United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2015 No. 175

House of Representatives

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

PRAYER

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

Father of us all, thank You for giving us another day.

In so many ways, the world is exploding with crisis after crisis. We ask Your blessing on the people and city of San Bernardino, but also upon this Nation, which seems plagued by so many problems of violence and resulting death.

We ask Your blessing upon Syria and the Middle East, where the threats and dangers of terrorism are confusing to nations who now find themselves, as traditional foes, vulnerable before a ruthless organization professing a twisted, violent religious fervor.

And we ask Your blessing upon our planet itself, which we all share. No matter the cause, we are well aware of extremes in weather systems which threaten populations in many parts of our world.

All of these are great and complicated problems. As the Members of this assembly consider them, give them the grace to see one another as brothers and sisters, rather than as foes, who must work together for the love of our Nation and our world.

May everything done in this place 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 Georgia (Mr. CARTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

HONORING TOM COFFEY

(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 to remember journalist and community leader Tom Coffey.

Last week, Tom Coffey died at the age of 92. He was one of the old-time newspaper guys. He never missed a chance to speak and listen to people he encountered.

Mr. Coffey entered the news business as a copyboy when he graduated from Savannah High School in 1940. With the exception of a short time away to serve his country in World War II, where he was wounded in the Philippines, and a brief stint from 1969 to 1974, when he served as acting city manager of Savannah twice, he was a journalist until he retired as editor of the Savannah Morning News.

More than 20 years ago, when Mr. Coffey retired in 1989, Representative Lindsay Thomas, my predecessor, referred to Tom as one of the most respected journalists in Georgia.

During his life, Tom wrote about national news, including civil rights and desegregation, but he also wrote about the thrill of playing stickball in the backyards of Savannah and the local bootlegger who bribed local law enforcement.

Tom's extraordinary career as a journalist and his work over the years has made life better for many people. He will truly be missed.

TAX EXTENDERS

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to state my opposition to the $800 billion of unpaid tax extenders now being discussed in Congress.

It is incomprehensible to me that Republicans and Democrats would entertain adding $800 billion to the $19 trillion debt that we already have, a debt that our children and grandchildren will end up having to pay.

Just as every well-meaning program should be paid for in these tough times, so should every tax incentive. This is especially true when those incentives are being expanded beyond their original purpose and made permanent.

What we really need, colleagues, is having a more comprehensive discussion on tax policy and entitlement reform. We probably have too many tax breaks. We should broaden the tax base, frankly, and reduce our tax load.

We must deal seriously with the long-term debt and deficits. Adding this additional burden to the out-of-control debt we already have is absolutely destructive to our country's future.

As one of the former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said, the greatest threat to our Nation is not from abroad, but our national debt.

SUPPORT FOR THE CRADLE ACT

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

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, sadly, every year in America, more than 20,000 babies are born addicted to drugs. Last year alone, nearly 1,000 of those babies were born in Maine. We can help these babies by passing H.R. 3865, the Cradle Act, of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor.

Eighty percent of addicted infants are covered by Medicaid and treated at local hospitals; however, our hospitals are overwhelmed. They are not equipped to provide the specialized care that these babies desperately need to recover from the drugs in their tiny bodies.

Residential pediatric recovery centers are designed and professionally staffed to provide this critically important early clinical care. These centers depend on Medicaid dollars to stay open, but need clear certification guidelines in order to receive those funds. The Cradle Act does that.

Every baby born into this world deserves our compassion and care. This is an opportunity to help the most vulnerable among us. This bill offers real hope for a healthy, safe, and loving start for thousands of American babies born addicted to drugs.

MASS SHOOTINGS

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, another mass shooting, another moment of silence. Actually, we will have to do two in a day or back-to-back because of the shooting in Savannah, Georgia. That did not get the attention because 1 person died and 3 people were injured, not like in California, where 14 died and 17 were injured.

You stood already this week for Colorado. I say ''you'' because I don't do it any more. I can't be hypocritical. You stand up, you sit down, you do nothing.

There have been 355 mass shootings so far this year, not to mention the many who have died alone and get no attention or no moment of silence.

When are we really going to stand up and do something? Just who has to die—your mother? your wife? your son? Or how many? We need to stand up, speak up, and take actions rather than another moment of silence. It is deafening, and it is killing us.

FUNDRAISING EFFORTS FOR PENN STATE THON

(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, next February, more than 700 students from Penn State University will come together for the university's annual dance marathon, otherwise known as THON. This event is the culmination of a huge fundraising effort for the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital, which is dedicated to fighting pediatric cancer. THON is the largest student-run philanthropy in the world.

Even though much of Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District falls solidly within the territory of Pittsburgh's sports teams, I want to commend the Philadelphia Flyers and the New Jersey Devils hockey teams. The proceeds from tickets purchased for either the Devils game on December 19 or the Flyers game on January 5 will go to benefit THON. Both games fall within Penn State's winter break, allowing students to support this effort even when they are away from the university.

I wish all the students involved in THON the best of luck as they continue in this tremendous effort. They should be deeply proud of the role they are playing in striking a blow to pediatric cancer.

NO HARMFUL OMNIBUS POLICY RIDERS

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I came to talk about no harmful omnibus policy riders, and I hope to get to that point, but my thoughts and prayers go out to the people of San Bernardino, the victims, and the families who have been affected by this violence. Again, I hope that this violence wakes up the Congress to begin a really serious discussion about violence in America, by Americans, against Americans.

In 8 days, we are going to find ourselves staring at a deadline to keep the Federal Government open. As negotiations are finalized, we need a clean spending bill, not one that is peppered with toxic policy riders.

