Americans to live up to the example set by Pat Johns. We have big shoes to fill, but Pat showed us that, with the right commitment, we can get it done.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we have all been deeply shaken by the horrific tragedies in Charleston and Roseburg and by all the mass killings that now occur with alarming regularity. The American people overwhelmingly support commonsense reforms that will keep firearms out of the hands of criminals and dangerous individuals; yet in response to mass shootings, too often Congress slips into a familiar cycle of shock, sorrow and, ultimately, inaction. Some in Congress pretend that there are no solutions; others claim that any restriction aimed at keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous people represents an affront to the Second Amendment. They are wrong.

Many, many Americans have had enough. We will not be satisfied by those who only offer their sympathies. And we will not be lulled into inaction.

While I was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee last Congress, we addressed gun violence head-on. In the wake of the horrifying and senseless murder of 26 people, including 20 children, at Sandy Hook Elementary in Newtown, CT, I and all Democratic members on the committee resolved to pass sensible reforms to protect our communities. We were moved by the powerful words of former Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords calling on us

to act, and we reported out legislation that would punish criminals who traffic in firearms and would close background check loopholes. This included my bipartisan legislation to prevent criminals from using straw purchasers who exploit weak background check laws in order to funnel firearms to criminals. Our efforts were strongly supported by the American public, but Senate Republicans blocked these commonsense reforms on the Senate floor.

It has been more than 3 months since Democratic members of the Judiciary Committee called for a hearing in the wake of the tragedy in Charleston, SC. I hope the majority will soon schedule this hearing so that we can have a constructive discussion on gun violence that has shaken too many communities and too many families. But if we truly want to make a difference, we must work together to build consensus around solutions to gun violence. I will work with anyone interested in preventing these tragedies, and I will soon reintroduce my legislation to strengthen our straw purchasing and firearm trafficking laws.

Like many Vermonters, I grew up with firearms, and I have enormous respect for the freedoms the Second Amendment protects. None of the concepts put forward by the Democratic caucus threaten the Second Amendment rights of lawful gun owners. But American lives are threatened when our laws do not protect them. This need not be a partisan issue, and we must work together.

Our country desperately needs meaningful reform now. The toll that gun violence takes on our communities is too great. It is past time for Congress to act. The American people should not have to wait until the next tragedy.

JUSTICE FOR WAR CRIMES IN SRI LANKA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier this week the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CARDIN, spoke about the opportunity for the United States and Sri Lanka to expand economic and security cooperation and the need for accountability for war crimes and reconciliation between ethnic and religious factions in that country. I want to join him in expressing support for the aspirations of the Sri Lankan people for reconciliation, justice, and equitable economic development.

Last week the United Nations Human Rights Council adopted a resolution which, if faithfully implemented, could be the basis for a meaningful and long overdue international role in Sri Lanka to hold accountable those involved in war crimes and crimes against humanity during that country's brutal civil war.

After so many false starts, so many investigations and reports that documented widespread atrocities by both sides in the conflict, including rape, arbitrary detention, torture, the use of child soldiers, summary executions, shelling of civilians, and forced disappearances were ignored; and after recommendations to bring those responsible to justice were ignored, the U.N. resolution affirms that the Sri Lankan Government needs to put in place a judicial mechanism with international participation.

The resolution refers to the recent report by the U.N. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, which documented horrific abuses by the Sri Lankan Armed Forces and LTTE rebels and the government's failure over decades to punish those responsible. Among the report's key recommendations is the establishment of a special court ''integrating international judges, prosecutors, lawyers and investigators'' with an independent Sri Lankan investigative and prosecuting body. No other mechanism would have the credibility and independence to deliver real justice.

Let me repeat that because it is so important: No other mechanism would have the credibility and independence to deliver real justice. The refusal of past Sri Lankan Governments to accept this premise and to recognize that no one, including the armed forces, is above the law, is why so far no one has been held accountable.

To its credit, President Maithrapala Sirisena's government cosponsored the resolution, which was presented initially to the U.N. Human Rights Council by the United States, United Kingdom, Montenegro, and Macedonia. The resolution, regarding a ''credible judicial process,'' ''affirms the importance of participation in a Sri Lankan judicial mechanism, including the Special Counsel's office, of Commonwealth and other foreign judges, defense lawyers, and authorized prosecutors and investigators.'' Having cosponsored the resolution, the government should establish without delay a special tribunal that brings together international investigators, prosecutors, and judges with Sri Lankan counterparts who are protected from outside pressure and intimidation, as well as a program to protect witnesses. The United States could provide assistance for such an effort.

The government will also need to ensure that violations of international law, including war crimes, disappearances, torture, and the concept of command responsibility, are incorporated into Sri Lankan law, so that charges brought reflect the severity of the crimes and target those most responsible.

I have spoken previously about President Sirisena's initial accomplishments, including the adoption of the 19th Amendment to the constitution, which curtails the extensive powers enjoyed by the Executive and vests more power in the parliament, limits the Presidential term to 5 years instead of 6, and allows the President to hold office only for two terms instead of an unlimited number of terms.

Unlike the previous government, which persecuted its critics and locked up after sham trials journalists who exposed corruption, President Sirisena has taken steps to reaffirm freedom of the press. Under the previous government, Sri Lanka's judicial system was politicized and corrupted. The new government is taking steps to reestablish the independence of the judiciary, which is fundamental to any democracy. And, as has been reported, the Government of Sri Lanka has accepted many recommendations to improve the human rights situation, including a repeal of the draconian Prevention of Terrorism Act and reforms to the Witness and Victim Protection Law, both long called for by victims' rights groups. The government has agreed to accelerate the return of lands confiscated by the security forces; to end the military's involvement in civilian activities in the country's north and east; to investigate allegations of attacks on civil society, the media, and religious minorities; and to work toward devolution of authority from Colombo, consistent with the 13th amendment to the constitution.

President Sirisena has sought to erase the worst excesses and abuses of his predecessor and put his country on a path to reconciliation and prosperity. For this he deserves our support. The sooner the government makes good on these commitments, the better, as the Sri Lankan people have waited a very long time for a government that is serious about reconciliation, which means addressing the ethnic, religious, social, economic, and political divisions and inequalities that were at the root of the conflict.

The U.N. resolution is far from perfect. It has been pointed out that it lacks adequate provisions for international oversight of implementation of its terms. The resolution only calls for an oral update from the High Commissioner in June 2016 and a written implementation report in March 2017. The United States should not wait until next June to report to Congress on the government's progress in complying with the terms of the resolution. Despite its shortcomings, the U.N. resolution points the way forward. A great deal of work lies ahead. More than 6 years have passed since the war ended. Physical evidence has been lost or destroyed, people's memories fade, and witnesses die. But the Sri Lankan people, and particularly those who suffered grievous losses in the war, should take solace from the fact that the international community has not forgotten them and that their own government may be ready to take the necessary steps to restore accountability and the rule of law to Sri Lanka.

PALESTINIAN TERRORISM

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, my thoughts and prayers are with the Israeli people who are enduring a new escalation of Palestinian terrorism.

Last Thursday evening, a mother and father were murdered in front of their four children ages 9, 7, 4, and 4 months when Hamas terrorists opened fire on their car. A few days later, another Jewish family was walking in the Old City of Jerusalem after praying at the Western Wall when a Palestinian terrorist went on a stabbing attack. He murdered the father, along with another courageous man who rushed to the scene to the family's aid. Both men leave behind their wives and nine children. In addition to the four murdered, many more Israelis have been seriously wounded from car-ramming, rock-throwing, and brutal knife and screwdriver stabbing attacks in what appears to be a fresh horror—an epidemic of low-tech, brutal attacks by militants who are acting on their own initiative.

These attacks have been incubated by the continued incitement and glorification of violence by the Palestinian leadership, most recently by President Mahmoud Abbas during his address at the United Nations General Assembly. He still has yet to categorically condemn these attacks. It is long past time for the United States and the international community to hold the Palestinians accountable for their incitement and support for terrorism, including through the financial payment to Palestinian terrorists who are jailed in Israel for committing acts of terrorism.

In yet another stark reminder of how closely our nations are connected in this fight, the father murdered last Thursday, Eitam Henkin, was a dual Israeli-American citizen. The terrorist who killed him did not care, as his sole intent was to kill Jews, not to engage in a political process. There is no moral equivalence between Palestinian terrorism and the obligation of Israel to act in defense of its people. To the Israeli people, especially those who are victims of terrorism and their families: I proudly stand in solidarity with you during this challenging time.

OBSERVING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Hispanic Heritage Month, a time to honor the many traditions and contributions of America's vibrant Hispanic community. This special time is celebrated from September 15 to October 15 and honors the many Americans whose ancestors originate from Spain, Mexico, the Caribbean, Central America, and South America. I am proud to recognize this month in honor of the many Hispanic Americans who contribute so much to communities across our state and country.

Hispanic Americans make up the largest ethnic minority throughout our Nation, as well as in Nevada. This community is an integral part of our State, helping shape our economy, trade, culture, and intrinsic Nevada footprint. I am thankful for the hard work and dedication of the many Hispanic Americans whose perseverance has greatly impacted the success of the Silver State. That is why I recently cosponsored a resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and the fundamental role Hispanic Americans have in the accomplishments of the United States. I am proud to support legislative efforts that distinguish the immense efforts brought forth by this community.

Hispanic Americans play a critical role in our Nation's identity, especially in 2015. As of August 2015, Latino workers represented nearly 17 percent of the workforce and exhibited the largest percentage of labor force participation of any ethnic group with nearly 63 percent. This community is made up of hard-working physicians, surgeons, chief business executives, lawyers, educators, and many other professionals crucial to the success of our country. Latinos represent one in four public school students and 19 percent of college students between the ages of 18 and 24. Hispanic Americans have served the United States in every war, helping bring freedom and democracy to our country. As of July 2015, 164,000 Active-Duty servicemembers from the Hispanic community served and continue to serve our country, maintaining these principal values. The vast influence this community has had on our great Nation warrants only the greatest gratitude.

I ask that today and throughout the rest of this time set aside for Hispanic Heritage Month, we recognize the many contributions that the Hispanic community brings. I join citizens across the Silver State in thanking the many Hispanic Americans who have brought greater strength to our State and our Nation.

OBSERVING THE 104TH NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA, TAIWAN

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize the 104th National Day of the Republic of China, Taiwan, to take place on October 10, 2015.

As a longstanding supporter of Taiwan, I believe the occasion of its National Day is an appropriate time for us to consider our special relationship with Taiwan and the Taiwanese people.

The United States and Taiwan have fostered a mutually beneficial relationship over the years based on shared democratic values and common strategic interests. Taiwan is a fine example of democracy in the Asia-Pacific region and is a trusted friend and trading partner to the United States. Our relationship has realized far-reaching economic and cultural benefits, and I hope that our bonds continue to grow in the years to come.

It is a sincere privilege to offer my compliments to the people of Taiwan on this very special occasion.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I would like to take time to recognize that October 10, 2015, will be the 104th National Day of the Republic of China, Taiwan.

Over the years, the United States and Taiwan have maintained a strong relationship based on common values and global interests. I hope to see Taiwan remain a strong ally and trade partner for many years to come as we look towards a mutually prosperous future.

It is a great pleasure to extend my best wishes to the people of Taiwan on this special day.

OBSERVING INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE GIRL

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, Sunday, October 11, 2015, is the International Day of the Girl. Started 4 years ago, this day is an effort to raise awareness of issues of gender inequality around the world. This year the theme is ''The Power of the Adolescent Girl.'' As the father of three daughters and two granddaughters, I am keenly aware of the power of our girls, as well as the challenges that they face.

For these reasons, I was proud to welcome a delegation of young women from Arkansas to my office in July. These ladies were attending a leadership summit here in Washington, D.C., and came to my office to advocate on issues related to human trafficking, gender-based violence, childhood education, and more. I am very proud of them and their efforts to fight the problems girls face around the world.

Across the globe, girls and young women face incredible odds and challenges. Over the last 15 years, work by the United States and our partners has resulted in real change. Girls are now more likely than ever to enroll in primary school and receive important vaccinations and are much less likely to suffer health and nutritional problems than ever before. It is important that we continue these efforts, along with our partners, to solidify the gains that we have made and reach for even greater successes.

I thank the young women from Arkansas and across the country who are making the crucial effort to advocate for those who do not have a voice. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that our children inherit a world of increased possibilities.

TRIBUTE TO DETECTIVE WILLIAM J. ZIMMERMAN

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating an extraordinary public servant, Detective William ''Bill'' Zimmerman, as he retires from the United States Capitol Police force, USCP.

For 32 years, Detective Zimmerman has served the USCP with great distinction, including 28 years with the threat assessment section, the division responsible for investigating threats made against Members of Congress and their families.

To every challenge, Detective Zimmerman brought unparalleled skill and dedication, ultimately helping to establish programs for threat assessment

and management programs that are used by other law enforcement agencies across the United States and in Great Britain. Detective Zimmerman served as the first president of the Washington, D.C., chapter of the Association of Threat Assessment Professionals, and in 2004, he became the inaugural recipient of the association's distinguished Meritorious Service Award.

Throughout his career, Detective Zimmerman consistently went above and beyond the call of duty to protect and serve. For my office, Detective Zimmerman was often our go-to person in an emergency, and he always handled any situation with professionalism, commitment, passion, and calm. Detective Zimmerman is not only the consummate professional, he is also a wonderful human being, and his well-deserved retirement is a huge loss for Congress.

Ralph Waldo Emerson said, ''To know one life has breathed easier because you have lived, that is to have succeeded.'' By that and every other measure, Detective Zimmerman had a remarkably successful career, and I congratulate him, thank him, and wish him all the best as he begins the next exciting chapter.

JOINT EMPLOYER DECISION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions at the hearing titled, ''Stealing the Dream of Business Ownership: The NLRB's Joint Employer decision.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT EMPLOYER DECISION

This morning we are having a hearing about the recent National Labor Relations Board decision that threatens to steal the American dream from owners of the nation's 780,000 franchise businesses and millions of contractors.

We will also discuss the legislation I have introduced to undo this decision.

Last week, I met a man named Aslam Khan. He is an immigrant from Pakistan who started out as a dishwasher at Church's Chicken and who today has become a very successful owner of Church's Chicken franchises.

He talked about achieving the American Dream. He said it was possible because of our nation's ''free enterprise, entrepreneurial spirit.''

But on August 27, the National Labor Relations Board released a decision that threatens to steal the American dream from owners of the nation's 780,000 franchise businesses and millions of contractors.

It threatens to destroy that free enterprise, entrepreneurial spirit.

The labor board's new ''joint employer'' standard will make big businesses bigger and make the middle class smaller by discouraging larger companies from franchising and contracting work to small businesses.

It is the biggest attack on the opportunity for small businessmen and women in this country to make their way into the middle class that we've seen in a long, long time—and I am committed to fighting it with legislation that already has 45 cosponsors in the Senate and bipartisan support in the House.

For three decades, federal labor policies have held that two separate employers are ''joint employers'' if both have direct and immediate control over employment terms and working conditions.

That means two employers who are both responsible for tasks like hiring and firing, setting work hours, issuing direction to employees, determining compensation and handling day to day record keeping.

Under the new ''joint employer'' standard adopted in August in Browning Ferris Industries, a 3–2 NLRB majority said that merely indirect control or even unexercised potential to control working conditions could make a franchisee and franchisor joint employers.

That means that for all these franchisees and contractors who have worked so hard to build businesses in their communities, hire the right people, and spend 12 hours a day serving customers, meeting a payroll, dealing with government regulations, paying taxes, and trying to make a profit—they will no longer be considered their workers' sole employer. Rather, they are just one of their workers' employers.

And for the businesses that have franchised their brand or used subcontractors to haul their waste or clean their offices—and are now considered one of the employers of those companies' workers—there will be a huge incentive to retake control of those franchises, and retake control of those contracted tasks. Because if you're going to have all the liability of being the boss, you're much better off actually being the boss.

If those businesses stop using franchisees and subcontractors, their costs go up. The system of letting other businesses invest their capital in carrying forward your business goal evaporates.

When costs go up, these businesses lose their ability to grow and create more jobs.

As joint employers, business owners will be forced to engage in collective bargaining and share liability for labor law violations.

As this new standard is applied, we will learn just how much liability an employer will face for another employer's decisions. Will she be required to contribute to healthcare costs, workers compensation and pension funds? Will this scheme mean new ''joint employers'' will be on the hook for notoriously underfunded multi-employer pension plans?

As if facing legal liability for another employer's labor problems isn't bad enough, the Administration is about to make it even more costly.

The President and his Department of Labor are currently in the process of finalizing regulations that will increase the impact of having labor law violations on your record if you want to contract with the federal government.

Under the Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces regulation, labor law violations will be counted against federal contractors when they bid for contracts.

This change also harms employees:

Millions of employees will lose the ability to negotiate things like pay, hours and leave time with their direct supervisor, because those decisions will now be made between the larger employer and the union.

As one employee put it in an interview with a local Denver news channel: ''I would be just another number to a corporation. I'm a person to my employer now.''

Franchising will be particularly impacted by this decision.

In my opinion, this is one of the biggest attacks on the opportunity for small businessmen and women in this country to make their way into the middle class that we've seen.

There are 780,000 franchise establishments across this country—and they create nearly 9 million jobs.

Last week I met with a Chattanooga, Tennessee, couple who started their own franchisee location of ''Two Men and a Truck,'' a moving company.

With hard work and commitment, they have been able to grow that first franchise into 6 locations. They would like to continue growing but this new NLRB decision is causing them to put those plans on hold.

The Two Men and a Truck franchisor is an excellent example of how franchising allow entry into business ownership and the middle class. It was started in Michigan by a mom who had two sons she was ready to put to work. Her first franchisee was her daughter.

It has now grown to 220 franchisees, who have created 8,000 jobs.

38 percent of their franchisees began by working on a truck.

75 percent of Two Men and Truck managers began by working on a truck.

Successfully operating a franchise business is today one of the most important ways to climb the ladder of success.

The International Franchise Association estimates that every $1 million in lending to starting or growing franchisees creates 40 jobs.

Franchising has been a way for many women and minorities to jump into business ownership.

Women own or co-own nearly half of all franchise businesses.

Minorities own about 20 percent of all franchises.

Why would the NLRB want to cut off this business model, as well as the opportunity of millions of small, local subcontractors to work with larger companies?

The Protecting Local Business Opportunity Act (S. 2015) would roll back the NLRB ruling and reaffirm that an employer must exercise actual, direct and immediate control over essential terms and conditions of employment.

This is the commonsense standard that has been applied for decades.

We have 45 cosponsors on S. 2015 already, and 60 cosponsors on the House bill, including 3 House Democrats. I hope we will be able to add more.

This is an issue that is so important—I believe that Congress must act as soon as possible to stop this destructive policy change from damaging the middle class growth that has made this nation what it is today.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will agree.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING BOB WHEELER

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today we honor the life and service of Bob Wheeler, whose passing signifies a great loss to Nevada. I send my condolences and prayers to his wife, M.J., and all of Mr. Wheeler's family in this time of mourning. Mr. Wheeler was a man of great wisdom, committed to his family, his country, his State, and his community. He will be greatly missed.

Mr. Wheeler joined the U.S. Air Force in November of 1962, serving in the pararescue career field. Throughout his tenure, Mr. Wheeler remained

dedicated and worked his way up to chief of pararescue. He was recognized as a true innovator in his leadership position, opening the door for free-fall parachuting and combat tactics. He led by example, working diligently and earnestly to help those around him and to protect our country.

Mr. Wheeler is credited with saving 28 lives throughout his career, including vulnerable aviators who had crashed and distressed seamen in the Vietnam war. He was distinguished in his military decorations, which included the Distinguished Flying Cross for Valor, the Airman's Medal, numerous commendation medals, 17 Air Medals, and SEA services ribbons. During the Cold War, Mr. Wheeler participated in a high-risk scuba jump mission to save civilian lives. His courage and success throughout the mission earned him not only Yugoslavia's ''Nation's Life Saving Award'' but also the admiration of the Government and people of Yugoslavia. Mr. Wheeler retired from the U.S. Air Force in 1982. His accolades are well deserved, and his bravery in achieving them will never be forgotten.

I had the pleasure of working with Mr. Wheeler personally, as he served on my Northern Nevada Veterans Advisory Council. We worked as a team, along with the rest of the council, to help improve resources for Nevada's veteran community. Mr. Wheeler had a vast understanding of Nevada's tight-knit veteran community and was always there to take a stand for those who served. His firsthand knowledge of combat and veterans needs could never be replicated—he was one of a kind, and I am thankful to have had him as an ally in helping Nevada's veterans.

I extend my deepest sympathies to M.J. and all of Mr. Wheeler's family. We will always remember him for his courageous contributions to the United States of America. His service to his country and dedication to his family and community earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation. His legacy of unwavering bravery and genuine compassion will live on for years to come.

Throughout his life, Mr. Wheeler maintained a dedication to keeping this great Nation safe and to helping Nevada's veteran community. I am honored to commend his many contributions and achievements. His patriotism and drive will never be forgotten. Today, I join citizens across the Silver State in celebrating the life of an upstanding Nevadan, Bob Wheeler.●

REMEMBERING HAROLD CASKEY

● Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I wish to honor Harold Caskey, a former Missouri State senator of Butler in Bates County, MO, with whom I had the great pleasure of serving in the Missouri General Assembly. Harold was one of Missouri's most influential legislators. Harold was known by many as ''the old lion''—a reference to his doggedness in debating. A dedicated public servant, Harold will be remembered for his love of family, his community in western and west central Missouri, and the State. Harold was blind, but he never let this prevent him from succeeding. Harold was a whip smart, strategic, loyal and hard-working man who conquered adversity. The State of Missouri has lost a special man, and he will be greatly missed and never duplicated.

Harold was born in Hume, MO, in 1938. During childhood, Harold became legally blind due to a genetic condition, but this did not prevent him from being a stellar student and becoming his high school's senior class valedictorian. He attended Central Missouri State University at Warrensburg, now the University of Central Missouri, where he graduated magna cum laude with dual majors in psychology and sociology. He then earned his law degree at the University of Missouri-Columbia, where he was elected to the Order of the Coif.

After earning his law degree, Harold started practicing law in the office of former Missouri State Senator William Cason in Clinton. In 1965, Harold started his own law practice in Butler. He was elected prosecutor for Bates County in 1967 and served three terms, ending in 1973. Harold continued his public service by serving as the city attorney for the communities of Butler and Rich Hill from 1973 to 1976. Harold was also an assistant professor in law enforcement and business education at Northeast Missouri State University, now Truman State University, in Kirksville.

Harold began his tenure in the Missouri Senate after winning election in 1976 and served for 28 years before retiring in 2004 due to newly enacted term limits. He was chairman of the Senate Civil and Criminal Jurisprudence Committee and the Senate Ethics Committee and vice chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. In the Missouri Senate, he was a tireless advocate for rural public education and sponsored influential public school laws, such as the 1993 Outstanding Schools Act, which significantly increased state public school funding and mandated higher school standards. As a member of the Missouri Commission on Performance, Harold advised the State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education on education reform and school finance. Harold had great influence over Missouri's criminal justice laws by increasing sentences for the most violent and, at the end of his term, sponsoring a sentencing reform bill that reduced some sentences for less serious offenders. He was also a passionate leader and advocate for the visually impaired and disabled. Harold served as vice chairman of the Missouri State Capitol Commission until his passing.

Harold received numerous honors for his legislative accomplishments, including recognitions from the Missouri Planning Council for Developmental Disabilities, the Public Telecommunications Association of Missouri, the Missouri Deputy Sheriffs Association, the Judicial Conference of Missouri, the Missouri Association of Counties, the Missouri Association of Pharmacists, the Missouri Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, the Missouri Cable Television Association, the Missouri Crime Commission, the Missouri Police Chiefs' Association, the American Business Women's Association, and the Cooperating School Districts of Suburban Kansas City.

Outside his work as an elected official, Harold's dedication to his community was passionate and unselfish as he served in countless ways, including as a member of the Rotary Club of Butler, the Missouri Bar Association, the Crescent Hill Masonic Lodge No. 368 A.F. and A.M., the Scottish Rite of Free Masonry in the Valley of Orient in Kansas City, MO, and the Ararat Shrine. He was also an honorary fellow of the Harry S. Truman Library Institute for National and International Affairs, a member of the Bates County Memorial Hospital Board of Trustees, and a member of Butler First Baptist Church.

Harold is survived by his wife, Kay; son, Kyle; sister, Velma Elaine May; and brothers, Robert, Leon, and Ray Lee. I witnessed firsthand his strong leadership and tenacious commitment to issues he cared about. I am grateful for the wisdom, knowledge, and lessons Harold shared with me. He made me a better legislator and public servant. While one might have seen Harold as intimidating or stern, he was secretly a sweet softie—kind and gentle.

I am deeply saddened by his passing and join his family and friends in reflecting on his many life accomplishments. Harold touched the lives of many and will be remembered as an invaluable public servant to the State of Missouri and an inspiration to all.

I ask that the Senate join me in honoring Harold Caskey.●

(At the request of Mr. LEE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

RECOGNIZING THE TAMPA BAY ESTUARY PROGRAM

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize and commend the Tampa Bay Estuary Program and its historic milestone in exceeding a 23-year goal by restoring more than 40,000 acres of sea grass in Tampa Bay. This outstanding accomplishment represents the great collaborative work to restore one of the greatest treasures this Nation has to offer, Florida's Gulf Coast. The improved estuary will have an immeasurable impact on the future of the State's environment and economy.

Since its establishment in 1991, the Tampa Bay Estuary Program has partnered with the Southwest Florida Water Management District and other state and local municipalities and local

businesses to restore and protect Florida's largest open water estuary. As the Tampa Bay region is home to a population of more than 2 million people, this valuable estuary serves as a diverse ecosystem for plant and wildlife and is an economic driver for the region.

After decades of voluntary effort, I am proud to learn how successful the Tampa Bay Estuary Program was in its environmental restoration by exceeding its original goal in recovering seagrass, to improve fish and wildlife populations, and to maintain the highest quality of water since the 1950s. From 2012 until 2014, the Tampa Bay Estuary Program's efforts were able to restore 5,000 acres of life-sustaining underwater grasses in Tampa Bay, which now total 40,295 acres of seagrasses. This amount significantly surpasses its original goal set in 1995 of harboring 38,000 acres.

Although Tampa and its surrounding cities have seen an increase in population since 1950, the Tampa Bay Estuary Program's Nitrogen Management Consortium, which includes local governments and agencies supporting voluntary environmental recovery, has invested over $500 million since the 1990s. The strategy developed by the Consortium continues to set standards that could serve as a model for and be implemented across the nation in other estuary recovery programs.

I am proud that the Tampa Bay Estuary Program aided in recovering sea grass in Florida's Tampa Bay. I whole heartedly commend the Tampa Bay Estuary Program on its accomplishments over the past 23 years and wish it further success in its continued endeavors to protect our natural resources.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:35 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3192. An act 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.

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 Minority Leader appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Care: Ms. Lucretia M. McClenney of Locust Grove, Virginia.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 2165. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to permanently authorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 2169. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to extend the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 8, 2015, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 986. An act 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.

S. 1300. An act to amend the section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide relief for adoptive families from immigrant visa fees in certain situations.

S. 2078. An act to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–3085. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Trans-1,3,3, 3-tetrafluoroprop-1-ene; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9934–74–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3086. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Dimethyl sulfoxide; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9934–17–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3087. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Cellulose Carboxymethyl Ether, Potassium Salt; Tolerance Exemption'' (FRL No. 9934–45–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3088. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Butanedioc Acid, 2-Methylene, Homopolmer, Sodium Salt; Inert Ingredient Tolerance Exemption'' (FRL No. 9933–74–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3089. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fee Increases for Overtime Services'' (Docket No. APHIS–2009–0047) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3090. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Importation of Tomato Plantlets in Approved Growing Media From Mexico'' ((RIN0579–AE06) (Docket No. APHIS–2014–0099)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3091. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Golden Nematode; Removal of Regulated Areas in Orleans, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties, New York'' (Docket No. APHIS–2015–0040) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3092. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3093. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Promulgation of NCUA Rules and Regulations'' (RIN3133–AE45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3094. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment—Part 747'' (RIN3133–AE56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3095. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3096. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, with respect to Sudan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3097. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3098. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3099. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances'' ((RIN2070–AB27) (FRL No. 9933–30)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3100. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District, Feather River Air Quality Management District, and San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District; Correcting Amendment'' (FRL No. 9931–19–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3101. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District'' (FRL No. 9934–04–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3102. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of Air Quality Implementation Plan; California; Feather River Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits'' (FRL No. 9933–52–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3103. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances'' ((RIN2020–AA47) (FRL No. 9930–70–OECA)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3104. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances'' ((RIN2060–AQ92) (FRL No. 9934–16–OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3105. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri, Limited Maintenance Plan for the St. Louis Nonclassifiable Maintenance Area for the 8-Hour Carbon Monoxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard'' (FRL No. 9934–98–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3106. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead NAAQS'' (FRL No. 9934–84–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3107. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Dakota; Revisions to South Dakota Administrative Code'' (FRL No. 9934–83–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3108. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Redesignation Request and Associated Maintenance Plan for the Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standard'' (FRL No. 9934–82–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3109. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Approval of Regulations Limiting Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds and Nitrogen Oxides'' (FRL No. 9932–12–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3110. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Adoption of Control Techniques Guidelines for Metal Furniture Coatings and Miscellaneous Metal Parts Coatings'' (FRL No. 9934–92–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3111. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; 2011 Base Year Inventories for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard for New Castle and Sussex Counties'' (FRL No. 9934–81–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3112. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Approval of the Base Year Emissions Inventory for the Liberty-Clairton Nonattainment Area for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standard and Approval of Transportation Conformity Insignificance Findings for the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standards for the Liberty-Clairton Nonattainment Area'' (FRL No. 9934–91–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3113. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Volatile Organic Compounds Definition'' (FRL No. 9934–11–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3114. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; California; Mammoth Lakes; Redesignation; PM10 Maintenance Plan'' (FRL No. 9935–05–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3115. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2008 Lead, and 2010 NO_2 Nation Ambient Air Quality Standards; North Dakota'' (FRL No. 9935–15–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3116. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the Minor New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Portable Facilities'' (FRL No. 9935–04–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3117. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky: New Sources in or Impacting Nonattainment Areas'' (FRL No. 9935–22–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3118. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead NAAQS'' (FRL No. 9935–19–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3119. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9935–24–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3120. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama; Infrastructure

Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9935–21–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3121. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Sulfur Content of Fuels'' (FRL No. 9935–31–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3122. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Maine; General Permit Regulations for Nonmetallic Mineral Processing Plants and Concrete Batch Plants'' (FRL No. 9935–33–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3123. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of New Reactors, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Quality Assurance Program Description—Design Certification, Early Site Permit and New License Applicants'' (NUREG–0800, Chapter 17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3124. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of Social Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of Continuing Disability Reviews for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3125. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Request for Comments on Definitions of Section 48 Property'' (Notice 2015–70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3126. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2015 Marginal Production Rates'' (Notice 2015–65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3127. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2015 Section 43 Inflation Adjustment'' (Notice 2015–64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3128. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Import Restrictions on Certain Categories of Archaeological Material From the Pre-Hispanic Cultures of the Republic of Nicaragua'' (RIN1515–AE05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3129. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Electronic Health Record Incentive Program—Stage 3 and Modifications to Meaningful Use in 2015 through 2017'' (RIN0938–AS26 and RIN0938–AS58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3130. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–032); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3131. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Replacement Period for Livestock Sold on Account of Drought'' (Notice 2015–69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 1, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3132. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reliance Standards for Making Good Faith Determinations'' ((RIN1545–BL23) (TD 9740)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 1 , 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3133. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at Hooker Electrochemical Corporation in Niagara Falls, New York, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3134. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Listing of Color Additives Exempt from Certification; Mica-Based Pearlescent Pigments'' (Docket No. FDA–2015–C–1154) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3135. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3136. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2015 Edition Health Information Technology (Health IT) Certification Criteria, 2015 Edition Base Electronic Health Record (EHR) Definition, and ONC Health IT Certification Program Modifications'' (RIN0991–AB93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3137. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Statistical Programs of the United States Government: Fiscal Year 2016''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3138. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) Filings for Electronic Entry/Entry Summary (Cargo Release and Related Entry)'' (RIN1515–AE03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3139. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to expenditures from the Pershing Hall Revolving Fund for fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–3140. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting proposed legislation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3141. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technology Transitions, Policies and Rules Governing Retirement of Copper Loops by Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Special Access for Price Cap Local Exchange Carriers, AT and T Corporation Petition for Rulemaking to Reform Regulation of Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier Rates for Interstate Special Access Services'' ((RIN3060–AK32) (FCC 15–97)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3142. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Gray Triggerfish; July Through December Season'' (RIN0648–XE004) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3143. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fisheries; 2016 Fishing Quotas for Atlantic Surfclams and Ocean Quahogs; and Suspension of Minimum Atlantic Surfclam Size Limit'' (RIN0648–XE164) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3144. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XE203) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3145. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer'' (RIN0648–XE096) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3146. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries'' (RIN0648–XE095) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3147. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XE183) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3148. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial and Recreational Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions No. 22 through No. 29'' (RIN0648–XE121) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3149. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer'' (RIN0648–XE162) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3150. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XE152) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3151. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Resources of the South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction'' (RIN0648–XE126) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3152. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XE170) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3153. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No . FAA–2014–0455)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3154. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No . FAA–2015–0926)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3155. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No . FAA–2015–0085)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3156. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No . FAA–2014–0753)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3157. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No . FAA–2015–0242)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3158. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0673)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3159. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0523)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3160. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0777)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3161. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0194)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3162. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0127)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3163. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–1071)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3164. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0126)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3165. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0245)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3166. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0772)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3167. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0823)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3168. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0822)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3169. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0583)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3170. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes''

((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0676)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3171. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–1050)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3172. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0680)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3173. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–1044)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3174. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Vulcanair S.p.A. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0656)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3175. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (Embraer) Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0586)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3176. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–2047)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3177. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; GE Aviation Czech s.r.o. Turboprop Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0625)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3178. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; CFM International S.A. Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0277)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3179. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Martin Corporation/Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0779)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3180. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls Royce plc Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0363)) received during adjournment in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3181. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshaft Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0900)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3182. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Canada Corp. Turboprop Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–1130)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3183. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class C Airspace; Burbank, CA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0690)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3184. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Aurora, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–1070)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3185. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tracy, CA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1623)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3186. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tracy, CA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1623)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3187. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Douglas, WY'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1089)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3188. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Portland, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1137)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3189. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace, Delta, CO'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0343)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3190. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Iron Mountain, MI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1871)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3191. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Newberry, MI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1869)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3192. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (33); Amdt. No. 3657'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3193. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (73);

Amdt. No. 3658'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3194. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (76); Amdt. No. 3659'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3195. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (120); Amdt. No. 3660'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3196. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 522'' (RIN2120–AA63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3197. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Jet Route J–513; North Central United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–3601)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3198. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–3375)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–77. A communication from a citizen of the State of South Dakota memorializing the State of South Dakota's petition to the United States Congress calling for a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing a federal balanced budget amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment and an amendment to the title:

S. 1864. A bill to improve national security by developing metrics to measure the effectiveness of security between ports of entry, at points of entry, and along the maritime border (Rept. No. 114–152).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 322. A bill 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. A bill 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. A bill 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. A bill 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. A bill 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. A bill 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. A bill 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.