We do not need more attacks on environmental protections, Planned Parenthood, the Affordable Care Act, and financial regulations. These are unacceptable policy changes in an appropriations bill, and they are being threatened to be included.

Mr. Speaker, in order for all of us to support this bill, I hope you have the courage to bring a clean bill to the floor.

JOE E. EDWARDS' RETIREMENT

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, today I want to pay tribute to a true pillar of our community, Pastor Joe E. Edwards.

For the past quarter century, Joe Edwards has served as pastor of the Church of God in Cartersville, Georgia; however, this Sunday, Joe Edwards will deliver his final sermon as senior pastor at The Church At Liberty Square, as he is retiring.

Joe Edwards has been more than just a pastor. He has been a leader who has sought not only to preach the gospel of Christ inside the church, but put his faith into action throughout the community.

While he has made numerous contributions to our community, his vision of unifying local churches to pray for local, State, and national leaders is fundamentally transforming the culture in our entire county. While he will be missed in the pulpit each Sunday, his legacy will live on through the thousands of lives he has touched.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Georgia's 11th Congressional District and the United States House of Representatives, I commend Pastor Joe E. Edwards for a life of service to God, community, and country, and congratulate him as he moves on to a new chapter in his life.

Godspeed, Pastor Joe.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN AND THE HIGHWAY BILL

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank my colleagues for working across the aisle to prepare to pass the first long-term highway bill in more than a decade.

For too long, Washington has governed from one manufactured crisis to another. This has hurt our economy by creating an environment of uncertainty for great manufacturers like Caterpillar, John Deere, UTC, and Woodward.

American families shouldn't have to worry when they cross a decrepit bridge on their way to the grocery store or take their kids to school. The men and women of labor who build our roads and bridges deserve this long-overdue, job-creating highway bill. And so do we.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for working together on this important issue.

FUNDING BILL RIDERS

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to end their calls for shutdown and to work in a bipartisan manner to pass a funding measure without riders.

This body has gotten into the habit of using last-minute Hail Mary votes to save us from one manufactured crisis after another, and it is taking our attention away from the list of things we need to get done—things like reforming our criminal justice system, addressing gun violence, or creating jobs.

There is just 1 week left before funding runs out, and it looks like we are heading into yet another crisis. In the midst of growing threats to national

security, we need to take politics out of this equation. We need to take poison pills that threaten working American families off the negotiating table.

Mr. Speaker, I am ready and willing to work to keep the government of the greatest nation in the world open, and I know my Democratic colleagues will as well. I hope every Member of this body is ready to do the same.

I want to express my condolences to San Bernardino and its families on their loss. I urge Congress to get moving on gun safety legislation.

□ 0915

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 22, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 546 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 546

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 22) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I confess to you, I usually use the time that the Reading Clerk is reading the rule to collect my thoughts and think about what the bill is before us today and how I am going to try to persuade my colleagues to vote ''yes.'' But we only got about 15 seconds of the Reading Clerk this morning because this rule is so straightforward and so simple.

I am thinking, why is it—because I sit on the Rules Committee. I think we do good work up there. Good work is sometimes complicated work. Why is it that the rule is so short today? And the answer is because we are in conference report season, Mr. Speaker. We are in conference report season.

We have already done the hard work in committee. We have already done the hard work on the floor. The Rules Committee has already done the hard work of sorting through dozens and dozens and dozens and dozens of amendments. The Senate has done the same hard work.

And we are now here on the conclusion of that work, on the first long-term transportation bill in more than a decade.

Mr. Speaker, Democratic administrations, Democratic Presidents, Democratic Houses, Democratic Senates have failed to do what we are doing today. Republican administrations, Republican Presidents, Republican Houses, Republican Senates have failed to do what we are doing today.

In divided government today, Mr. Speaker, I dare say my friend from Colorado didn't get everything he wanted in this bill, I certainly didn't get everything I wanted in this bill, but we are taking the first big step forward toward certainty for the American people on transportation that we have seen in more than a decade under both administrations.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 546 is a standard rule for consideration of a conference report to accompany H.R. 22, the FAST Act, the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act.

I want to thank Chairman BILL SHUSTER for the way that he conducted this entire process. Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure of serving on his committee, and between his leadership, the ranking member's leadership, Mr. DEFAZIO, we have crafted a bipartisan, bicameral bill.

I was privileged to serve on the conference committee, Mr. Speaker, that completed this work, and it worked the way conference committees are supposed to work, I guess, because, Mr. Speaker, it is the first conference committee I have been on.

I have been here 4½ years. We don't see things get to conference that often. I was a staffer around here, chief of staff, for a decade, never saw a conference committee from that perspective.

Mr. Speaker, these things don't happen that often. They should happen more. We considered a conference committee report on education yesterday. We are doing transportation today. I think we might be on to something. I think we might be on to something. It is called doing the long, hard work, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know how many sound bites you have read about the transportation bill. I don't know how much press is being paid to this bill. It has taken not days, not weeks, not even months, but years to bring folks together around this solution, and folks have worked incredibly hard to make that happen.

It is regular order, Mr. Speaker. It is regular order. This is the way it is supposed to happen. We are not supposed to have a bill airdropped into the House of Representatives, into the Senate under a take-it-or-leave-it circumstance.

What you are supposed to have are those days, those weeks, those months, and, yes, even years of discussion and debate and moving people together, finding that common ground, finding those solutions, moving it to a conference report at the end. And that is exactly what we have done here today.

Mr. Speaker, this is a report that contains views from across this conference—Members from rural districts, Members from urban districts, Members from districts that focus on mass transportation, Members from districts that have incredible road needs.

It covers folks from the West in single-Member States, single-district States, and folks from the East, with some of the highest population densities in the country. It is an amazing accomplishment to bring all of those folks together.

I would tell you, Mr. Speaker, historically, that has been the way transportation has been. Transportation is not one of those issues that divides us as Republicans and Democrats or even from the East and West. It is one of those issues that brings people together.

It is one of those issues—and there aren't many—but it is one of those issues that we actually have a constitutional responsibility to perform. The Constitution does not ask much of this United States Congress when it comes to developing policy and practice domestically here in this country, but transportation is one of those issues.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned it was the first long-term bill in more than a decade. That is absolutely true. Length is important all by itself; certainty in transportation, important all by itself.

We passed a 2-year transportation extension, Mr. Speaker. We put in the requirement to streamline some of the regulatory process. Here we are, more than 2 years later, and those regulations haven't even come out yet.

Building is a long-term process. Rulemaking, so that people can build, is a long-term process.

Having long-term certainty is valuable in and of itself, but that is not just what this bill does. It focuses on the national highway freight network, Mr. Speaker.

Between Washington, D.C., and Baltimore, for example, there are three major Federal arteries. We have the Baltimore-Washington Parkway running those 35 miles north. We have U.S. Route 1 running that distance. We have U.S. Interstate 95 running that distance. Those roads are never separated by more than about 4 miles.

Now, whether or not we need three major Federal arteries running between two cities over a course of 35 miles, that is a debate that we can have. What the scope of Federal transportation funding should be is a debate

that we can have, And, in this bill, we did have it, Mr. Speaker.

We are focusing on moving goods to market. This is a bill about getting to your child's soccer game on time. This is a bill about freeing up congestion on America's roads and improving America's mass transit in a way that you don't miss the first pitch. But this is also a bill about moving freight to market. It is a bill about making America's economy work.

In a 21st century world, we cannot have a 20th century transportation system. We focus on those issues that have been left on the sidelines for far too long. We focus on bridges, Mr. Speaker. Bridges. It seems so simple. It is a transportation bill; there ought to be more that goes on than just roads and just buses.

Bridges, Mr. Speaker, turn out to be that chokepoint that so many of us have in our district. It turns out it is expensive to build a bridge. It is environmentally difficult to get the permits. It is an engineering marvel to put together some of the bridges that we have here today.

As dollars have gotten tight, many of our communities have not focused on the safety of existing infrastructure in ways that we all know our constituents demand. We make that investment in safety and security today.

Mr. Speaker, we streamline a lot of Federal regulation in this bill. There is not a man or woman on this floor who doesn't believe that we have an obligation to protect this great Earth. There is not a man or woman on this floor who doesn't believe that constructing in an environmentally sensitive manner is a priority for us all.

But there is also not a man or woman on this floor who believes it ought to take 10 years to get a yes-or-no answer. There is not a man or woman on this floor that thinks it ought to take 8 years to get a yes-or-no answer. If the answer is no, the answer is no. But we deserve, our constituents deserve some certainty in that construction process.

We eliminate duplication. We speed up delivery. We allow States, through a pilot program, Mr. Speaker, to begin to enforce some of these Federal mandates. In many cases, it is not the mandate itself that is the problem. It is the Federal bureaucracy that is overburdened and can't come through on permitting.

We allow States, under this bill, as long as they abide by the Federal standards, to go ahead and implement those standards on their own so that they can prioritize the projects that are most important to them.

Mr. Speaker, an issue that I know is important to all of our colleagues: We take some steps to get veterans back to work. This isn't the first bill that has done that, of course. We have done bill after bill after bill after bill on this floor, Hire More Heroes most recently, to say, if the only thing standing between you and putting our veterans back to work is Federal regulation, we want to get Federal regulation out of the way. We build on that again in this bill, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know if you have any truck-driving schools in your district, but I can't find a truck-driving school in my district that doesn't have job offers waiting today for folks who sign up today. The demand is so great, Mr. Speaker, for folks to move goods to market.

But we have limitations on who is eligible to drive trucks, and for good reasons. For good safety concern reasons, we don't want folks 19, 20 years of age to be driving these heavy trucks.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have, returning from Afghanistan, returning from Iraq, folks who have been trained by the finest training facility in all the world, the United States military, folks who have been trained in the skills required, the safety skills required, to move heavy equipment from one place to another.

Those men and women are returning from serving us and are looking for work. If they were talented enough to serve us overseas, are they not talented enough to serve us here domestically? Of course they are. We take steps to recognize that here today.

Mr. Speaker, I am still waiting on that opportunity when I can come to the floor and tell you I got absolutely everything I wanted in absolutely every line of the bill. It has only been 4½ years for me; I haven't had that opportunity yet. I am still hoping that opportunity comes.

But what I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, is that I came here to make a difference. I came here to move the ball forward. I came here to do the hard things, not the easy things. The easy things have already been done.

There is a reason we haven't passed a long-term bill in more than a decade. It is because it is hard to do. And I take great pleasure and great pride, as a member of the Rules Committee, the Transportation Committee, and the conference committee, in bringing this rule to the floor today.

If we pass this rule, Mr. Speaker, we can move to that conference report, and we can deliver for America what has been undeliverable for more than a decade.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I commend my colleagues on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, who we will be hearing from shortly, for their diligence in developing a thoughtful, long-term, sustainably funded surface transportation compromise that really has many of the priorities that Republicans and Democrats brought to the table.

As the gentleman from Georgia said, this is an example of what we call regular order of a conference committee.

I want to inquire of the gentleman from Georgia, what was the vote on the conference committee on this final transportation bill?

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend for yielding. It was a unanimous approval of this provision.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, you did even better than the education conference committee. We were 39–1. There was actually one person on that conference committee who didn't support it. What a great job that you and your colleagues did.