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

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.

S. Res. 274. A resolution commemorating the 25th anniversary of the peaceful and democratic reunification of Germany.

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.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with amendments:

S. 1811. A bill 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. 2126. A bill to reauthorize the women's business center program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Julie Furuta-Toy, of Wyoming, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Equatorial Guinea.

Nominee: Julie Furuta-Toy.

Post: Malabo, Equatorial Guinea.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: Steven M. Toy: None.
3. Children and Spouses: Eliot C. Toy: None; Sarah C. Toy: None.
4. Parents: Emi K. Furuta: $200, 2010, Democratic National Committee; $200, 2011, Democratic National Committee; $150, 2011, Barack Obama Presidential Campaign; $200, 2012, Democratic National Committee; $200, 2012, Barack Obama Presidential Campaign; $200, 2012, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; $200, 2013, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; None, 2014; Tokuji Furuta: Deceased.
5. Grandparents: Deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Richard K. Furuta and Ellen Ratoosh: None; Kenneth R. Furuta: None.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Joy E. Furuta: None; Lucy J. Furuta: None, 2010; $65.50, 2011, Barack Obama Presidential Campaign; $100, 2012, Barack Obama Presidential Campaign; None, 2013; None, 2014.

---

*Dennis B. Hankins, of Minnesota, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea.

Nominee: Dennis Bruce Hankins.

Post: Conakry, Republic of Guinea.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: None.
3. Children and Spouses: Danu Hankins (s): None.
4. Parents: Father—D. Bruce Hankins (deceased): None; Mother—Margie Gough (deceased): None; Step-Father—Rod Gough (deceased): None; Step-Father—Russell Sawdey (deceased): None; Step-Mother—Ini Hankins (no contact): Unknown.
5. Grandparents: None living.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Brother—Knute Hankins and Ann: None; Half-Brother—Tim Hankins (no contact): Unknown; Half-Brother—Damien Hankins (no contact): Unknown; Step Brother—Steve Sawdey and Deana: None; Step Brother—Stuart Sawdey: None; Step Brother—Stanton Sawdey and Mary: None; Step Brother—David Gough (no contact): Unknown.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Step Sister—Sharon Valdez and Gil: Less than $100, 2010, Sen Patty Murray; Step Sister—Susan Whalen and Dan: None; Step Sister—Nancy Hayes (no contact): Unknown; Step Sister—MaryAnn Yamaguchi (no contact): Unknown; Step Sister—Linda Starkenburg (no contact): Unknown; Step sister—Patty Gough (no contact): Unknown.

---

*Harry K. Thomas, Jr., of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zimbabwe.

Nominee: Harry K. Thomas Jr.

Post: Harare.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I

have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $100, 10/2012, Obama Re-election.
2. Spouse: None.
3. Children and Spouses: Mithi I. Aquino-Thomas: None; Casey M.E. Thomas: None; Nathan Rowe: None; Emmanuel Ticzon: None; Zoe Ticzon: None.
4. Parents: Harry K. Thomas, Sr.—Deceased; Hildonia M. Thomas: None.
5. Grandparents: Frank Thomas—Deceased; Mary Thomas—Deceased; Charles McClary—Deceased; Merie McClary—Deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: I do not have any brothers.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Nelda T. Canada: $200, 3/2012, Obama Re-election; Daniel Canada, None.

---

*Robert Porter Jackson, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.

Nominee: Robert Porter Jackson.

Post: Republic of Ghana.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: none.
3. Children and Spouses Names: Babette Pollard Jackson (spouse): none.
4. Parents Names: Barbara Buchanan Jackson (deceased): none; Francis Marion Jackson, Jr. (deceased): none.
5. Grandparents Names: Francis Marion Jackson, Sr. (deceased): none; Nancy Melvina Winchester Jackson (deceased): none; ArthurPer Buchanan (deceased): none; Addie Vaughn Porter Buchanan (deceased): none.
6. Brothers and Spouses Names: Brother Francis Marion Jackson III: $200, 09/28/2010, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; $100, 11/16/2010, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; $1,000, 09/21/2010, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; $2,000, 10/15/2010, Maine Democratic State Committee; $1,000, 03/11/2012, Obama VictoFund 2012; $1,000, 11/02/2012, Obama VictoFund 2012; $1,500, 09/06/2012, Obama for America; $1,500, 10/17/2012, Obama for America; $300, 09/21/2014, Troy Jackson for Congress. Sister-in-law Ellen Rogers Jackson: $175, 04/29/10, Act Blue; $8.75, 04/29/10, Act Blue; $500, 06/10/2014, Shenna Bellows for Senate.
7. Sisters and Spouses Names: Nancy Vaughan Jackson Gronbeck (deceased): none; David Gronbeck: none.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Edward L. Gilmore, of Illinois, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Illinois for the term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committed of the Senate.

(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 Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 2165. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to permanently authorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund; read the first time.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2166. A bill to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure that mental health screenings and assessments are provided to children and youth upon entry into foster care; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 2167. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (popularly referred to as the Buy American Act) and certain other laws with respect to certain waivers under those laws, to provide greater transparency regarding exceptions to domestic sourcing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

S. 2168. A bill to encourage greater community accountability of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 2169. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to extend the Land and Water Conservation Fund; read the first time.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2170. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the ability of health care professionals to treat veterans through the use of telemedicine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2171. A bill to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2172. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for consumers against excessive, unjustified, or unfairly discriminatory increases in premium rates; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 2173. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to mental health services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2174. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the preparation of career and technical education teachers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 2175. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the role of podiatrists in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. KING):

S. 2176. A bill to expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2177. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Medgar Evers House, located in Jackson, Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 2178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent certain provisions of the Heartland, Habitat, Harvest, and Horticulture Act of 2008 relating to timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 2179. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into certain agreements with non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care providers if the Secretary is not feasibly able to provide health care in facilities of the Department or through contracts or sharing agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. COONS):

S. 2180. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. Res. 282. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of American Diabetes Month; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. HELLER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. KIRK):

S. Res. 283. A resolution designating October 2015 as ''Filipino American History Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. Res. 284. A resolution recognizing the importance of mental health globally and highlighting the contributions and value of mental health, psychosocial support, and human capacity, particularly in development contexts and humanitarian settings; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 285. A resolution commemorating the life and accomplishments of Robert Edward Simon, Jr; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr.

REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. Res. 286. A resolution designating the week beginning on October 11, 2015, as ''National Wildlife Refuge Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. Res. 287. A resolution condemning the senseless murder and wounding of 18 individuals (sons, daughters, fathers, mothers, uncles, aunts, cousins, students, and teachers) in Roseburg, Oregon, on October 1, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 248

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 248, a bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to safeguard data stored abroad from improper government access, and for other purposes.

S. 571

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 571, a bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 613

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 624

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 624, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 799

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 799, a bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

S. 812

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 812, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1014

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1014, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 1252

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1252, a bill to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes.

S. 1378

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1378, a bill to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

S. 1460

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1460, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the Yellow Ribbon G.I. Education Enhancement Program to cover recipients of the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry scholarship, and for other purposes.

S. 1555

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor 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. 1562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1562, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 1617

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1617, a bill to prevent Hizballah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1641

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1641, a bill to improve the use by the Department of Veterans Affairs of opioids in treating veterans, to improve patient advocacy by the Department, and to expand availability of complementary and integrative health, and for other purposes.

S. 1651

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1651, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1676

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1676, a bill to increase the number of graduate medical education positions treating veterans, to improve the compensation of health care providers, medical directors, and directors of Veterans Integrated Service Networks of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1711

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1711, a bill 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.

S. 1714

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1714, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the Multiemployer Health Benefit Plan and the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1754

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1754, a bill 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, and for other purposes.

S. 1766

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1766, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual

orientation of the member, and for other purposes.

S. 1833

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1833, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the child and adult care food program.

S. 1870

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1870, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to carry out a pilot program on issuing grants to eligible veterans to start or acquire qualifying businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1890

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1890, a bill to amend chapter 90 of title 18, United States Code, to provide Federal jurisdiction for the theft of trade secrets, and for other purposes.

S. 1913

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1913, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish programs to prevent prescription drug abuse under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2013

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2013, a bill 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 for other purposes.

S. 2021

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors 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. 2066

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2066, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

S. 2067

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2067, a bill to establish EUREKA Prize Competitions to accelerate discovery and development of disease-modifying, preventive, or curative treatments for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia, to encourage efforts to enhance detection and diagnosis of such diseases, or to enhance the quality and efficiency of care of individuals with such diseases.

S. 2123

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2123, a bill to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2142

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 2146

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 2148

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 2148, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prevent an increase in the Medicare part B premium and deductible in 2016.

S. 2152

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2152, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to encourage the efforts of countries in sub-Saharan Africa to develop and appropriate mix of power solutions, including renewable energy, for more broadly distributed electricity access in order to support poverty reduction, promote development outcomes, and drive economic growth, and for other purposes.

S. 2161

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2161, a bill to provide for the adjustment of status of certain nationals of Liberia to that of lawful permanent residents and for other purposes.

S. RES. 148

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) 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.

S. RES. 261

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 261, a resolution designating the week of October 11 through October 17, 2015, as ''National Case Management Week'' to recognize the role of case management in improving health care outcomes for patients.

S. RES. 274

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 274, a resolution commemorating the 25th anniversary of the peaceful and democratic reunification of Germany.

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 274, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 2626

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2626 intended to be proposed to S. 754, an original bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2171. A bill to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleagues Senator RON JOHNSON, Senator TIM SCOTT, and Senator CORY BOOKER to introduce the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, bipartisan legislation to extend the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program.

I am a long-time supporter of this important program, which provides low-income students residing in the District of Columbia the opportunity to improve academically by attending a private school of their choice.

Without this platform, D.C.'s most disadvantaged students would not have access to a high-quality education, including smaller class sizes and effective curriculum. That is not right. All

students should have the same opportunity to learn and thrive.

The Opportunity Scholarship is a successful and transformative program. It has shown promising results in raising student achievement. According to data released by the program administrator for the 2014–2015 school year, 90 percent of scholarship students graduated from high school and 88 percent of those graduates are enrolled in a 2- or 4-year college or university. The Opportunity Scholarship Program's graduation rate is more than 30 percentage points higher than D.C. Public Schools' rate, which stands at only 58 percent, well below the national average of 81 percent.

For the 2015–2016 school year, there were more than 8,500 names on waiting lists at D.C. charter schools, an 18 percent increase over last year. This shows the demand for high-quality education in this city and unfortunately, the shortage to meet that demand.

I have worked on this legislation with my House colleague, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, for many years. I also had my staff visit schools and talk to administrators and parents about ways to improve the program so that it can fully meet the goal of providing a better education to low-income families in the District's lowest-performing schools.

I am pleased that this legislation strengthens the program by requiring participating schools to acquire and maintain accreditation, and by ensuring that an evaluation study truly assess the effectiveness of the scholarship, including how it affects academic achievement for scholarship recipients.

I am pleased that Senators JOHNSON, SCOTT and BOOKER have joined me as original cosponsors of this bill. I remain fully committed to the success of the program, and I believe this reauthorization bill makes critical improvements to ensure that scholarships continue to transform the lives of the District's most vulnerable students.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2172. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for consumers against excessive, unjustified, or unfairly discriminatory increases in premium rates; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, great progress has been made in improving oversight of health insurance companies, holding them accountable for how premium dollars are spent, and increasing access to affordable health insurance. Even so, there is still work to be done to protect consumers from unreasonable and excessive health insurance rate increases.

Through the Affordable Care Act, health insurance rate increases greater than 10 percent must be publicly posted and include an explanation for the increase. The increases are reviewed by States, and the Federal Government steps in when States opt out from participating in the review process.

This is a good first step, which has helped reduce increases, but it isn't enough. The enforcement authority to block or modify unreasonable rate increases is key to providing strong consumer protection.

In 2011, 43 percent of requested rate increases for health insurance rates on the individual market were larger than 10 percent. In 2013, 25 percent of plans had an increase greater than 10 percent.

This shows progress, but not enough. Health insurance companies can still get away with putting profits before patients. Affordability of health insurance is vital in continuing to decrease the number of uninsured Americans, and to ensure that families can access coverage.

Currently, 13 States still have little or no authority to block or modify excessive rate increases in the individual and small group markets. Even when regulators in these States find an increase to be unreasonable and unjustified, they have no ability to block or modify the increase.

The Protecting Consumers from Unreasonable Rates Act creates a Federal fallback option for States currently lacking this authority. This will protect consumers regardless of the State they live in, and improve accountability for insurance companies attempting to raise premium prices without adequate justification.

This solution is simple: in States where the insurance regulator does not have or use authority to block unreasonable rate increases, the Secretary of Health and Human Services can do so.

In some States, like California, companies are not required to get prior authorization for rate increases to go into effect. California insurance regulators with the Department of Insurance and Department of Managed Care review rates, but when they find rate increases to be unjustified and unreasonable, they have no authority to stop or adjust the price increases.

Just a few months ago, Aetna raised rates for a small business plan that, on average, was an increase of 21 percent and affected approximately 13,000 people. The California Department of Managed Care had found the increase to be unreasonable, but couldn't stop it from going into effect.

In many States we can already see that this type of authority is working, and this bill doesn't interfere at all with what they are doing.

For example, in New York, insurers requested an average of a 13.5 percentage increase for 2016 premiums. Regulators disagreed and reduced the increase by nearly half, so consumers in that State will see a 7.1 percent increase instead.

In Connecticut, a UnitedHealthcare plan wanted to raise rates by 12.4 percent for 2016. After regulators reviewed the request, they approved a 5.5 percent increase instead. For one plan in the State offered by ConnectiCare, a small increase was denied and consumers will actually see a reduction in their premiums for 2016.

Regulators in Vermont reduced the increase that 65,000 residents of the State would have faced in 2016—the proposed hike was 8.6 percent and the approved rate increase was 5.9 percent.

Any unreasonable rate increase that perpetuates year after year is unacceptable, and makes a big impact on a family's budget.

All consumers deserve to have fully effective health insurance rate review and enforcement. This bill closes the final gap in this process and ensures that these protections are available for the entire country.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Protecting Consumers from Unreasonable Rates Act.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2174. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the preparation of career and technical education teachers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, in today's increasingly competitive global economy, America's success will depend on the talent of its workforce. In cultivating the workforce necessary to succeed, we need to look at ways to expand opportunities for students, and refocus our Nation's education strategy to meet the demands of the industry in the 21st century. Career and technical education, CTE, programs play a vital role in increasing student engagement, continuing our nation's economic competitiveness, and building the skills of our country's workforce.

We are beginning to see a renaissance of student interest in career and technical education, but school districts across the Nation are facing critical shortages in high-quality CTE teachers. While the Higher Education and Opportunity Act of 2008 provides grants for teacher residency partnership programs to colleges and universities who work with high-needs school districts to train prospective teachers, no CTE-focused partnerships exist.

That is why I am introducing with my colleagues, Senator BALDWIN, Senator PORTMAN and Senator CAPITO the Creating Quality Technical Educators Act, which would create a CTE teacher-training grant partnership to give aspiring CTE teachers the experience necessary to mirror their success in the business world with that in the classroom. This legislation would foster teacher training partnerships between high-needs secondary schools and post-secondary institutions to create a 1-year residency initiative for teachers and includes teacher mentorship for a minimum of 2 years. When CTE teachers have work experience in a related industry before entering the classroom, students not only

benefit from their hands-on knowledge, but also look to them as career models.

The Creating Quality Technical Educators Act would amend the Higher Education and Opportunity Act to give aspiring CTE teachers real-world experience and develop credible skills to apply in the classroom. This bipartisan bill takes a proactive approach to recruiting and training more high-quality CTE teachers. In addition to mid-career professionals in related technical fields, CTE teacher residencies would target teacher candidates who are recent college graduates, veterans, and currently licensed teachers with a need for technical skills training who seek to become transition into CTE fields.

As co-chair of the Senate CTE Caucus, I am proud to introduce this commonsense, bipartisan legislation to recruit and train talented teachers to meet the rising need for CTE. The Creating Quality Technical Educators Act takes an important step to ensure students in communities of all sizes have access to high-quality CTE teachers and career-training programs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. KING):

S. 2176. A bill to expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. 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. 2176

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 ''Affordable College Textbook Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The high cost of college textbooks continues to be a barrier for many students in achieving higher education.