The education conference committee was the first chance in 7½ years that I had to serve on a conference committee; my friend from Georgia, his first chance during his time in Congress to do it.

And that is a procedural matter. When the American people hear, oh, conference committee, that sounds procedural. Yet another committee; what does that mean? But the product of these committees are substantial bills.

□ 0930

Part of the problem here in this institution is that it is a bicameral legislature, and the House and the Senate don't talk to each other enough. The formal way they talk to one another is through a conference committee. What that means is there are Senators and Representatives on the same committee working on the same bill, rather than what happens too often around here where the House passes one bill and the Senate, if they pass a bill at all, passes a very different bill, and never the twain shall meet. Mr. Speaker, thanks to this procedural conference committee, the differences between the House and the Senate have been worked out.

So we were on the education bill yesterday. The Senate will likely consider that exact same bill next week, which means it will likely go to President Obama's desk before Christmas. This transportation bill the House considers today, I don't know the Senate's schedule, but hopefully in the next week or two they will consider this exact same bill, and hopefully it will go to President Obama's desk.

So we had a very quick meeting of the Rules Committee yesterday. My goodness, usually when the Rules Committee meets, those are contentious meetings. We have a lot of amendments from Democrats and Republicans that want to have their voice heard. But on a final conference report, it went pretty quickly, and members of our committee on both sides of the aisle had a lot of praise for the chair and the ranking member of the committee that had worked tirelessly to put this deal together.

The Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act—they came up with a clever acronym, FAST. That works well, right? Transportation, fast, we all want to go fast, not too fast. The act commits $305 billion over a 5-year period towards improving our Nation's

roads, bridges, transit systems, and railways. This is something that Republicans and Democrats both agree is the job of government. Transportation, infrastructure, and making sure people can get from one place to another is one of the most critical roles that our government plays.

In the first year, FAST increases spending on highways by $2.1 billion. By the final year, the funding levels will reach $6.1 billion in addition to current investment. It also raises transit funding from $8.6 billion to almost $10.6 billion by 2020.

It establishes a Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects program that helps focus our attention on projects that increase the competitiveness of American goods and services by expanding and improving upon heavily trafficked freight routes. Two that affect us in Colorado—very near and dear to my district—are highway 25, from Denver to Wyoming, and highway 70, from Denver to Salt Lake City, which we were able to successfully include an amendment in the House version, which I am proud to say is also reflected in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, these Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects open the door to economic development, improve the flow of goods across our great country, increase the quality of life for residents, ease congestion and safety concerns, and, along our particular corridors, are to the benefit of tourism and the tourism industry as well.

This bill helps leverage private investment in our surface transportation program by promoting the use of public-private partnerships which simply have become a reality for many infrastructure projects today like those used to expand highway 36 from Denver to Boulder, which I drive on most days that I am back home in Colorado.

The FAST Act encourages installation of vehicle-to-vehicle and vehicle-to-infrastructure equipment—which the Colorado Department of Transportation has been at the cutting edge of designing and implementing—to improve congestion, ensure passenger safety, and really help create a 21st century infrastructure. This bill helps increase dedicated bus funding by 89 percent over the life of the bill, a change that was direly needed after the last highway authorization.

The FAST Act maintains local flexibility for STP Metro funding, allows governments to dictate what is best for our communities, and leaves the door open for complex transportation infrastructure projects like the northeast line of the Denver Regional Transportation District's FasTrack system, which our voters approved a decade ago.

The bill requires a feasibility study to determine an impairment standard for drivers under the influence of marijuana, something that I introduced a bill on and have been working hard on to increase the safety of driving in States where marijuana is legalized, like my home State of Colorado.

This bill increases funding for highway railway grade crossings and requires operators to report the movements of hazardous materials along railroads, many of which, again, traverse my district. In Fort Collins, in Loveland, and in Longmont, where trains run through the downtown every day, these types of commonsense safety measures are desperately needed and welcomed.

The bill includes reforms to the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing loan program—a loan that can be used to divert cumbersome traffic out of the middle of our downtown areas like in Fort Collins—to ensure speedy approval.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a good bill. The policy changes are thoughtful and progressive. The funding levels authorized are an improvement upon those of the past. The financing sources we tap, while not ideal, are workable.

Now, it is always fair to say in any compromise that we could have done better. There are a few things I am disappointed that this bill doesn't contain.

We were on the edge of cutting a deal that would have included international tax reform that would have brought American wealth home, used the taxes gained to fund transportation and infrastructure restoration projects nationwide, and prevented the offshoring of corporations, which we continue to see.

Earlier this Congress, Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill with my friend, Representative DELANEY, that would have deemed repatriation at 8.75 percent to fund both a 6-year highway bill at increased funding levels and create a new, national infrastructure bank. Combining international tax reform—desperately needed in its own right—with bold and robust infrastructure investment is a forward-thinking, problem-solving solution and exactly the type of move that I wish—and the American people wish—that Congress could have made.

Our failure to come to a deal on the repatriation of overseas wealth has, unfortunately, robbed the American people of hundreds of billions of dollars in public investment and continues to abandon the $2 trillion in overseas earnings that could have been brought home.

In addition, we fail to address the tax incentive that American companies have to merge with overseas corporations or relocate their own headquarters overseas to avoid paying American taxes. We came close—we came close—to addressing this in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Congress to address international tax reform as soon possible to prevent the continuing offshoring of companies and the moving of jobs overseas, as well as to ensure that over $2 trillion in overseas earnings can be invested here in America rather than face an enormous tax penalty if it is brought back, thereby preventing it from being brought back and providing an incentive for companies to invest in overseas growth and infrastructure rather than investing in infrastructure and growth here at home.

Mr. Speaker, the failure to contain corporate tax reform is not my only challenge in supporting this bill. There were certainly other programs that I believe we could have invested in, like improving even more the TIFIA investment which funds important projects like those needed along highways 70 and 25 in my district. I would have liked to have seen a direct funding stream tied to improvement and maintenance projects along designated high-priority corridors.

Finally, I would have liked to have seen the plight of communities with rail running through their downtowns addressed in the bill, an issue very near and dear to the cities in my district, cities like Fort Collins, Loveland, and Longmont, which are changed entirely by constant disruption of train horns and road blockages through our busy downtown areas.

The economic loss that we face in our communities, on top of the disturbance to residents' quality of life, isn't something that we can continue to sit by and do nothing about. We are going to work with every bit of flexibility in the bill. We continue to work with the department on less expensive implementation of quiet zones and of trying to reopen the rulemaking around train horns, which we expect to happen shortly, but there is no specific statutory fix to that issue in this bill itself.

So while I support this bill and commend the effort and the regular order that led to us getting here, we still need to look at what we can do. We see this bill as a floor, not a ceiling. There is even more we can do to bring our transportation infrastructure into the 21st century, to ensure its funding source is reliable and sustained, to repatriate overseas earnings and invest them here at home, and to eliminate an incentive for American companies to move overseas.

I hope my Republican colleagues agree that passage of this bill doesn't mean that we retire from presenting new, thoughtful ideas to improve our Federal highway system. I hope that Republicans and Democrats will continue to partner to address and solve some of these issues that I have raised that are not included in this bill.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to tell my friend how much I appreciate what he had to say about international tax reform and what our opportunities are to grow America rather than grow our competitors abroad and to say there are a lot of different provisions in this bill. The Transportation Committee was unanimous in its support of this bill, as were

several of the other committees who were involved in the conference, but there were a few stragglers out there on some of the extraneous provisions that were placed in here.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE), a member of the freshman class of 2010 and a member of the Transportation Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, the Congress has offered Members the classic Sophie's choice. Either vote ''no'' on the transportation bill and guarantee no reforms to road and bridge building happen, or vote ''yes'' and get reforms necessary to save money and streamline construction, but do it without actually paying for it and keep racking up the national debt.

While many of my colleagues are sure to rush to the floor in the next few hours to pat themselves on the back for accomplishing this marvelous, transformational highway bill, we should not be popping champagne. There is no backslapping deserved.

While I am encouraged by the fact that in many ways the policy related to surface transportation takes a significant step forward, I am deeply discouraged by the phony pay-fors.

Mr. Speaker, during the upcoming debate on this legislation, you and the American people are going to hear repeatedly that this bill is fully offset and fully paid for, essentially that new revenue and savings will keep the cost of this bill from adding to our national debt. This is, plain and simple, not the case. Most of the offsets are from general fund transfers.

Now, it would take a magician of miraculous skill to transfer money out of a fund that has a negative balance of $400 billion. If, in fact, there is money to transfer from an empty fund, I might suggest that we instead try to make the fund a bit less empty instead of transferring it to more spending.

But I digress. Let's take a look at the pay-fors.

One of a long series of phony offsets is selling off oil that is currently owned by the American people in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. While you are stewarding the American people's money, you are supposed to buy low and sell high, not the other way around. Not only are we selling off a public asset at near record low prices, we are also counting on getting over double the current market price in order to make all the math work. If you can find a buyer to pay $94 per barrel for oil, like the authors claim, while the market price is $41, I have got a bridge to nowhere to sell you.

Another phony offset is hiring aggressive private contractors to go after people who are delinquent on their Federal taxes. Now, listen, I am all for collecting all outstanding taxes. But what does that have to do with road building? If, in fact, we can collect an additional $2.5 billion by doing this, shouldn't that money be put against the $400-billion deficit we are facing already?

Why is it an offset that generates its revenue amount over 10 years when the highway bill is only for 5 years? What is going to happen in year 6? Will all the road building the country needs be completed by then? Are there not any other roads going to need to be built in year 6? Are we not, then, just going to have to borrow even more money?

Mr. Speaker, the bill does make a very reasonable point that taxes must be indexed to inflation to keep from losing value every year. I found this quite ironic. That makes total sense. So it is applied to the gas tax; right? Wrong.

Mr. Speaker, here is my favorite phony pay-for. The bill's authors didn't have the political courage to deal with user fees for drivers, but instead are indexing taxes collected by the U.S. Customs Service. Now, that is really ironic, but that tax is easy to hide from constituents. Now Americans returning from overseas will pay more for them in taxes to pave our roads while people who use the roads simply look on and smile.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there is more. There are modifications to royalty payments. Wow, that has got everything to do with roads. Or how about denying passports to those who have unpaid taxes? This is allegedly going to raise $350 million. Of course, that has nothing to do with roads, and, in fact, may not even be possible without all kinds of court trials and cases.

Mr. Speaker, I know you can sense my frustration. At the end of the day, this bill will pass, the President will sign it, and while everyone is patting themselves on the back for passing a long-term solution, we are going to continue to pile debt on our grandchildren.

We are so close, though, to getting this right. We streamlined the process to get roads built faster saving taxpayer dollars. We have returned more decisionmaking back to the States, and we have reduced the bureaucracy and red tape around transportation construction.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Georgia have eloquently explained some of the benefits of the piece of legislation. These are valuable and not insignificant reforms. It is because of these reforms that I am going to reluctantly support this bill in spite of these phony, god-awful pay-fors. Here is why: I realize that if this bill does not pass, what we will get instead is another extension of current policy and more borrowing, because that is what the Congress has done since I have been here.