(2) According to the College Board, during the 2014-2015 academic year, the average student budget for college books and supplies at 4-year public institutions of higher education was $1,225.

(3) The Government Accountability Office found that new textbook prices increased 82 percent between 2002 and 2012 and that although Federal efforts to increase price transparency have provided students and families with more and better information, more must be done to address rising costs.

(4) The growth of the Internet has enabled the creation and sharing of digital content, including open educational resources that can be freely used by students, teachers, and members of the public.

(5) Using open educational resources in place of traditional materials in large-enrollment college courses can reduce textbook costs by 80 to 100 percent.

(6) Federal investment in expanding the use of open educational resources could significantly lower college textbook costs and reduce financial barriers to higher education, while making efficient use of taxpayer funds.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE.—The term ''educational resource'' means an educational material that can be used in postsecondary instruction, including textbooks and other written or audiovisual works.

(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(3) OPEN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE.—The term ''open educational resource'' means an educational resource that either is in the public domain or is made available under a permanent copyright license to the public to freely adapt, distribute, and otherwise use the work with attribution to the author as designated.

(4) OPEN TEXTBOOK.—The term ''open textbook'' means an open educational resource or set of open educational resources that either is a textbook or can be used in place of a textbook for a postsecondary course at an institution of higher education.

(5) RELEVANT FACULTY.—The term ''relevant faculty'' means both tenure track and contingent faculty members who may be involved in the creation of open educational resources or the use of open educational resources created as part of the grant application.

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Education.

SEC. 4. GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From the amounts appropriated under subsection (i), the Secretary shall make grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities to support pilot programs that expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students.

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this section, the term ''eligible entity'' means an institution of higher education or group of institutions of higher education.

(c) APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity desiring a grant under this section, after consultation with relevant faculty, shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall include a description of the project to be completed with grant funds and—

(A) a plan for promoting and tracking the use of open textbooks in postsecondary courses offered by the eligible entity, including an estimate of the projected savings that will be achieved for students;

(B) a plan for evaluating, before creating new open educational resources, whether existing open educational resources could be used or adapted for the same purpose;

(C) a plan for quality review and review of accuracy of any open educational resources to be created or adapted through the grant;

(D) a plan for disseminating information about the results of the project to institutions of higher education outside of the eligible entity, including promoting the adoption of any open textbooks created or adapted through the grant; and

(E) a statement on consultation with relevant faculty, including those engaged in the creation of open educational resources, in the development of the application.

(d) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give special consideration to applications that demonstrate the greatest potential to—

(1) achieve the highest level of savings for students through sustainable expanded use of open textbooks in postsecondary courses offered by the eligible entity;

(2) expand the use of open textbooks at institutions of higher education outside of the eligible entity; and

(3) produce—

(A) the highest quality open textbooks;

(B) open textbooks that can be most easily utilized and adapted by faculty members at institutions of higher education;

(C) open textbooks that correspond to the highest enrollment courses at institutions of higher education; and

(D) open textbooks created or adapted in partnership with entities, including campus bookstores, that will assist in marketing and distribution of the open textbook.

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant funds to carry out any of the following activities to expand the use of open textbooks:

(1) Professional development for any faculty and staff members at institutions of higher education, including the search for and review of open textbooks.

(2) Creation or adaptation of open educational resources, especially open textbooks.

(3) Development or improvement of tools and informational resources that support the use of open textbooks.

(4) Research evaluating the efficacy of the use of open textbooks for achieving savings for students.

(5) Partnerships with other entities, including other institutions of higher education, for-profit organizations, or nonprofit organizations, to carry out any of the activities described in paragraphs (1) through (4).

(f) LICENSE.—Educational resources created under subsection (e) shall be licensed under a non-exclusive, permanent license to the public to exercise any of the rights under copyright conditioned only on the requirement that attribution be given as directed by the copyright owner.

(g) ACCESS AND DISTRIBUTION.—The full and complete digital content of each educational resource created or adapted under subsection (e) shall be made available free of charge to the public—

(1) on an easily accessible and interoperable website, which shall be identified to the Secretary by the eligible entity; and

(2) in a machine readable, digital format that anyone can directly download, edit with attribution, and redistribute.

(h) REPORT.—Upon an eligible entity's completion of a project supported under this section, the eligible entity shall prepare and submit a report to the Secretary regarding—

(1) the effectiveness of the pilot program in expanding the use of open textbooks and in achieving savings for students;

(2) the impact of the pilot program on expanding the use of open textbooks at institutions of higher education outside of the eligible entity;

(3) educational resources created or adapted under the grant, including instructions on where the public can access each educational resource under the terms of subsection (g); and

(4) all project costs, including the value of any volunteer labor and institutional capital used for the project.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. PRICE INFORMATION.

Section 133(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1015b(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (6); and

(2) in paragraph (9);

(A) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

(B) by striking ''a college textbook that—'' and inserting ''a college textbook that may include printed materials, computer disks, website access, and electronically distributed materials.''.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that institutions of higher education should encourage the consideration of open textbooks by faculty within the generally accepted principles of academic freedom that establishes the right and responsibility of faculty members, individually and collectively, to select course materials that are pedagogically most appropriate for their classes.

SEC. 7. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives detailing—

(1) the open textbooks created or adapted under this Act;

(2) the adoption of such open textbooks; and

(3) the savings generated for students, States, and the Federal Government through the use of open textbooks.

SEC. 8. GAO REPORT.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives on the cost of textbooks to students at institutions of higher education. The report shall particularly examine—

(1) the change of the cost of textbooks;

(2) the factors that have contributed to the change of the cost of textbooks;

(3) the extent to which open textbooks are used at institutions of higher education; and

(4) the impact of open textbooks on the cost of textbooks.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 282—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF AMERICAN DIABETES MONTH

Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 282

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (referred to in this preamble as the ''CDC''), in the United States—

(1) nearly 30,000,000 individuals have diabetes; and

(2) an estimated 86,000,000 individuals aged 20 years and older have prediabetes;

Whereas diabetes is a serious chronic condition that affects individuals of every age, race, ethnicity, and income level;

Whereas the CDC reports that Hispanics, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans are disproportionately affected by diabetes and suffer from the disease at rates that are much higher than the general population of the United States;

Whereas according to the CDC, an individual aged 20 years or older is diagnosed with diabetes every 19 seconds;

Whereas approximately 4,660 individuals in the United States aged 20 years or older are diagnosed with diabetes each day;

Whereas the CDC estimates that approximately 1,700,000 individuals in the United States aged 20 years and older were newly diagnosed with diabetes in 2012;

Whereas a joint study carried out by the National Institutes of Health and the CDC found that in the United States during 2008 and 2009, an estimated 18,436 youth were newly diagnosed with type 1 diabetes and 5,089 youth were newly diagnosed with type 2 diabetes;

Whereas according to the CDC, the prevalence of diabetes in the United States increased by more than 300 percent between 1980 and 2010;

Whereas the CDC reports that 27.8 percent of individuals with diabetes in the United States have not been diagnosed with the disease;

Whereas in the United States, more than 12 percent of adults aged 20 years or older and 25.9 percent of individuals aged 65 years or older have diabetes;

Whereas as many as 1 in 3 adults in the United States will have diabetes in 2050 if the present trend continues;

Whereas after accounting for the difference of the average age of each population, data surveying individuals aged 20 years or older in the United States between 2010 and 2012 indicates that 7.6 percent of non-Hispanic whites, 13.2 percent of non-Hispanic blacks, 12.8 percent of Hispanics, and 9.0 percent of Asian Americans suffered from diagnosed diabetes;

Whereas after accounting for the difference of the average age of each population, data surveying Hispanic individuals aged 20 years or older in the United States between 2010 and 2012 indicates that 8.5 percent of individuals of Central and South American descent, 9.3 percent of individuals of Cuban descent, 13.9 percent of individuals of Mexican descent, and 14.8 percent of individuals of Puerto Rican descent suffered from diagnosed diabetes;

Whereas according to the American Diabetes Association, in 2012, the United States spent an estimated $245,000,000,000 on cases of diagnosed diabetes;

Whereas the American Diabetes Association reports that 20 percent of the funds that the United States spent on health care in 2012 went towards caring for individuals with diabetes;

Whereas a study carried out by Mathematica Policy Research found that total expenditures for individuals with diabetes receiving benefits under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) in fiscal year 2005 comprised 32.7 percent of the budget for the Medicare program in that fiscal year;

Whereas according to the CDC, in the United States in 2010, diabetes—

(1) was the seventh leading cause of death; and

(2) contributed to the death of more than 234,051 individuals;

Whereas as of November 2015, a cure for diabetes does not exist;

Whereas there are successful means to reduce the incidence and delay the onset of type 2 diabetes;

Whereas with proper management and treatment, individuals with diabetes live healthy, productive lives; and

Whereas individuals in the United States celebrate American Diabetes Month in November: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of American Diabetes Month, including—

(A) encouraging individuals in the United States to fight diabetes through public awareness of prevention and treatment options; and

(B) enhancing diabetes education;

(2) recognizes the importance of early detection, awareness of the symptoms, and understanding the risk factors of diabetes, including—

(A) being over the age of 45 years;

(B) having a specific racial and ethnic background;

(C) being overweight;

(D) having a low level of physical activity;

(E) having high blood pressure; and

(F) having a family history of diabetes or a history of diabetes during pregnancy; and

(3) supports decreasing the prevalence of type 1, type 2, and gestational diabetes in the United States through increased research, treatment, and prevention.

SENATE RESOLUTION 283—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 2015 AS ''FILIPINO AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH''

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. HELLER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. KIRK) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 283

Whereas the earliest documented Filipino presence in the continental United States was October 18, 1587, when the first ''Luzones Indios'' arrived in Morro Bay, California, on board the *Nuestra Senora de Esperanza*, a Manila-built galleon ship;

Whereas the Filipino American National Historical Society recognizes 1763 as the year in which the first permanent Filipino settlement in the United States was established in St. Malo, Louisiana;

Whereas the recognition of the first permanent Filipino settlement in the United States adds a new perspective to United States history by bringing attention to the economic, cultural, social, and other notable contributions made by Filipino Americans to the development of the United States;

Whereas, with a population of approximately 3,416,840 individuals, the Filipino American community is the second largest Asian American and Pacific Islander group in the United States;

Whereas from the Civil War to the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts, Filipino American servicemen and servicewomen have a longstanding history of serving in the Armed Forces;

Whereas 250,000 Filipinos fought under the United States flag during World War II to protect and defend the United States in the Pacific theater;

Whereas Filipino Americans continue to demonstrate a commendable sense of patriotism and honor;

Whereas 9 Filipino Americans have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force that can be bestowed on an individual serving in the Armed Forces;

Whereas the late Thelma Garcia Buchholdt, born in Claveria, Cagayan on the island of Luzon in the Philippines—

(1) moved with her family to Alaska in 1965;

(2) was elected to the House of Representatives of Alaska in 1974;

(3) was the first Filipino woman elected to a State legislature; and

(4) authored a comprehensive history book entitled ''Filipinos in Alaska: 1788-1958'';

Whereas Filipino American farmworkers and labor leaders such as Philip Vera Cruz

and Larry Itliong played an integral role in the multiethnic United Farm Workers movement alongside Cesar Chavez, Dolores Huerta, and other Latino workers;

Whereas Filipino Americans play an integral role in the United States healthcare system as nurses, doctors, and other medical professionals;

Whereas Filipino Americans have contributed greatly to music, dance, literature, education, business, journalism, sports, fashion, politics, government, science, technology, the fine arts, and other fields that enrich the landscape of the United States;

Whereas, as mandated in the mission statement of the Filipino American National Historical Society, efforts should continue to promote the study of Filipino American history and culture because the roles of Filipino Americans and other people of color have largely been overlooked in the writing, teaching, and learning of United States history;

Whereas it is imperative for Filipino American youth to have positive role models to instill in Filipino American youth—

(1) the significance of education, complemented by the richness of Filipino American ethnicity; and

(2) the value of the Filipino American legacy; and

Whereas Filipino American History Month is celebrated during the month of October 2015: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 2015 as ''Filipino American History Month'';

(2) recognizes the celebration of Filipino American History Month as—

(A) a study of the advancement of Filipino Americans;

(B) a time to reflect on and remember the many notable contributions that Filipino Americans have made to the United States; and

(C) a time to renew efforts toward the research and examination of history and culture so as to provide an opportunity for all people of the United States—

(i) to learn more about Filipino Americans; and

(ii) to appreciate the historic contributions of Filipino Americans to the United States; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to observe Filipino American History Month with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 284—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF MENTAL HEALTH GLOBALLY AND HIGHLIGHTING THE CONTRIBUTIONS AND VALUE OF MENTAL HEALTH, PSYCHOSOCIAL SUPPORT, AND HUMAN CAPACITY, PARTICULARLY IN DEVELOPMENT CONTEXTS AND HUMANITARIAN SETTINGS

Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 284

Whereas on October 10, 2015, World Mental Health Day is observed;

Whereas mental health is essential to achieve the full potential of an individual and mental health disorders can affect the ability of an individual to carry out daily tasks, establish or maintain relationships, or pursue other fundamental endeavors;

Whereas mental health disorders and substance use disorders are the leading causes of disability globally;

Whereas depression is the third leading cause of disease burden globally, and by 2030, depression will be the highest cause of disease burden in low-income countries and the second highest cause of disease burden in middle-income countries;

Whereas depression has a particularly negative impact on women, for whom depression is the leading cause of disease burden independent of the income level of their countries of residence;

Whereas approximately 3,000 suicide deaths occur each day globally;

Whereas for each completed suicide, 20 more individuals attempt to commit suicide;

Whereas up to 90 percent of individuals who commit suicide have a diagnosable mental health disorder;

Whereas serious and persistent mental illness, such as schizophrenia and bipolar disorder, affects up to 7 percent of the population of the world and is extremely debilitating;

Whereas the global cost of mental health disorders was $2,500,000,000,000 in 2010, and is projected to increase to more than $6,000,000,000,000 by 2030, but the total amount of development assistance for global mental health was only $134,000,000 between 2007 and 2013, less than 1 percent of all development assistance;

Whereas in high-income countries, approximately ½ of individuals afflicted with mental health disorders do not receive appropriate mental health care;

Whereas in low-income countries, approximately 85 percent to 90 percent of individuals afflicted with mental health disorders do not receive appropriate mental health care;

Whereas traumatic events and losses are common experiences, especially among refugees and internally displaced individuals, and may—

(1) double the incidence of mental health disorders;

(2) result in intense suffering and dysfunction; and

(3) require mental health treatment;

Whereas integrating mental health and psychosocial support into health and social sectors improves the health, economic development, and political stability of the population, builds the capacity of staff and health facilities, and creates non-stigmatizing mental health services; and

Whereas there is an urgent need to create readily-accessible, high-quality mental health services in line with national and global guidelines by designing and implementing comprehensive programs that are culturally, developmentally, and linguistically appropriate, building local human resource capacity, and strengthening health systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of World Mental Health Day;

(2) affirms the continued support of the United States for making resources available to provide mental health services and build capacity across countries and income levels, in particular in countries affected by conflict and crisis;

(3) honors the importance of trained mental health workers as they enhance human well-being and mental health, restore functioning, and save lives by ensuring the availability of high-quality, context-relevant mental health and psychosocial support services;

(4) calls on the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the heads of other relevant agencies to integrate mental health and psychosocial support services into programs, funding opportunities, and budget allocations in order to improve the overall quality of life of individuals living with mental health disorders; and

(5) commends the dedication of organizations, professionals, and volunteers globally who work to improve the mental health of all individuals, and the important contributions and bravery of individuals globally who live with or have overcome mental health disorders.

SENATE RESOLUTION 285—COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF ROBERT EDWARD SIMON, JR.

Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 285

Whereas in 1961, Robert Edward Simon, Jr. (referred to in this preamble as ''Bob Simon'') purchased 6,750 acres of undeveloped land in Northern Virginia and in 1964, established on the land the town of Reston, Virginia;

Whereas the vision of Bob Simon for economic development—

(1) involved communities that integrate jobs, residential housing, commercial business, recreational resources, outdoor space, accessible transportation, and pedestrian-friendly geography; and

(2) was a vision that, in 2015, is known as ''smart growth'';

Whereas the vision of Bob Simon for a community was a community that included residents of all income levels and racial backgrounds at a time during which, in Virginia, housing was segregated and interracial marriage was banned;

Whereas Bob Simon is credited with mainstreaming the idea of robust citizen participation in local development plans through community associations;

Whereas Bob Simon returned to live in Reston from 1993 until his passing on September 21, 2015, at 101 years of age; and

Whereas, as of September 2015, Reston, Virginia is a 62,000-citizen town in the Northern Virginia Dulles Corridor, which continues to develop along the lines that Bob Simon envisioned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the contributions of Robert E. Simon, Jr.—

(1) in founding Reston, Virginia;

(2) in setting a trend of vibrant urban development in Virginia; and

(3) in inspiring and empowering citizens across the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 286—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 11, 2015, AS ''NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE WEEK''

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 286

Whereas, in 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt established the first national wildlife refuge on Pelican Island in Florida;

Whereas, in 2015, the National Wildlife Refuge System, administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, is the premier system of lands and waters to conserve

wildlife in the world, and has grown to approximately 150,000,000 acres, 563 national wildlife refuges, and 38 wetland management districts in every State and territory of the United States;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are important recreational and tourism destinations in communities across the United States, and these protected lands offer a variety of recreational opportunities, including 6 wildlife-dependent uses that the National Wildlife Refuge System manages: hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, photography, environmental education, and interpretation;

Whereas, in 2015, 336 units of the National Wildlife Refuge System have hunting programs and 275 units of the National Wildlife Refuge System have fishing programs, averaging approximately 2,500,000 hunting visits and nearly 7,000,000 fishing visits each year;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System experienced nearly 30,000,000 wildlife observation visits during fiscal year 2014;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are important to local businesses and gateway communities;

Whereas, for every $1 appropriated, national wildlife refuges generate nearly $5 in economic activity;

Whereas visitation to the National Wildlife Refuge System increased by nearly 27 percent from 2005 to 2014;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System experiences over 47,000,000 visits each year, which generated more than $2,400,000,000 and more than 35,000 jobs in local economies during fiscal year 2011;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System encompasses every kind of ecosystem in the United States, including temperate, tropical and boreal forests, wetlands, deserts, grasslands, arctic tundras, and remote islands and spans 12 time zones from the Virgin Islands to Guam;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are home to more than 700 species of birds, 220 species of mammals, 250 species of reptiles and amphibians, and more than 1,000 species of fish;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are the primary Federal lands that foster production, migration, and wintering habitat for waterfowl;

Whereas, since 1934, the sale of the Federal Duck Stamp to outdoor enthusiasts has generated more than $850,000,000 in funds, which has enabled the purchase or lease of more than 5,700,000 acres of habitat for waterfowl and numerous other species in the National Wildlife Refuge System;

Whereas the recovery of 386 threatened and endangered species is supported on refuge lands;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are cores of conservation for larger landscapes and resources for other agencies of the Federal Government and State governments, private landowners, and organizations in their efforts to secure the wildlife heritage of the United States;

Whereas nearly 36,000 volunteers and approximately 200 national wildlife refuge ''Friends'' organizations contribute more than 1,400,000 hours annually, the equivalent of nearly 700 full-time employees, and provide an important link to local communities;

Whereas national wildlife refuges provide an important opportunity for children to discover and gain a greater appreciation for the natural world;

Whereas, because there are national wildlife refuges located in several urban and suburban areas and a refuge located within an hour drive of every metropolitan area in the United States, national wildlife refuges employ, educate, and engage young people from all backgrounds in exploring, connecting with, and preserving the natural heritage of the United States;

Whereas, since 1995, refuges across the United States have held festivals, educational programs, guided tours, and other events to celebrate National Wildlife Refuge Week during the second full week of October;

Whereas the United States Fish and Wildlife Service will continue to seek stakeholder input on the implementation of ''Conserving the Future: Wildlife Refuges and the Next Generation'', an update to the strategic plan of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for the future of the National Wildlife Refuge System;

Whereas the week beginning on October 11, 2015, has been designated as ''National Wildlife Refuge Week'' by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

Whereas the designation of National Wildlife Refuge Week by the Senate would recognize more than a century of conservation in the United States, raise awareness about the importance of wildlife and the National Wildlife Refuge System, and celebrate the myriad recreational opportunities available to enjoy this network of protected lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning on October 11, 2015, as ''National Wildlife Refuge Week'';

(2) encourages the observance of National Wildlife Refuge Week with appropriate events and activities;

(3) acknowledges the importance of national wildlife refuges for their recreational opportunities and contribution to local economies across the United States;

(4) pronounces that national wildlife refuges play a vital role in securing the hunting and fishing heritage of the United States for future generations;

(5) identifies the significance of national wildlife refuges in advancing the traditions of wildlife observation, photography, environmental education, and interpretation;

(6) recognizes the importance of national wildlife refuges to wildlife conservation and the protection of imperiled species and ecosystems, as well as compatible uses;

(7) acknowledges the role of national wildlife refuges in conserving waterfowl and waterfowl habitat pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (40 Stat. 755, chapter 128);

(8) reaffirms the support of the Senate for wildlife conservation and the National Wildlife Refuge System; and

(9) expresses the intent of the Senate—

(A) to continue working to conserve wildlife; and

(B) to manage the National Wildlife Refuge System for current and future generations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 287—CONDEMNING THE SENSELESS MURDER AND WOUNDING OF 18 INDIVIDUALS (SONS, DAUGHTERS, FATHERS, MOTHERS, UNCLES, AUNTS, COUSINS, STUDENTS, AND TEACHERS) IN ROSEBURG, OREGON, ON OCTOBER 1, 2015

Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 287

Whereas on October 1, 2015, an armed gunman opened fire on the Umpqua Community College campus in Roseburg, Oregon, killing 9 individuals and wounding 9 other individuals;

Whereas deceased and surviving victims demonstrated acts of heroism and sacrifice for the safety and sake of others;

Whereas the first responders were swift and professional in their response to the initial call, which avoided even more bloodshed; and

Whereas, local, State, and Federal law enforcement, firefighter, and medical service professionals performed their duties with utmost skill and coordination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) offers condolences to the families and friends of individuals who were murdered by an armed gunman on the Umpqua Community College campus in Roseburg, Oregon, on October 1, 2015;

(2) expresses hope for the swift and complete recovery of individuals who were wounded by the gunman;

(3) applauds the swift response and professional conduct of—

(A) the first responders to the scene; and

(B) the investigating officers following the neutralization of the gunman, including local, State, and Federal officials and others who offered their support and assistance; and

(4) remains committed to reducing the likelihood of this kind of event happening again.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2711. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BOOKER) proposed an amendment 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.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2711. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BOOKER) proposed an amendment 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; as follows:

On page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike ''July 8'' and insert ''December 8''.

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 8, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 8, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled ''Consumer Product Safety and the Recall Process.''

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 8, 2015, at 9:30 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 8, 2015, at 9:45 a.m.

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 8, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Securing a Prosperous and Democratic Future for Ukraine.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 8, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Threats to the Homeland.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 8, 2015, at 10:30 a.m., in the President's Room of the Capitol.

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 8, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 8, 2015, at 2 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Theft by Another Name: Eminent Domain Ten Years After Kelo v. City of New London.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 8, 2015, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE DEPARTMENT AND USAID MANAGEMENT, INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS, AND BILATERAL INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on State Department and USAID Management, International Operations, and Bilateral International Development be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 8, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Ensuring an Efficient and Effective Diplomatic Security Training Facility for the Twenty-first Century.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sharon Haggett, a detailee in Senator ALEXANDER's office, have the privileges of the floor for the duration of today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mark Mendenhall, a detailee to the Appropriations Committee have floor privileges for the remainder of the debate on the Energy and Water appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dan Podair, a legal fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. I yield the floor.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Tuesday, October 20, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 139; that the time until 11 a.m. be equally divided for debate on the nomination in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that following disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN C. HEDGER TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 210, Stephen Hedger; that the Senate vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that following disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen C. Hedger, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the nomination, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Stephen C. Hedger, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President shall be notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules and Administration Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Con. Res. 21 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Booker amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the concurrent resolution, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2711) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the resolving clause to correct the date of the ceremony)

On page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike ''July 8'' and insert ''December 8''.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21), as amended, was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 21

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO COMMEMORATE THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RATIFICATION OF THE 13TH AMENDMENT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on December 8, 2015, for a ceremony to commemorate the 150th Anniversary of the ratification of the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which abolished slavery in the United States.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF ROBERT EDWARD SIMON, JR.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 285, 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. 285) commemorating the life and accomplishments of Robert Edward Simon, Jr.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 285) was agreed to.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, just over a year ago, I attended a dual celebration in the Town of Reston, VA—50 years since the town's founding and 100 years since the birth of its founder. That founder, Robert E. Simon, Jr., whose initials were the basis for naming the town, passed away on September 21st at the age of 101.

Bob Simon was a visionary who recognized that all humans ought to be able to live together and be neighbors. His vision was of a community in which people could live, work, and play in the same general area. He believed that features like natural landscaping, open plazas, and public art were important to building a vibrant community and fostering a sense of place. Today we would call that ''smart growth,'' but to Bob, it was simply commonsense. His vision was ahead of its time in another way. It was a vision of a community in which people of all races and income levels could coexist—a vision that was not yet shared by all in the segregated Virginia of the early 1960s.

The legacy of Bob Simon will live on in the community he created and loved. I and my Virginia colleague Senator MARK WARNER ask the Senate to formally commemorate Bob and the ideals he championed in his life's work of a better and more just America.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 286.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 286) designating the week beginning on October 11, 2015, as ''National Wildlife Refuge Week.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 286) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

WELCOMING THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA ON HER OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 278.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 278) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 6, 2015, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2165 AND S. 2169

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2165) to amend title 54, United States Code, to permanently authorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

A bill (S. 2169) to amend title 54, United States Code, to extend the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will receive their second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2015, THROUGH MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Friday, October 9, for a pro forma session only with no business being conducted; further, that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, October 9, it next convene for a pro forma session only with no business conducted on the following dates and times: Tuesday, October 13, at 10:30 a.m., and Friday, October 16, at 10 a.m.; further, that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, October 16, it next convene at 4 p.m. on Monday, October 19; 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; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2146.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. 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 5:49 p.m., adjourned until Friday, October 9, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DANA J. BOENTE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE NEIL H. MACBRIDE, RESIGNED.

ROBERT LLOYD CAPERS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE LORETTA E. LYNCH, RESIGNED.

JOHN P. FISHWICK, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE TIMOTHY J. HEAPHY, RESIGNED.

CHANNING D. PHILLIPS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RONALD C. MACHEN, JR., RESIGNED.

EMILY GRAY RICE, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN P. KACAVAS, RESIGNED.

RANDOLPH J. SEILER, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE BRENDAN V. JOHNSON, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TARNJIT S. SAINI

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

TERRY A. PETROPOULOS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

JESSICA L. MORERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

KARI J. TEREICK

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

AMOS J. HOCHSTEIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (ENERGY RESOURCES), VICE JOHN STERN WOLF.

DAVID MCKEAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO LUXEMBOURG.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 8, 2015:

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

MARIO CORDERO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSIONER FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2019.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

STEPHEN C. HEDGER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SARAH ELIZABETH MENDELSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

UNITED NATIONS

SARAH ELIZABETH MENDELSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

W. THOMAS REEDER, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LUCY TAMLYN, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF BENIN.

JEFFREY J. HAWKINS, JR., OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC.

DAVID R. GILMOUR, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE TOGOLESE REPUBLIC.

EDWIN RICHARD NOLAN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SURINAME.

CAROLYN PATRICIA ALSUP, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE GAMBIA.

DANIEL H. RUBINSTEIN, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TUNISIA.

SUSAN COPPEDGE AMATO, OF GEORGIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE TO MONITOR AND COMBAT TRAFFICKING, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR AT LARGE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOMEBUYERS ASSISTANCE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 7, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3192, the Homebuyers Assistance Act, which would delay, until February 1, 2016 enforcement of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's (CFPB) integrated rule regarding disclosures that mortgage lenders must provide to homebuyers.

I oppose this legislation for two principal reasons.

First, H.R. 3192 contains a provision that hurts homeowners by removing their private right of action for violations of the CFPB's Truth in Lending Act—RESPA Integrated Disclosure (TRID) regulations.

Second, I oppose the legislation because it is unnecessary since the CFPB has previously announced its intention to take into account good faith efforts by lenders in evaluating compliance by lenders with the TRID regulations.

Madam Speaker, it should be noted that CFPB gave the mortgage industry approximately two years notice to implement the new disclosure requirements, and this past summer extended that deadline until October 3, 2015.

H.R. 3192 would revise the effective date for the Know Before You Owe rule to February 1, 2016, and would shield lenders from liability for violations for loans originated before February 1 so long as lenders made a good faith effort to comply.

In extending the effective date of the Know Before You Owe rule by an additional 4 months, H.R. 3192 unnecessarily delays implementation of important consumer protections designed to eradicate opaque lending practices that contribute to risky mortgages and hurt homeowners by removing their private right of action for violations, and undercuts the Nation's financial stability.

The delay of enforcement harms consumers by encouraging some lenders to attempt to evade the new rule and reduces the incentive to comply promptly.

Having witnessed the economic and financial devastation inflicted on the economy, business, and households in 2008 resulting from inadequate oversight of the financial industry, we simply cannot afford to repeat that mistake.

I urge my colleagues to vote to protect consumers and homebuyers from predatory and unfair lending practices by voting against H.R. 3192.

RECOGNIZING ELIZABETH MATSUMOTO AS 2015 NONPROFIT LEADER

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Elizabeth Matsumoto, who is honored by the Northern California Association of Nonprofits with the 2015 Nonprofit Leader Achievement Award, a recognition she richly deserves.

Elizabeth's commitment to improving the lives of those in need in Humboldt County is noteworthy. Through her work with Housing Humboldt, she has touched numerous lives by increasing access to quality, safe, and affordable housing for lower and moderate-income individuals, families and seniors—a much-needed resource in this rural region.

While obtaining her Environment and Community Master's degree from Humboldt State University, Ms. Matsumoto joined Housing Humboldt in 2003, working on the development of the county's first community land trust homes. Since then she has been integral to the completion of 22 community land trust homes, which provide a unique opportunity for affordable home ownership. She continues to assist with resale and refinancing to keep these homes affordable. Elizabeth's technical expertise and leadership also made it possible for Housing Humboldt to continue to manage and improve 105 affordable apartments throughout the county.

During periods of organizational transition, Elizabeth Matsumoto stepped up to provide stability and guidance as interim executive director, development director, and now as co-executive director while seeing large-scale housing projects through to completion. Most recently, she led the development of the county's first permanent supportive housing complex, which opened in September to serve chronically homeless and extremely low income individuals, including supportive services such as case management to help keep people housed. She forged multiple partnerships and creatively leveraged millions of dollars in investments to bring this dream to fruition.

In addition to her work with Housing Humboldt, Elizabeth Matsumoto has shared her talents with the community through the Humboldt League of Women Voters Board of Directors, Humboldt Tri-Kids Triathlon Organizing Committee, and the Community Gifts Committee for the Alzheimer's Center. She balances her service with being a mom to two young children and enjoying activities such as running, mountain biking, and playing soccer.

Mr. Speaker, Elizabeth Matsumoto's commitment to improving access to safe and affordable housing is commendable and worthy of recognition. I urge my colleagues to join me in extending our congratulations to her.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, 2015, I was unable to vote on H.R. 3192, the Homebuyers Assistance Act, introduced by Rep. FRENCH HILL. I would have voted in support of final passage of H.R. 3192, roll call No. 540, had I been present.

Additionally, I would have voted in support of H. Res. 461, roll call No. 538, to establish a select investigative panel on the Energy and Commerce Committee, introduced by Rep. FRED UPTON.

CONGRATULATING NEW HAVEN HIGH SCHOOL ON THEIR RECOGNITION AS A NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating New Haven High School on their recognition as a National Blue Ribbon School for 2015 from the U.S. Department of Education.

This award is based on a school's overall academic excellence or progress in closing achievement gaps among student subgroups. As one of only 285 public schools receiving national recognition, New Haven High School's administration, teachers, and students have shown dedication and commitment to hard work that contributed to receiving this award. It is evident that New Haven High School represents excellence within the school and also with the surrounding community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing New Haven High School for a job well done.

CELEBRATING SENATOR AKAKA'S 91ST BIRTHDAY

HON. MARK TAKAI

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to address the House to say Happy Birthday to a selfless public servant, Senator Daniel K. Akaka. As we celebrate his 91st birthday, let us look back on a few of his numerous accomplishments as a Soldier, teacher and as a Member of Congress.

Born on September 11, 1924 in Honolulu, Hawaii, Senator Akaka has worked ever since as a dedicated civil servant to Hawaii and the United States. During World War II, he served

in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. After his military service, he earned his bachelor's degree in education at the University of Hawaii.

As a school teacher and principal, he encouraged the use of the Native Hawaiian language and culture in schools and worked tirelessly to create some of the first Head Start programs in the State. The education of children, especially the Native Hawaiian children, was extremely important to him because he knew that increasing access to opportunity would improve educational outcomes among children.

First elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1976, he served there for 14 years until he was elected to the Senate, where he served until he retired in January 2013. Senator Akaka fought endlessly to advocate on behalf of Hawaii, particularly Native Hawaiians, and his work on the Veteran's Affairs Committee combating PTSD and unemployment among Soldiers has had a profound impact on our country.

His commitment to a lifetime of public service in the military, as a teacher and as a United States Senator should be an inspiration and motivation to us all.

We wish Senator Akaka the best for the coming year. Happy Birthday (Hau'oli lā hānau), Senator Akaka.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE HEROIC ACTIONS OF CHRIS MINTZ

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Chris Mintz—an Army veteran who answered the call when our nation needed him and again when a heartless gunman threatened a community in Oregon.

As a high school football star from North Carolina and a 10-year army Veteran, Chris is known as a tough guy. According to those who know him best, he's always one to "cowboy up."

And one week ago, on October 1, Chris did more than that. He didn't wake up planning to be a hero, but that's what he became.