So this goes back to the classic Sophie's choice I mentioned at the beginning of my conversation here. To get the good, I must accept the bad; to reject the bad, I must reject the good. If only this body, this Congress, had the political courage to tell the American people a simple truth: if something is worth buying, it is worth paying for. Taxing tomorrow should not replace living within our means today. It hurts future generations, and I am profoundly disappointed. We can and should do better for the people who sent us here to speak for them.

□ 0945

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds before I further yield.

I agree with many of the critiques from the gentleman from Wisconsin. I think, when you pick apart a lot of the ways that this bill is paid for, you will find that they either won't generate the amount of revenue we think they will or you are borrowing from the outyears, meaning years 5 through 10, to effectively fund years 1 through 5. I know a lot of Members on both sides of the aisle will weigh that in their vote. I wish that the committee could have done better in finding pay-fors.

I would like to briefly address the national petroleum reserve. I think it is great that Democrats and Republicans are coming together around selling assets the Federal Government has that are nonproductive assets, like the petroleum reserve that was set up for a time when America relied on foreign oil. We are now net producers of crude oil.

I introduced an amendment that was not allowed for the energy bill yesterday to sell down the entire strategic petroleum reserve, which I think we should. However, the accounting for it in this bill shows us magically receiving twice the value per barrel for the price of oil than the futures market actually indicates that we would get. That is simply fictitious accounting in terms of how this bill is paid for.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to yield 5 more minutes to my friend from Wisconsin because I strongly, strongly agree with the framework that he advanced.

I have come to this floor repeatedly with a simple suggestion that we index the gas tax and move forward with paying for our future. It is, I think, an interesting question if we had followed regular order dealing with transportation funding, if we would have had a hearing that would have had the President of the AFL–CIO, had the President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, truckers, AAA, legislators from seven red Republican States that have raised the gas tax and the sky didn't fall come forward and talk to Congress about what would make a difference.

Because they have all agreed that we shouldn't be borrowing from the future, that we should right-size this, not playing budget games, and be able to have the most effective way to create millions of family wage jobs and show that we can do our job the same way that was led by President Eisenhower and President Reagan.

That said, I think this bill does represent an important step forward because there was some regular order followed by the committee. I take my hat off to Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO, who worked their way through a variety of contentious issues and brought forward a piece of legislation that provides modest, but important, increases in our funding programs.

It retains the basic structure. It has some improvements streamlining the process. It protects transit, safety, pedestrian, cycling programs, and a higher speed passenger rail. It speaks to a multiplicity of interests that Americans care deeply about.

It has embedded in it areas of innovation to encourage us to use technology to be able to improve the transportation system. I think there is no question that this is a new frontier, that 10 years from now we will not recognize much of what happens in the transportation space.

We will be able to coax more value out of our transportation system. We will be able to stretch dollars and unleash a great deal of innovation and activity. This legislation encourages that.

Part of the innovation is that, while I think we should index and raise the gas tax to actually adequately fund a robust bill, I think it is important for us to get rid of the gas tax and replace it with something that is sustainable over time.

And, again, this legislation has some provisions that will enable States to experiment with pilot projects like we have had in Oregon for the last 10 years for a fee that is based on road use, that would be sustainable, that would be fair, that actually could be adjusted in ways to help rural and small-town America and be able to give greater access to transportation in a more efficient fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that we will use the 5 years of stability, ending the saga of 35 short-term extensions because we wouldn't face the funding question.

I am hopeful that we will use these 5 years to be able to refine some of the improvements that are in it and to be able to directly face the question of whether or not we are going to pay for our transportation future, that we won't use gimmicks, that we will use the tried-and-true user fee and replace the gas tax with something that is better and more sustainable.

It is time to start building that foundation now. It is not just more money, but it is transforming how the transportation systems work. I think this bill gives us leverage to move forward on that. Rebuilding and renewing America is a nonpartisan issue. It is an issue that can actually bring us together while we make our communities more livable, our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

We can put millions of Americans to work at family wage jobs that will improve the quality of life for communities from coast to coast. This bill is a step in that direction. But it is only going to work if we accept our responsibilities to properly fund it, to face the future, and accept responsibility to do our job right. I hope we will.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to not just celebrate the successes that we are having today, but to associate myself with my colleagues who say the next round of hard work begins tomorrow.

There is a reason that we have the funding pay-fors that we have in this bill. It is not a lack of political courage. I have colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have courage to spare. It is a lack of trust.

When my constituents back home send me a dollar's worth of taxes and get 50 cents worth of road out of it, they say: ROB, what is the deal?

The streamlining that goes on in this bill grows that trust. The elimination of duplication, the focus on national priorities instead of pet projects, on and on and on, builds that trust.

The time to build that trust is before the next highway bill, not at the end of a highway bill cycle. There is a lot of work for each and every one of us to do in a bipartisan way to go out and build that trust.

I think about what my friend from Oregon said: We are going to squeeze a lot of efficiency out of our transportation system.

The innovation title in this bill is absolutely going to allow us to do more with less, which is precisely why constituents are worried about an indexed gas tax that puts transportation spending on autopilot, because all of our experience is, if you raise it, someone will spend it.

Balancing efficiency with productivity is a challenge that we all face that begins with trust generated back home, Mr. Speaker. My great hope is that the reforms in this bill, combined with the reforms in MAP–21, combined by the leadership that States and localities are taking with their own revenue bases, are going to create that trust for a generation to come.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Like the others you have heard from this morning, I commend those who have worked so hard on this bill. But, like them, I, too, have reservations about the final product.