When he heard gun shots at his school, he ran towards them, pulling fire alarms and fighting to save others. With dogged determination, he fought to block the shooter from entering a classroom and was shot seven times.

It's clear his incredible bravery and selfless actions saved lives and prevented a far worse tragedy. I applaud Chris for his integrity, self-sacrifice and valor in the face of such evil, and my wife Renee and I send our thoughts and prayers to him and his loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues, as we continue to mourn the dead in Oregon, let's put politics aside and take heart in the heroic acts of this American hero. Chris Mintz deserves our utmost gratitude and respect. Let's give it to him.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE HEROIC ACTS OF MR. SAMUEL SELL

HON. DAVID P. JOYCE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Samuel Sell of Bainbridge Township, Ohio for his heroic actions on September 13, 2015. Samuel was fishing with his cousin at the LaDue Reservoir when he observed an occupied vehicle go into the water, trapping the driver inside. When no one got out of the car, Samuel swam 100 feet toward the car while he asked his cousin to call 911 immediately. He brought a fishing knife out with him to help free the passenger, which he then gave to the emergency responders when they reached the car. Due to his quick thinking and heroic bravery he helped save a man's life. Along with all of the residents of the 14th Congressional District, I commend him for his actions and wanted to record his feat so that it is enshrined for all future generations.

HONORING OCTOBER 8TH AS NATIONAL HYDROGEN AND FUEL CELL DAY

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a House resolution expressing support for today, October 8th, as National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day.

Although we are just now developing and implementing new applications for hydrogen fuel cells, this technology has a long and proud history that goes back to the Apollo space missions.

Fuel cells utilize hydrogen without combustion to generate electricity in a way that is clean, efficient, and quiet.

Today, mobile and stationary fuel cell systems produce clean power for vehicles, forklifts, utilities, businesses, and homes.

Stationary fuel cells provide resilient backup power sources for institutions that cannot afford to lose power, such as hospitals. They are increasingly being used as primary electrical sources as well.

Air Products and Chemicals, located in my district, is in the process of deploying 40 hydrogen fueling stations to support the recently announced rollout of hydrogen powered vehicles from several major auto manufacturers.

I have had the opportunity both to drive and fuel these vehicles, and I can say from experience that the process is safe, easy, and surprisingly unremarkable. It's just like driving a traditional car, except the only emission it produces is water.

In closing, I am proud to stand with the innovators of this growing industry as we recognize today as National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID KEPLER

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to David Kepler, Chairman of the United Way's Alexis de Tocqueville Society, upon receiving the 2015 Distinguished Citizen Award.

A valued member of the community involved in many civic organizations, David Kepler joined the Dow Chemical Company in 1975. He went on to serve as Dow's Executive Vice President for Business Services, its Chief Information Officer and Chief Sustainability Officer. David is currently a board member of the Midland Baseball Foundation, Momentum Midland and chairman of the MidMichigan Innovation Center.

The Distinguished Citizens Award is given to an outstanding individual who shows consistent Scouting values and provides distinguished service to both youth and community. David lives in Sanford and has been a community leader who has had a positive impact throughout the region.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, I am honored today to recognize David Kepler for his service to the Boy Scouts of America and his contributions to the Midland community.

IN HONOR OF MAYOR JOE BENNETT OF THOMASVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Joe Bennett, Mayor of the City of Thomasville, located in the 8th Congressional District of North Carolina. Mayor Bennett has been a tireless advocate for the people of Thomasville, and has fully earned the admiration and gratitude of his fellow North Carolinians.

A native of High Point, North Carolina, Mayor Bennett served the Duke Power Company for 36 years before retiring and pursuing a career in public service. After his retirement in 1998, Mayor Bennett ran for and was elected to the Thomasville City Council, where he served two terms before being elected Mayor of the City of Thomasville in 2003.

During his tenure, Mayor Bennett has made job creation and infrastructure development two of his highest priorities. After a period of rapid manufacturing and furniture building job loss in the area, Mayor Bennett was successfully able to bring jobs back to the city with the opening of a large manufacturing facility. Mayor Bennett also led a city-wide initiative, known as "Children at Play," designed to upgrade local playgrounds in order to combat childhood obesity. I have also been told that if there was a celebration in the city of Thomasville, whether it is a large parade, a small church ceremony, or an individual's 100th birthday celebration, Mayor Bennett was there with a smile on his face.

In addition to his service as Mayor of Thomasville, Mayor Bennett has earned his title as

a "civil servant" through his various charitable and volunteer roles. To highlight a few of these roles; he delivers "meals on wheels," serves on the Economic Development Commission of Davidson County, serves on the Community General Hospital Board, and is an active member in the Rotary Club of Thomasville.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in thanking Mayor Joe Bennett for his esteemed service to the City of Thomasville and congratulating him on his well-deserved retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I voted for H.R. 3192, the Homebuyers Assistance Act, which will delay enforcement of the Mortgage Disclosure Rule until early next year. While I understand concerns about this legislation and delaying enforcement, even the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which drafted this regulation, has delayed the rule and acknowledged that further improvements need to be made. The Motion to Recommit would refine this legislation by ensuring that the path towards legal redress is not blocked for our most vulnerable homebuyers like veterans and seniors, which is why I voted for it as well as the underlying bill. Going forward, it's my hope that the Senate will continue to improve the Homebuyers Assistance Act. The underlying objective of securing a more transparent and consumer-friendly process for home ownership is deeply important. The rule would increase transparency for mortgage lenders and reduce confusion for homebuyers seeking a mortgage, strengthening critical consumer protections. That's why it is necessary to get this right, even it takes a few more months.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROTARY CLUB OF HANFORD

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Rotary Club of Hanford in honor of its Seventy-Fifth Anniversary.

The Rotary Club of Hanford (RCH) was charter on October 6, 1940 in order to serve the community of Hanford, California. Since its establishment, the RCH has been a pillar in its community and spearheaded many events. Specifically, the Chapter has helped acquire playground equipment for multiple parks, rebuilt the Babe Ruth Baseball Field, sponsored numerous Little League teams, assisted with highway cleanup, conducted holiday food drives, sponsored foreign exchange students, and administered a Job Shadow Program. The RCH has also been active internationally and helped to establish two orphanages in Mexico, schools, health clinics, and clean water projects in Guatemala, and build Hope High School in Kenya.

Over the past seventy-five years, the RCH has helped Hanford and its residents thrive. We are fortunate to have such a committed Rotary Club in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the Rotary Club of Hanford's Seventy-Fifth Anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL HAYES

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Michael Hayes, president and chief executive officer of the Midland Center for the Arts, in recognition of his five years of service to the Center and his many contributions to the community.

An influential member of the Midland community for more than forty years, Michael Hayes originally moved to Midland to work in the Midland County Courthouse. He went on to serve four terms in the Michigan House of Representatives, work as the vice-president of executive relations at the Dow Chemical Company, and founded Main Street Consulting. Before his selection as CEO of the Midland Center for the Arts, Michael Hayes served on the board of directors for the Center and on the Matrix:Midland advisory board.

During his tenure as president and CEO, Michael Hayes brought in exciting exhibits, enhanced the Operating Philosophy and Core Values of the Midland Center for the Arts and oversaw the highest earned revenue season in MCFTA history. In his five years at the helm of MCFTA, Michael truly helped to change lives through the arts, sciences and history.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, I am honored today to recognize Michael Hayes for his service to the Midland Center for the Arts and his contributions to the Midland community.

WELCOMING SOUTH KOREAN PRESIDENT PARK GEUN-HYE TO THE UNITED STATES

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Northern New Jersey's vibrant Korean American community. I would like to welcome the long awaited visit of South Korean President Park Geun-hye to the United States.

I want to express my deepest condolences to President Park and the people of South Korea for the deadly Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) outbreak, which infected 186 people and tragically claimed 36 lives.

As we mourn this heartbreaking loss, I was encouraged to learn that the last South Korean patient previously diagnosed with MERS has tested negative for the virus and has showed a complete recovery from the disease.

It is my hope that this visit will provide a venue for our countries to find new areas of cooperation in protecting our environment, improving global responses to health crisis, and for continued engagement on regional security that will bolster our nation's relationship in the 21st century.

I am proud to represent one of the largest Korean American communities in Congress because they have made significant contributions to the success of our nation and have enriched our heritage through their unwavering patriotism, strong values and entrepreneurial spirit.

I look forward to President Park's visit and will continue to be a strong advocate for my constituents so we can make New Jersey and our nation a better place for all.

INTERNATIONAL PLASMA AWARENESS WEEK

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, International Plasma Awareness Week will occur October 11 to 17, 2015. Around the world, there will be observances to raise global awareness of the crucial need for plasma to create lifesaving therapies, recognize that plasma donors contribute greatly in saving and improving lives, and increase understanding of the many rare diseases and plasma protein therapies that help to treat them.

Plasma-derived therapies and recombinant blood clotting factors, collectively known as plasma protein therapies, are unique, biologic medicines that are either infused or injected to treat a variety of rare, life-threatening, chronic, and genetic diseases including bleeding disorders, immune deficiencies, pulmonary disorders, neurological disorders, shock and trauma, liver cirrhosis, and infectious diseases such as tetanus, hepatitis, and rabies.

Plasma-derived therapies save and improve lives of individuals throughout the world, including in emergency and surgical medicine. Plasma protein therapies have significantly improved the quality of life, markedly improved patient outcomes, and extended the life expectancy of individuals with rare, chronic diseases and conditions.

Healthy, committed donors provide the plasma essential to manufacture these lifesaving therapies; and there are more than 450 plasma collection centers in the U.S. that have demonstrated their commitment to plasma donor and patient safety and quality by earning International Quality Plasma Program (IQPP) certification.

I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me and rise in commemoration of International Plasma Awareness Week, honoring those committed donors and collection centers who make and collect needed and lifesaving contributions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call 540 on final passage of H.R. 3192, the Homebuyers Assistance Act, I would have voted "Aye," which is consistent with my position on this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM WEIDEMAN

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Bill Weideman, former Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of The Dow Chemical Company, upon his induction into this year's Junior Achievement Business Hall of Fame.

After graduating from Central Michigan University in 1976 with a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Bill Weideman joined The Dow Chemical Company. During his thirty-nine-year tenure, Bill held many positions, including Controller for Dowbrands and Texas Operations, Global Business Finance Director for Specialty Chemicals, Performance Chemicals, Basic Chemicals and Basic Plastics, Vice President and Corporate Controller, Interim Chief Financial Officer and, finally, Chief Financial Officer in 2010. In 2012, he administered the Corporate Strategic Development and executive oversight for Dow AgroSciences. Bill served on Dow Chemical's Executive Committee and was a member of the Board of Directors at both Sadara Chemical Company and Dow Corning Corporation.

Bill Weideman remains very active in the community, serving on the Board of the Dow Chemical Employees' Credit Union, Mid Michigan Medical Health Systems, the Midland Baseball Foundation and the Central Michigan University Board of Trustees, as well as volunteering for Midland Cancer Services and Family & Children Services.

In keeping with Junior Achievement's mission of a commitment to market-based economics, honesty, integrity and excellence as well as the belief in the potential of young people, Bill Weideman's career has reflected these values. Through his illustrious career at The Dow Chemical Company and his involvement in the Midland community, Bill has positively influenced the careers and lives of countless individuals.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, I am honored today to welcome Bill Weideman into the Junior Achievement Business Hall of Fame.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. LINDA HATFIELD

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mrs. Linda Hatfield for receiving a Lifetime Achievement Award from the American Cancer Society (ACS).

Mrs. Hatfield was born on December 24, 1935. She grew up in the Central Valley of California and attended Lemoore High School. After completing her education, Mrs. Hatfield became a teacher and taught in Central Valley schools until her retirement. A lifelong Central Valley resident, Mrs. Hatfield currently resides in Hanford, California with her husband, Bill Hatfield. Together they have three children, seven grandchildren, and seven great-grandchildren.

In 1982 while still teaching full-time, Mrs. Hatfield began volunteering for the ACS. Over the last three decades, she has dedicated her life to the organization, successfully recruited additional volunteers, and educated many on how to prevent and survive cancer. Mrs. Hatfield also served on the ACS Board of Directors and helped reopen the ACS office after it was shut down as an entirely volunteer-run location. A survivor herself, Mrs. Hatfield has gone above and beyond her duty as a volunteer and demonstrated her commitment to fighting cancer time and time again.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Mrs. Linda Hatfield on being honored with an American Cancer Society Lifetime Achievement Award.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I submit a clarification of my vote during consideration of H.R. 3192, the Homebuyers Assistance Act. I mistakenly voted "no" on roll call vote 540, final passage of the bill. I intended to vote "aye".

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PASTIME CLUB

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Pastime Club, located in the Borough of Mendham, Morris County, New Jersey as they celebrate their 100th Anniversary.

The Pastime Club has been an integral part of Mendham's community life since its founding, on June 22, 1915, as a civic and fraternal organization.

The Pastime Club began its modern era after the Great Depression in 1938. At this point the club met monthly and hosted Pinochet and Quoits tournaments along with an annual children's Christmas party. During the Second World War club members restored a building at 3 Hilltop Road, which has been their home for over 75 years now. As a volunteer organization, members devoted their time to the restoration, and raised funds to cover the costs. In 1947 two apartments were built on the second-floor of 3 Hilltop Road. In March of 1953 construction started on "The Lanes," a bowling alley. Keeping with tradition, the bowling alley was built by The Pastime Club members on a volunteer basis. "The Lanes" was finished in October of the same year. Over the next 60 years "The Lanes" was a community asset, hosting birthday parties, and community leagues. Currently "The Lanes" is maintained by the club for the use of their members, along with bowling leagues being open to the public.

Today, the Pastime Club is the single largest supporter of youth athletic programs in the Mendhams, exemplified by its motto "Progress in Sports". They sponsor teams and leagues, provide equipment for fields, and provide scholarships to local student-athletes. The Pastime Club also supports a semi-professional baseball team that competes in the Morris County Major League. Along with supporting local sports, the Pastime Club hosts the largest community event in Mendham—the Labor Day Carnival. This tradition began in 1943 and has run every year since. Today the carnival includes rides, games, food, fireworks, and a 50/50 raffle. All members take shifts volunteering to ensure the event is the success that it has been. In addition to the Labor Day Carnival, the Pastime Club brings their own circus to town. The Pastime Club also hosts a number of member oriented events including golf outings, and a Christmas party.

For the Pastime Club's 100th Anniversary, I commend its Leadership, Board of Directors and members who have selflessly volunteered their time over the club's history to provide services to the residents of Mendham. It is clear that the Pastime Club has provided services to the community that have improved the lives of everyone living there.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Pastime Club, its Board of Directors in celebrating its 100th Anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO DAN KOZAKIEWICZ

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dan Kozakiewicz, Chairman of Three Rivers Corporation, upon receiving the 2015 Distinguished Citizen Award.

An influential member of the Midland community for more than twenty-five years, Dan Kozakiewicz started his illustrious career with Three Rivers Corporation in 1986. He was appointed president in 2001, and currently serves as Chairman of the Board of Directors. Three Rivers Corporation has thrived under Dan's leadership, fulfilling commitments to its customers and community. Of all company accomplishments, Dan remains most proud of Three Rivers Corporation's commitment to safety in the workplace.

The Distinguished Citizen Award is given to an outstanding individual who shows consistent Scouting values and provides distinguished service to both youth and community. A former Boy Scout in his hometown of Bay City and now a Cub Scout leader for his son's Pack in Midland, Dan has been an exemplary role model for youth in the Great Lakes Bay Region.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, I am honored today to recognize Dan Kozakiewicz for his service to the Boy Scouts of America and his contributions to the Midland community.

HONORING THE LATE MS. ALMA BEATTY OF NEWARK

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Alma Beatty, the longtime Vice President of Community Affairs at Newark Beth Israel Medical Center, who passed away earlier this year.

Ms. Beatty was born in Newark, New Jersey, and became one of the city's most beloved citizens through her 45 years of service at ''The Beth.''

Under Ms. Beatty's leadership, ''The Beth'' became a model of excellence in protecting the most vulnerable among us.

Thanks to her vision, ''The Beth'' instituted a number of community service programs that continue to this day, including Thanksgiving Giveaway Programs, the Adopt a Child Christmas Program, the Alma Beatty Health and Wellness Fair, and job readiness workshops.

Ms. Beatty truly was a voice for the voiceless. She dedicated her life to improving the lives of the people of Newark, and for that we are eternally grateful.

Words cannot express how much Ms. Beatty meant to me and my family throughout the years.

I had the pleasure of working with her while she was Vice President of Community Affairs for Newark Beth Israel Medical Center. Together, we were able to secure funds to construct ''The Beth's'' Geriatric Emergency Department.

Ms. Beatty graciously dedicated her life to building a tremendous legacy here in Essex County; one committed to improving the quality of life for all residents regardless of their financial background.

She was a true role model for all that she did and accomplished for the City of Newark.

Last month, I had the honor of participating in a ceremony to change the name of Newark's Osborne Terrace to ''Alma Beatty Way.''

It is a fitting recognition of Ms. Beatty's contributions to the City of Newark and Essex County.

To Ms. Beatty's family, I extend my thoughts and prayers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call 538 on final passage H. Res. 461, Establishing a Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I would have voted Aye, which is consistent with my position on this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO DAVE CAMP

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to The Honorable Dave Camp, Senior Policy Advisor at PricewaterhouseCoopers, former Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and former Chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, upon his induction into this year's Junior Achievement Business Hall of Fame.