It continues to underfund our Nation's infrastructure and it relies on unsustainable revenue sources and budgetary musical chairs; yet, it does include some policy provisions that I believe will result in better project development and delivery.

I represent the heart of the Las Vegas Valley, a region that is home to over 2 million people. We receive and enjoy the visits of over 43 million people from around the world annually. Having a transportation system to safely and efficiently move these people and products around is vital to our economic success.

That is why I am thankful that this final report includes a number of provisions that I advocated for, including language to ensure our States and MPOs consider the needs of the traveling public when developing their long-term transportation plans.

The bill will also create a national travel and tourism advisory committee comprised of stakeholders from across the industry to develop a plan to identify and invest in infrastructure and operational improvements along the most important travel corridors.

In addition, the final bill includes language I submitted that will extend the authorization for the development of Interstate 11, a major regional project in the Southwest.

Lastly, the conference report includes provisions I advocated for in the committee to make our roadways safer for all users, not just cars and trucks, but pedestrians and cyclists who have seen increased accidents and fatalities in recent years.

For these reasons that affect my district and the rest of the country and for others that have been mentioned, I think the bill deserves support. While it is not perfect, it is a step in the right direction.

For that reason, I will vote for it. I urge others to do so as well.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say I think my friend from Nevada missed one of those great successes that she had—I will call it the Rodney Davis-Dina Titus amendment—to make sure that localities have even more control over their spending decisions.

It is one of those episodes, Mr. Speaker, where folks didn't get everything they wanted, but because folks were in there advocating for their constituents throughout the entire process, we ended up further down the road today than we would have been yesterday but for the Davis-Titus team pushing forward on that language.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this bill is, and that is what regular order gets us. It is so frustrating. I feel like I am in a room full of racehorses here trying to wait for the doors to open. The gates have just come open, and we all want to get to the finish line.

Our new Speaker has made some commitments about bringing more involvement and individual Member participation in the process. That is new to this institution in many ways, Mr. Speaker, but it is not new to the Transportation Committee. It is not new to the work that you and I have been doing on the committee for these past many months. That is why this bill is worthy of the support of so many of our colleagues.

I can go through a similar list as my friend from Nevada of ideas that came

from the folks who lead back home. Folks who are in the tourism industry know more about tourism than those of us who are not, as do folks who are in the visitor industry, folks who are in the construction industry, folks who are in the concrete industry, on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, when you open the process up, you end up with fewer folks with political agendas at the table. You end up with more folks with practical agendas at the table. When you open the process up, you don't end up with politicians looking for their own piece of the pie. You end up with the public sharing their expertise and their experience. That is how you end up with a bill like the FAST Act today.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a great pleasure for me to serve on the Transportation Committee with folks like the gentlewoman from Nevada, like the gentleman from Illinois, to be able to have a common goal—very different approaches on how you want to achieve that goal, very different constituencies pushing you towards that goal—but to know that, if you put in the time and if you put in the hours, you will get a result.

So often in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, it seems like we are tilting at windmills. When I joined the Transportation Committee, I knew that we were not going to be tilting at windmills. We were going to be slaying a dragon. This bill slays that dragon today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am pleased to be here as a conferee to the conference that worked to resolve the difference between the House and Senate versions on the surface transportation reauthorization.

A huge thank you goes to Chairmen SHUSTER and GRAVES and Ranking Members DEFAZIO and NORTON and their committees and personal staff for all the work that was put in to get us to this 5-year authorization.

The fact is that America is literally falling apart. I am glad that we are going to be sending the President a long-term authorization this week. Making our infrastructure work and work for us smarter is really critical.

□ 1000

The bill does a lot to support research, development, and the deployment of transportation technology.

I am pleased with the overall research title, including specific investments in hazardous materials, R&D, and traffic congestion mitigation, but I do have a couple of concerns with oversight.

The Intelligent Transportation Systems Joint Program Office was moved out of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology and into the Federal Highway Administration. We have to be vigilant that this move doesn't undermine the multimodal coordination of ITS research and development.

A new deployment program was funded through a large tax on existing R&D programs. While I support the deployment program, we shouldn't lose sight of the fact that today's R&D investments enable tomorrow's new deployment opportunities. So we shouldn't be shortsighted.

Nonetheless, I support the FAST Act. It is a bipartisan, bicameral, long-term authorization to fund highway transit, highway safety, motor carrier safety, hazardous material safety, and even passenger rail programs and projects.

Let me be clear. It is not the bill I would have written, and it is definitely not perfect, including some of the problematic pay-fors that have been discussed today. But it will provide certainty, invest in America's infrastructure, and create good-paying American jobs.

The bill is funded at the higher Senate-approved level, which is important.

I am happy to have worked in a bipartisan fashion with my colleagues on the floor and in committee to make a difference in people's lives.

In our region, our Senators, Representatives NORTON and COMSTOCK, and I have provided new and direct Federal oversight of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

We have also worked to include transit-oriented development eligibility in TIFIA. Yes, this would mean that many of the transit-oriented projects across the Nation, in the metropolitan Washington region, and in my county, Prince George's County, along the Green Line, will now be able to qualify for Federal financing because most transit-oriented development infrastructure projects are less than the $50 million threshold that TIFIA currently requires.

In working with several Members, we were able to restore funding for the High Density States program that will allow transit systems in these States to maintain jobs, service, and service frequency and continue to help those who rely on public transportation.

Though I oppose today's rule, we have to enact a bill that will construct and rebuild our road, bridge, transit, and rail infrastructure that creates jobs here at home and enables the United States to compete internationally in the 21st century.

This is a good first step. Let's not stop here. Let's continue to work in this fashion to rebuild America's infrastructure.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I thank Congressman POLIS for the time he has granted me.