Dave Camp was born and raised in Midland, Michigan, where he attended H.H. Dow High School. He went on to receive a Bachelor of Arts from Albion College and a Juris Doctor from the University of San Diego before coming back to his hometown to practice law at the firm of Riecker, George, Hartley, Van Dam and Camp.

It was with a passion for public service that Dave Camp ran and was elected State Representative for Michigan's 102nd District. He served one term in the state legislature before his election to the United States House of Representatives in 1990. During Camp's tenure, from 1991 to 2015, he served his constituents and country honorably. He cut through the red tape of bureaucracy to ensure his constituents received the services they needed and their voices were heard in Washington.

Legislatively, his list of accomplishments is innumerable. Dave Camp was a leading advocate in Congress for breaking down barriers to adoption and advancing efforts to harmonize varying state and national laws to make adoptions safer and more efficient. He introduced landmark adoption legislation, called the Adoption and Safe Families Act, which was signed into law by President Bill Clinton. This law streamlined the adoption process to quickly help move more children in foster care into permanent adoptive homes. He also worked hard to inject accountability into federal safety net programs, playing an integral role in enactment into law of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act—legislation that reformed our welfare system and helped move people out of poverty.

His hard work, intellect and leadership led to Camp's appointment as Ranking Member and later Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. In this role, Camp introduced policy on a wide range of important issues. To highlight just a few, he ushered into enactment three job creating trade deals that were the most significant expansion of trade relations in nearly two decades. He also introduced the Tax Reform Act of 2014, deemed the most comprehensive tax reform proposal since the mid 1980s.

As Senior Policy Advisor at PricewaterhouseCoopers, Camp continues working to advance economic, tax, international trade and health care policy. His tremendous expertise and perspective on legislative and regulatory processes will enable his clients to make a positive impact in the global market.

In keeping with Junior Achievement's mission of a commitment to market-based economics, honesty, integrity and excellence as well as the belief in the potential of young people, Dave Camp's career has reflected these values. Whether working on landmark adoption reform during his early years in Congress, or mentoring junior staff to reach their full potential, Camp has positively influenced the careers and lives of countless individuals.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, I am honored today to recognize Dave Camp for his many contributions to our country and the great state of Michigan.

RESTORING VOTING RIGHTS

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bipartisan Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2015, H.R. 885, and urge Republican Leadership to bring it to the floor for consideration.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was born from the ''Bloody Sunday'' marches from Selma to Montgomery.

With its enactment over fifty years ago, it protected the ability of every American to make their voice heard at the voting booth.

In 2013, that changed. In the two years since the Supreme Court struck down one of the Voting Rights Act's most important provisions in Shelby County v. Holder,—the Justice Department's ability to prevent discriminatory rules—our democracy has been weakened.

Mr. Speaker, every American deserves unfettered access to exercising one of our most basic rights—the right to vote.

It is time for Congress to right the wrong created by the Shelby decision and pass H.R. 885, legislation that restores the full power of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 885, and I strongly urge Republican Leadership to bring it to the floor for a vote before October 31st.

GIRLS LIKE ME PROJECT INC

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the Girls Like Me Project Inc for their 4th Annual Chicago Day of the Girl, this organization has connected more than 500 Chicagoland girls with the global girl empowerment movement. Since 2011 this non-for-profit group has been mentoring urban African-American girls in hopes to help them make positive life choices and connect globally with their peers. International Day of the Girl was adopted by the United Nations in 2011, since then millions of girls and women around the globe have participated in this movement to help educate and shed light on social and political injustices impacting girls and women across the globe. I support the Girls Like Me Project and commend them for their continued efforts to help the disenfranchised young women in the Chicagoland area and for their continued work with the global initiative known as International Day of the Girl.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following remarks regarding my absence from votes which occurred on October 6, 2015. I was delayed in arriving in

Washington due to the current flooding crisis threatening families.

1) H.R. 1553—Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act—AYE

2) H.R. 1839—Reforming Access for Investments in Startup Enterprises—AYE

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call 518 on final passage of H.R. 348, Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2015, I would have voted Aye, which is consistent with my position on this legislation.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INFORMATION CENTER

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize The Information Center on their 40th anniversary. The accomplishments of this long-standing non-profit agency exemplify the importance and strength of public-private partnerships in our communities.

Founded in 1975 in Taylor, Michigan, The Information Center was created to inform citizens of the over 10,000 resources available to them, including both private sector assistance and public services offered by their local, state, and federal governments. Since becoming the first organization in Michigan to be certified by the national Alliance for Information and Referral Services, the Information Center has become an indispensible tool for connecting people with the human service resources that fit their individual needs. Learning from their experience in our communities, The Information Center has expanded over the years and has initiated programs that address unemployment, health and wellness, housing, transportation, veterans services, financial and legal assistance, disability advocacy and other human services. In addition, The Information Center emphasizes support for our seniors by providing options for home care and caregiver training that respects the dignity and encourages the independence of older Americans.

For 40 years, The Information Center has held itself to the highest standards to ensure that our residents always have somewhere to turn. The most recent report from the Michigan Department of Community Health ranked The Information Center as best in the county and second best in the state for quality assurance in their work with seniors. Their tireless efforts have helped the citizens of Southeast Michigan with comprehensive, community-based programs that help control the cost of care for our elders and provide peace of mind to our families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in gratitude to honor The Information Center on their 40th anniversary and wish them many more years of success.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATION'S FIRST COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding landmark to community health and welfare. This year marks the 50th anniversary of the nation's Community Health Center program Community Health Centers (CHC) are the family doctor to over 23 million Americans and, as such, are the largest network of primary care providers in the country. The CHC model is distinguished by its comprehensive range of health services, recognizing the particular needs and characteristics of the communities they serve. Community Health Centers are located exclusively in medically-underserved areas, providing needed care for communities and populations that do not have adequate access to care. Community involvement in CHCs is guaranteed by the requirement that Federal Qualified Health Centers must have governing boards of directors that have patients of the center holding at least 51% of the board seats.

In the 8th Congressional District of Massachusetts we are particularly proud because the nation's first community health center opened in December 1965 on Columbia Point in Boston's Dorchester neighborhood. Drs. Jack Geiger and Count Gibson of Tufts Medical School founded the Columbia Point Health Center in order to meet the needs of the residents of an isolated public housing project, cut off from the City's health resources. Drs. Geiger and Gibson opened a rural center shortly thereafter in the Delta region of Mississippi. From that start, the community health center program expanded throughout the country. In 1985, Columbia Point Health Center joined with the Neponset Health Center to form Harbor Health Services, Inc. And in 1990, the Columbia Point Health Center moved into a new building and was renamed Geiger Gibson Community Health Center in honor of the founders of the national movement.

Mr. Speaker, there are now over 1,270 community health centers providing services at 9,000 sites across the country. CHCs have become the primary source of medical, dental, behavioral health, substance abuse treatment, social services and other community health services for neighborhoods and rural communities that would otherwise be inadequately served. And CHCs have also provided employment and career opportunities for thousands of local residents.

Mr. Speaker, fifty years ago it all began in Dorchester, Massachusetts. I am proud to rise today to recognize and honor what has become a national model for providing services to our country's underserved areas and urge my colleagues to join me in acknowledging the efforts of our Community Health Centers.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 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 $18,150,557,110,995.00. We've added $7,523,680,062,081.92 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.

TAIWAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate our nation's historic relationship with Taiwan on their 104th National Day. These occasions remind us to reflect on our past successes and look forward with renewed commitment to what we may accomplish together in the days and months ahead.

Just last week, the United States House of Representatives expressed in a resounding and unified voice our support of the 2016 National Defense Authorization Act. In this Act, Congress declared its support of Taiwan through numerous policy provisions, including the new "South China Sea Initiative".

It is more important now than ever, for this Administration to declare with a resounding voice that it joins with Congress in recognizing the importance of a vibrant bilateral relationship with Taiwan. We look forward with eager anticipation to Taiwan's exercise of democracy in their upcoming January elections. They are a model of freedom to a region plagued by instability and the heavy hand of government.

The Taiwan Strait is of critical importance to our national and global security and both the United States and Taiwan must continue to prioritize investment in defense capabilities that will secure its peace. I congratulate Taiwan on their 104th National Day and ask for their continued partnership with the United States.

CONGRATULATING MR. CHRIS SMITH

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Chris Smith on his retirement and thank him for his many years of service to Clermont County and Ohio.

Chris Smith has a long and distinguished record of service to Clermont County, and is remembered for his invaluable commitment to the local economic development throughout his career.

With decades of business experience, including 20 years in the banking industry and

10 years in real estate, Chris' contributions in his many capacities of public service has been invaluable. Chris Smith served his community in numerous ways, including as the Director of the Clermont County Convention and Visitors Bureau, the Economic Development Director for Clermont County, and as an economic development staff member for Ohio Governor Bob Taft.

Due in part to his leadership, Clermont County has become a thriving hub of economic activity. The residential and economic growth of Clermont County is a testament to this hard work and success.

Also commendable is the positive and solutions-oriented attitude with which Chris has served. He has worked tirelessly to improve Clermont County over the years, always devoted to the big picture and listening to the people he serves, never asking or expecting anything in return.

Southwest Ohio is fortunate to have a local leader as committed to service and progress as Chris Smith is. Again, I congratulate Chris on his retirement, thank him for his public service, and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CAREER OF COACH DAVID CLARK

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to congratulate Coach David Clark on his 1000th win as coach of the volleyball team of Jacksonville High School, in Jacksonville, Alabama.

Clark attended Saks High School, graduating in 1986, and enrolled in Auburn University. While there, he studied architecture and received a degree in environmental design.

After a short time living in Oregon, he returned to Alabama to pursue an education degree at Jacksonville State University. After graduation, he worked for one year at his former high school before becoming part of the Jacksonville High School coaching staff.

In his 23 years of coaching, he has led the Jacksonville Golden Eagles volleyball team to three state championship wins with four state runner up positions, as well as eight county and 16 area championships.

Coach Clark's 1000th win came Saturday, October 3rd during the Calhoun County volleyball tournament. He is only the 10th coach in the history of the Alabama High School Athletic Association to reach this milestone.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Coach David Clark on his achievement.

IN HONOR OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Frederick Douglass, a Maryland native who made tremendous contributions to our country. This year marks the 170th anniversary of his first autobiography, Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, An American Slave, Written by Himself which gives us a first glimpse of his remarkable life.

Born into chattel slavery on February 14, 1818 on the Wye Plantation near Tuckahoe, Maryland, Frederick Augustus Washington Bailey became internationally known as Frederick Douglass, a champion in his own time for eliminating slavery and an impassioned voice demanding freedom for all.

In 1838, he married Anna Murray, a free born black woman who provided him with money to escape slavery. Together they settled in New Bedford, Massachusetts and raised four children.

After escaping slavery, Mr. Douglass began to work for the abolition of slavery in the United States. In 1845, Mr. Douglass wrote and published the Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, An American Slave, Written by Himself. It is the first of a trilogy of autobiographical writings. The second, entitled My Bondage and My Freedom, was published in 1855, and the final work, titled The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass, was published in 1881.

The first autobiography, like its successors, described the system of chattel slavery and Mr. Douglass' rejection of its premise that he, like other slaves, was not a human being. Stunningly direct in its portrayal of friends and foes, the autobiographies present the conflicts between freedom and slavery. This book recounts the honors of slavery, his courageous efforts to educate himself, and his harrowing but successful escape.

In 1847, Mr. Douglass published the North Star, a weekly abolitionist newspaper. It was the first of 4 newspapers he owned and wrote for as a journalist.

A strong supporter of women's rights, in 1848, Mr. Douglass attended the critical Seneca Falls Convention in Seneca Falls, New York for women's suffrage and supported women's right to vote.

In 1852, Mr. Douglass gave what is regarded as the greatest abolitionist speech, "What to the Slave Is the Fourth of July?" in Rochester, NY.

In 1863, during the middle of the Civil War, Mr. Douglass met with President Lincoln and successfully persuaded him to allow black men to fight for the Union. This led to the formation of the 54th Massachusetts Regiment, the first all-black combat regiment.

In addition to his writings, Mr. Douglass served his country in a number of government positions. In 1871, he was appointed by President Grant as Assistant Secretary to the Santo Domingo Commission. In 1876, he was appointed by President Hayes as United States Marshal for the District of Columbia. In 1881, he accepted an appointment from President Garfield as Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia. And in 1889, he was appointed by President Harrison as Minister and Consul General to Haiti.

In 1894, at the Metropolitan African Methodist Church in Washington, D.C., Mr. Douglass delivered "Lessons of the Hour," a searing critique of lynching.

A year later, at the age of 77, Mr. Douglass died of a heart attack at Cedar Hill, his home in the Anacostia neighborhood of Washington, D.C.

Today, Cedar Hill is a national historic site where visitors from around the world can learn about the many contributions of Frederick Douglass, an American treasure who dedicated his life to winning freedom for all Americans.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be in Washington, DC on October 7, 2015 due to a death in the family and thus missed the recorded votes on that day. On Roll Call Votes 536, 537, 538, and 540, I would have voted yea had I been present. On Roll Call Vote 539, I would have voted no had I been present.

IN HONOR OF RETIRED MAJOR JESSE BALTAZAR

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the accomplishments and service of retired Major Jesse Baltazar on this, his ninety-fifth birthday.

Major Baltazar's service includes over forty years of dedication to the United States military through the Battle of Bataan in World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. Still recovering from wounds suffered at the hands of a Japanese attack on his camp in 1942, Major Baltazar managed to escape "the Bataan Death March" after more than three days of marching. His bravery earned him the honor of a Bronze Star, a POW Medal, and a Purple Heart, which was awarded to him this past January.

As the first Filipino native commissioned into the United States Air Force, Major Baltazar is a true trail-blazer and has helped pave the way for the many men and women who have since immigrated to the United States and joined our military.

The United States has been blessed by the sacrifices of outstanding people such as Major Baltazar who have adopted this country as their own. I am proud to represent Major Baltazar and all of the selfless men and woman who serve our nation in uniform. They are truly invaluable members of our society. The debt of gratitude owed to these men and women is impossible to repay, but today, we do our small part by recognizing one special man: Major Jesse Baltazar.

IN RECOGNITION OF WINTHROP UNIVERSITY AND THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE HONORS COUNCIL

HON. MICK MULVANEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Winthrop University and the 50th

anniversary of the National Collegiate Honors Council.

Winthrop University is a coeducational, comprehensive university that teaches students to live, learn, and lead for a lifetime. Their Honors Program is designed to enrich the college experience for highly talented and motivated students and create a community of scholars that promote the pursuit of knowledge for intellectual and personal growth. The Honors Program was founded in 1960 and is one of the oldest in the nation. Over the years, the program has flourished by adapting when needed and now enrolls around 350 students from each of the academic colleges at the university. Winthrop University honors students who exemplify the kind of leadership, knowledge and experience we look for in future leaders of our global society.

I also want to recognize and express my gratitude to the National Collegiate Honors Council as they celebrate their 50th anniversary. The National Collegiate Honors Council serves Winthrop and more than 800 other colleges and universities across the country. These institutions share a commitment to achieving excellence in diverse subject and curriculum areas to accomplish professional career goals.

With the help of universities like Winthrop and professional organizations like the National Collegiate Honors Council, I am confident our nation will continue to produce the workforce necessary to lead us successfully through the 21st century.

TRIBUTE TO ELAINE MATZNER

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 2015

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to the incredible life of a dear friend, Elaine Matzner, who passed away on October 3, 2015 at her home in Palm Springs, California, surrounded by family. Elaine was a woman full of life and a pillar of the Palm Springs community; she will be deeply missed.

Elaine was born on October 6, 1933 in southern New Jersey to the owners of a fruit farm. Desiring a different life from her parents, she left the farm choosing to further her education by attending Drexel University. It was there that she met her husband Eric. After the couple married, settled down and had spent a few years raising a young family in New Jersey, Elaine and Eric decided to move their family to Southern California. They moved to Hacienda Heights and then later to Palm Springs.

She was a woman of many passions, including business, travel, and family. Elaine opened the clothing store La Mariposa in Palm Springs with her daughter Lisa and daughter-in-law Diane. After years raising a family she wanted to find a new outlet and Elaine enjoyed being a small business owner and entrepreneur. La Mariposa imported luxury goods and clothing from all over South and Central America. The store became a fixture to the residents and tourists of the Palm Springs area.

Elaine pursued her passion of culture and travel by indulging in numerous family trips over the years that included seven African safaris, 49 states and over 50 countries. She never let age slow her down on any trip. One of her favorite memories was climbing Huayna Picchu, in Peru, the cliff above Machu Picchu in the rain, when she was 65. Elaine took enjoyment from experiencing the new places she visited, their unique histories, and their people.

Elaine's biggest passion throughout her life was her family. She had a deep love of her family and involved them in every aspect of her life. Elaine took enormous pride in watching the growth and achievements of her children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren over the years.

Elaine is survived by her brother Reed Heritage of Sacramento, California; her four children, Bruce, Lisa, Jill and Evan; her five grandchildren; and three great grandchildren. I extend my heartfelt condolences to the entire Matzner family and friends during this time; although Elaine may be gone—the life, energy, and wit that she brought to the world remains and will never be forgotten.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7227–S7282

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2165–2180, and S. Res. 282–287. **Pages S7272–73**

Measures Reported:

S. 1864, to improve national security by developing metrics to measure the effectiveness of security between ports of entry, at points of entry, and along the maritime border, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 114–152)

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.

S. Res. 148, 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.

S. Res. 274, commemorating the 25th anniversary of the peaceful and democratic reunification of Germany.

S. Res. 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.

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, with amendments.

S. 2126, to reauthorize the women's business center program of the Small Business Administration, with amendments. **Page S7271**

Measures Passed:

Authorizing the Use of Emancipation Hall: Committee on Rules and Administration was discharged from further consideration of 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, and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7280–81**

McConnell (for Booker) Amendment No. 2711, to amend the resolving clause to correct the date of the ceremony. **Page S7281**

Commemorating the Life of Robert Edward Simon, Jr: Senate agreed to S. Res. 285, commemorating the life and accomplishments of Robert Edward Simon, Jr. **Page S7281**

National Wildlife Refuge Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 286, designating the week beginning on October 11, 2015, as ''National Wildlife Refuge Week''. **Page S7281**

Welcoming the President of the Republic of Korea: Senate agreed to S. Res. 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. **Page S7281**

Measures Considered:

Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act: Senate continued 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 S7233–44, S7245–49

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 49 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 278), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S7244**

Subsequently, the motion to proceed was withdrawn. **Page S7249**

Stop Sanctuary Policies and Protect Americans Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of 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. **Pages S7249–60**

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, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, October 8, 2015, a vote on cloture will occur at 2:15 p.m., on Tuesday, October 20, 2015. **Page S7249**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 4 p.m., on Monday, October 19, 2015, Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S7281**

Pro Forma Session—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate adjourn until 10 a.m., on Friday, October 9, 2015, for a pro forma session only, with no business being conducted; that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, October 9, 2015, it next convene for pro forma session only with no business conducted on the following dates and times: at 10:30 a.m., on Tuesday, October 13, 2015, and at 10 a.m., on Friday, October 16, 2015; that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, October 16, 2015, it next convene at 4 p.m., on Monday, October 19, 2015. **Page S7281**

Donnelly Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that following Leader remarks on Tuesday, October 20, 2015, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Ann Donnelly, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York; that the time until 11 a.m. be equally divided for debate on the nomination in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nomination; and that no further motions be in order to the nomination. **Page S7280**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Mario Cordero, of California, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 2019.

Sarah Elizabeth Mendelson, of the District of Columbia, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Sarah Elizabeth Mendelson, of the District of Columbia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Lucy Tamlyn, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Benin.

Jeffrey J. Hawkins, Jr., of California, to be Ambassador to the Central African Republic.

David R. Gilmour, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Togolese Republic.

Edwin Richard Nolan, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Suriname.

W. Thomas Reeder, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

Carolyn Patricia Alsup, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of The Gambia.

Daniel H. Rubinstein, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Tunisia.

Susan Coppedge Amato, of Georgia, to be Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, with the rank of Ambassador at Large.

Pages S7244–45, S7282

Stephen C. Hedger, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense. **Pages S7280, S7282**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Dana J. Boente, of Virginia, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia for the term of four years.

Robert Lloyd Capers, of New York, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York for the term of four years.

John P. Fishwick, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Virginia for the term of four years.

Channing D. Phillips, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Attorney for the District of Columbia for the term of four years.

Emily Gray Rice, of New Hampshire, to be United States Attorney for the District of New Hampshire for the term of four years.

Randolph J. Seiler, of South Dakota, to be United States Attorney for the District of South Dakota for the term of four years.

Amos J. Hochstein, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Energy Resources).

David McKean, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to Luxembourg.

Routine lists in the Army and Navy. **Page S7282**

Messages from the House: **Page S7266**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S7266, S7281**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S7266**

Executive Communications: **Pages S7266–71**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S7271**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S7271–72**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7273–74**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S7274–79**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7264–66**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S7279**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S7279–80**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S7280**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—278) **Page S7244**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 5:49 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Friday, October 9, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7281.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

RUSSIAN STRATEGY AND MILITARY OPERATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Russian strategy and military operations, after receiving testimony from General John M. Keane, USA (Ret.), former Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, Institute for the Study of War; General James L. Jones, USMC (Ret.), former National Security Advisor, Atlantic Council Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security; Heather Conley, Center for Strategic and International Studies Europe Program; and Stephen Sestanovich, Council on Foreign Relations.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY AND THE RECALL PROCESS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security concluded a hearing to examine consumer product safety and the recall process, after receiving testimony from Elliot F. Kaye, Chairman, and Ann Marie Buerkle, Commissioner, both of the Consumer Product Safety Commission; Frederick Locker, National Association of Manufacturers CPSC Coalition, New York, New York; Jonathan Gold, National Retail Federation, and Cheryl A. Falvey, Crowell and Moring LLP, both of Washington, D.C.; and Nancy A. Cowles, Kids in Danger, Chicago, Illinois.

WATER AND HYDROELECTRIC LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine H.R. 2898, to provide drought relief in the State of California, S. 1894, to provide short-term water supplies to drought-stricken California, S. 1936, to provide for drought preparedness measures in the State of New Mexico, S. 1583, to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, S. 2046, to authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to issue an order continuing a stay of a hydroelectric license for the Mahoney Lake hydroelectric project in the State of Alaska, and S. 2083, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project, after receiving testimony from Senators Feinstein and Boxer; Representative Valadao; Michael L. Connor, Deputy Secretary of the Interior; Jeffrey Kightlinger, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Los Angeles; Dan Keppen, Family Farm Alliance, Klamath Falls, Oregon; Richard M. Frank, University of California School of Law California Environmental Law and Policy Center, Davis; Adrian Oglesby, Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, Albuquerque, New Mexico; and Sarah Woolf, Clovis, California.

PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining concluded a hearing to examine S. 414, to provide for conservation, enhanced recreation opportunities, and development of renewable energy in the California Desert Conservation Area, S. 872, to provide for the recognition of certain Native communities

and the settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, S. 1295 and H.R. 1324, bills to adjust the boundary of the Arapaho National Forest, Colorado, S. 1448, to designate the Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary in the State of Oregon, S. 1592, to clarify the description of certain Federal land under the Northern Arizona Land Exchange and Verde River Basin Partnership Act of 2005 to include additional land in the Kaibab National Forest, S. 1941 and H.R. 2223, bills to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, S. 1942 and H.R. 1554, bills to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, S. 1955, to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide for equitable allotment of land to Alaska Native veterans, S. 1971, to expand the boundary of the California Coastal National Monument, and S. 2069, to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify provisions relating to certain land exchanges in the Mt. Hood Wilderness in the State of Oregon, after receiving testimony from Senators Feinstein and Sullivan; Glenn Casamassa, Associate Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Steven A. Ellis, Deputy Director, Operations, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Leo Barlow, Southeast Alaska Landless Corporation, Anchorage; Buck Lindekugel, Southeast Alaska Conservation Council, Juneau; Robert Lovingood, County of San Bernardino, Victorville, California; and Frazier Haney, Mojave Desert Land Trust, Joshua Tree, California.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2152, to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to encourage the efforts of countries in sub-Saharan Africa to develop and appropriate mix of power solutions, including renewable energy, for more broadly distributed electricity access in order to support poverty reduction, promote development outcomes, and drive economic growth, with amendments;

S. 1789, to improve defense cooperation between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan;

S. Res. 274, commemorating the 25th anniversary of the peaceful and democratic reunification of Germany;

S. Res. 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;

S. Res. 148, 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; and

The nominations of Robert Porter Jackson, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ghana, Harry K. Thomas, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zimbabwe, Julie Furuta-Toy, of Wyoming, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Equatorial Guinea, and Dennis B. Hankins, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea, all of the Department of State.

UKRAINE

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the economic and political future of Ukraine, after receiving testimony from Victoria Nuland, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, and Clifford G. Bond, United States Assistance Coordinator in Ukraine, both of the Department of State; and Paula J. Dobriansky, Harvard University JFK Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

DIPLOMATIC SECURITY TRAINING FACILITY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on State Department and USAID Management, International Operations, and Bilateral International Development concluded a hearing to examine ensuring an efficient and effective diplomatic security training facility for the twenty-first century, after receiving testimony from Gregory B. Starr, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Diplomatic Security; Michael J. Courts, Director, International Affairs and Trade, Government Accountability Office; and Connie L. Patrick, Director, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, Department of Homeland Security.

THREATS TO THE HOMELAND

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine threats to the homeland, after receiving testimony from Jeh Charles Johnson, Secretary of Homeland Security; James B. Comey, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; and Nick Rasmussen, Director, National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Edward L. Gilmore, of Illinois, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Illinois for the term of four years, Department of Justice.

EMINENT DOMAIN

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution concluded a hearing to examine eminent domain ten years after *Kelo v. City of New London*, after receiving testimony from Clemente Casillas, Community Youth Athletic Center, National City, California; Dan Alban, Institute for Justice, Arlington, Virginia; and David A. Dana, Northwestern University School of Law, Chicago, Illinois.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 23 public bills, H.R. 3708–3730; and 9 resolutions, H.J. Res. 69; H. Con. Res. 85; and H. Res. 467–473 were introduced. **Pages H6935–36**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6937–38**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Duncan (TN) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6895**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:52 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6900**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:02 p.m. and reconvened at 1:01 p.m. **Page H6901**

Native American Energy Act: The House passed H.R. 538, to facilitate the development of energy on Indian lands by reducing Federal regulations that impede tribal development of Indian lands, by a yea-and-nay vote of 254 yeas to 173 nays, Roll No. 544. **Pages H6911–20**

Rejected the Ben Ray Luján (NM) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 184 yeas to 239 nays, Roll No. 543. **Pages H6918–19**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–30 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. **Pages H6916–18**

Agreed to:

Young (AK) amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–290) that clarifies that a state, tribes, and local governments in an affected area of a proposed federal action on Indian lands may continue as provided under current law to comment on an environmental impact statement required under the National Environmental Policy Act, and that Section 4 shall not limit any public comment on a federal action concerning gaming on Indian lands under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act; and **Pages H6917–18**

Lujan Grisham (NM) amendment (No. 2 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–290) that allows the Forest Service to create a pilot program that would execute contracts with tribes to perform administrative, management, and other functions of programs of the Tribal Forest Protection Act of 2004. **Page H6918**

H. Res. 466, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 538) and (H.R. 702) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 244 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 542, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 244 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 541. **Pages H6902–11**

Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Representative Black. **Page H6921**

National Council on Disability—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following individual on the part of the House to the National Council on Disability: Lt. Colonel Daniel M. Gade, PhD., New Windsor, New York. **Page H6921**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H6901.

Senate Referrals: S. 2162 was referred to the Committee on House Administration. S. 32 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Energy and Commerce. **Page H6932**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6909–10,

H6910–11, H6919, H6920. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:28 p.m.

Committee Meetings

THE 2015 FIRE SEASON AND LONG-TERM TRENDS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry held a hearing to review the 2015 fire season and long-term trends. Testimony was heard from Tom Tidwell, Chief, U.S. Forest Service; and public witnesses.

U.S. STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''U.S. Strategy in Afghanistan''. Testimony was heard from General John F. Campbell (USA), Commander, Operation Resolute Support and U.S. Forces—Afghanistan.

UPDATE ON MILITARY SUICIDE PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled ''Update on Military Suicide Prevention Programs''. Testimony was heard from Keita Franklin, Director, Suicide Prevention Office, Office of the Secretary of Defense; Lieutenant General James C. McConville, Deputy Chief of Staff, G1, U.S. Army; Rear Admiral Ann M. Burkhardt, Director, 21st Century Sailor Office, U.S. Navy; Major General Burke Whitman, Director Marine and Family Programs, U.S. Marine Corps; and Lieutenant General Mark Ediger, Surgeon General, USAF, U.S. Air Force.

REVIEWING THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM AND HOW IT SERVES AT-RISK YOUTH

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Reviewing the Juvenile Justice System and How It Serves At-Risk Youth''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

VOLKSWAGEN EMISSIONS CHEATING ALLEGATIONS: INITIAL QUESTIONS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Volkswagen Emissions Cheating Allegations: Initial Questions''. Testimony was heard from Christopher Grundler, Director, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Office of Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency; Phillip Brooks, Director, Air Enforcement Division, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, Environmental Protection Agency; and a public witness.

EXAMINING LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO COMBAT OUR NATION'S DRUG ABUSE CRISIS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Examining Legislative Proposals to Combat our Nation's Drug Abuse Crisis''. Testimony was heard from Michael Botticelli, Director, National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President; Richard Frank, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services; and Jack Riley, Deputy Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration.

EXAMINING THE SYRIAN HUMANITARIAN CRISIS FROM THE GROUND, PART I

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Syrian Humanitarian Crisis from the Ground, Part I''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROTECTING MARITIME FACILITIES IN THE 21ST CENTURY: ARE OUR NATION'S PORTS AT RISK FOR A CYBER-ATTACK?

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security held a hearing entitled ''Protecting Maritime Facilities in the 21st Century: Are Our Nation's Ports at Risk for a Cyber-Attack?''. Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral Paul Thomas, Assistant Commandant, Prevention Policy, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security; Gregory C. Wilshusen, Director, Information Security Issues, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

REFORM AND IMPROVEMENT: ASSESSING THE PATH FORWARD FOR THE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation Security held a hearing entitled ''Reform and Improvement: Assessing the Path Forward for the Transportation Security Administration''. Testimony was heard from John Roth, Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security; and Peter Neffenger, Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD EXPOSED: EXAMINING ABORTION PROCEDURES AND MEDICAL ETHICS AT THE NATION'S LARGEST ABORTION PROVIDER

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Planned Parenthood Exposed: Examining Abortion Procedures and Medical Ethics at

the Nation's Largest Abortion Provider''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee concluded a 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''. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 1452 and H.R. 1820. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 974, H.R. 1107, H.R. 2212, H.R. 2270, H.R. 2406, and H.R. 3382.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3033, the ''Research Excellence and Advancements for Dyslexia (READ) Act''; and H.R. 3293, the ''Scientific Research in the National Interest Act''. H.R. 3033 was ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 3293 was ordered reported, without amendment.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF DOL'S ONE-SIZE-FITS-ALL OVERTIME RULE FOR SMALL BUSINESSES AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Regulations held a hearing entitled ''The Consequences of DOL's One-Size-Fits-All Overtime Rule for Small Businesses and their Employees''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, markup on reconciliation submissions, 9 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, hearing entitled ''E-manifest: An Update on Implementation'', 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled ''The Future of the Multilateral Development Banks'', 9:15 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H. Res. 348, supporting the right of the people of Ukraine to freely elect their government and determine their future; and H. Res. 354, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the safety and security of Jewish communities in Europe, 11:15 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 10, the ''Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act''; H.R. 3231, the ''Federal Intern Protection Act of 2015''; H.R. 2347, the ''Federal Advisory Committee Act Amendments of 2015''; S. 1172, the ''Edward 'Ted' Kaufman and Michael Leavitt Presidential Transitions Improvements Act of 2015''; S. 1576, the ''Representative Payee Fraud Prevention Act of 2015''; S. 1580, the ''Competitive Service Act of 2015''; S. 1629, the ''District of Columbia Courts, Public Defender Service, and Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Act of 2015''; H.R. 136, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1103 USPS Building 1103 in Camp Pendleton, California, as the ''Camp Pendleton Medal of Honor Post Office''; H.R. 2928, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 B Street in Perryville, Arkansas, as the ''Harold George Bennett Post Office''; H.R. 3082, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5919 Chef Menteur Highway in New Orleans, Louisiana, as the ''Daryle Holloway Post Office Building''; H.R. 3274, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4567 Rockbridge Road in Pine Lake, Georgia, as the ''Francis Manuel Ortega Post Office''; H.R. 3601, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7715 Post Road, North Kingstown, Rhode Island, as the ''Melvoid J. Benson Post Office Building''; S. 1596, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2082 Stringtown Road in Grove City, Ohio, as the ''Specialist Joseph W. Riley Post Office Building''; and S. 1826, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 West 2nd Street in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, as the Lieutenant Colonel James ''Maggie'' Megellas Post Office, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Space, hearing entitled ''Deep Space Exploration: Examining the Impact of the President's Budget'', 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Friday, October 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, October 9

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 702—To adapt to changing crude oil market conditions (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Beatty, Joyce, Ohio, E1452, E1453
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1451
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1456
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1454
Collins, Doug, Ga., E1454
Comstock, Barbara, Va., E1455
Cummings, Elijah E., Md., E1455
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E1453
Dent, Charles W., Pa., E1450
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E1454
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E1452
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E1450, E1450
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E1449
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1449
Joyce, David P., Ohio, E1450
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E1449
Lynch, Stephen F., Mass., E1454
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E1451
Moolenaar, John R., Mich., E1450, E1451, E1452, E1452, E1453
Mulvany, Mick, S.C., E1455
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E1451
Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J., E1453
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E1455
Smith, Lamar, Tex., E1449
Takai, Mark, Hawaii, E1449
Valadao, David G., Calif., E1451, E1452
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E1455
Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E1454
Williams, Roger, Tex., E1451, E1453, E1454
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E1453

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.