Mr. Speaker, after more than 2 years of obstruction by a vocal, ideologically driven minority that led to a 5-month shutdown of the Export-Import Bank, I could not be more pleased to rise and speak in strong support of the provision in the conference report that would finally put the Ex-Im Bank back in the business of supporting U.S. jobs.

After having spoken with and having listened to the stories of countless users of the Ex-Im Bank, both in my district and across the country, I can tell you without a doubt that the 4-year reauthorization of the Bank in this conference report is absolutely necessary and essential to ensure that U.S. businesses, both large and small, can operate and survive in the global marketplace.

From the loss of satellite contracts in California, to the many potential job losses across this country, to offers from our foreign competitors that have urged American exporters to take their operations to Canada or overseas to Europe and China, there is no question that the shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank has done great damage.

In joining with Whip HOYER, Leader PELOSI, Representatives HECK and MOORE, as well as with Representatives FINCHER and LUCAS, we showed that a determined majority of Democrats and Republicans who work together will ultimately prevail.

It is time to put an end to this wholly destructive and entirely unnecessary period that has caused us so much pain and fear and hopelessness for so many businesses and workers across this country whose livelihoods rely on the Ex-Im Bank.

I urge the passage of the conference report.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Today, I recognize the patriotism and volunteer service of Major Fredric Arnold, a World War II P–38 fighter pilot in the Army Air Corps.

Mr. Arnold flew and survived 50 combat missions and was promoted to the rank of major at the age of 23. He received numerous medals, including the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal with nine oak leaf clusters.

While assigned to the Office of Flying Safety, he wrote and illustrated the first ever flight training manuals for the P–38, P–47, P–51, and P–80 fighter aircraft, and he created educational air combat situation drawings for the P–38 Lightning, which saved the lives of inexperienced American pilots.

Today, at age 93, Mr. Arnold lives in Boulder, Colorado, where he is creating a monumental bronze sculpture, funded by The Radiance Foundation, which depicts 12 life-sized fighter pilots who are engaged in a World War II flight briefing, in order to honor the 88,000 airmen who lost their lives during the war and to ensure future generations remember the sacrifices that were made to protect our freedom.

This sculpture is entitled, ''Lest We Forget: The Mission,'' and it will be exhibited at the World War II Museum in New Orleans, Louisiana.

I am proud to recognize Major Fredric Arnold for his service as a fighter pilot and for his personal commitment to honor and help us all remember the aviators who served this Nation during World War II.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend from Colorado if he has any other speakers remaining.

Mr. POLIS. We are prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

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

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

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up bipartisan legislation that would close the loophole that allows suspected terrorists to legally buy guns. This bill would bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the terrorist watch list.

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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, a third of our Nation's major roads are rated as poor or mediocre, and one in four bridges is in need of significant repair or expansion, many of them dangerous, while 45 percent of Americans don't have access to public transit.

Congestion on our roadways has gotten so bad that Americans are wasting an average of 8.4 billion hours—that is 8.4 billion hours less in productivity—and 4.5 billion gallons of gas over a decade while being stuck in traffic.

The average commuters are wasting nearly $800 of their own money and 5 full days of their lives each year in traffic. In my district alone, population and congestion has far outpaced our ability to maintain our critical thoroughfares.

If you have ever been to Colorado, you will know that there is one way up to our world-class ski resorts and ski areas and unparalleled 14,000-foot peaks from the Denver metro area. It is called highway 70. If you have ever taken it on a Friday evening or on a Sunday evening, you have probably sat in your car at a dead stop, waiting at times perhaps even for hours.

If you have ever been to the largest city in my district, Fort Collins, home to one of our greatest universities, Colorado State University, you have probably found similar circumstances along highway 25 during rush hour.

The expansion of highway 25 and the high-speed rail along highway 70 have been given completion dates of 60 years from now. That isn't good enough. Fort Collins, Loveland, Boulder, Vail, Frisco, Breckenridge—none of these tourism- and recreation-driven communities can survive without making improvements for 60 years.

The future of these projects lies with a long-term, robustly funded surface transportation reauthorization. Our future depends upon our States' and municipalities' ability to rely on what level of Federal support they can expect to receive and what their Federal partnerships will look like year in and year out.

By providing consistency in funding levels and a several-year commitment to critical infrastructure projects, as we do today in this conference report, we open up a future for major highway improvements like those needed with highways 25 and 70 in my district and with highways and roads across the entire Nation.

While I have outlined the issues and misgivings I have with this bill—and I certainly agree with Mr. RIBBLE about the lack of courage this Congress has to actually pay for a bill and to instead devise clever gimmicks that only partially pay for the bill, including assuming that we are going to get twice the money per barrel for oil that the Federal Government owns and the actual market price would bear—I think that this bill, nevertheless, is a step forward over continued short-term reauthorizations, which I have been voting against the last several times they have come before us and which, I should point out, also generally include gimmicky ways of paying for it.

So if this Congress, which it seems to have done, has chosen not to address the real issue of how to pay for something and has chosen to instead use gimmicks, it is still better to do that in a predictable manner rather than to come up with a new gimmick every 60 days—a gimmick of the month, if you will—which is what this Congress has been doing throughout this year.

I thank my colleagues for the inclusion of my amendments in this bill, particularly an amendment to designate Highway 70 from Denver to Salt Lake City as a High Priority Corridor. That provision will open up funding sources and opportunities for a highway that has been a nightmare for residents, for tourists, and for freight truck drivers for decades, particularly during its busiest times.

I appreciate the committee's desire to be transparent and receptive to ideas brought by Members who don't serve on the committee.

I am hopeful that what happened here this week, as my colleague from Georgia started out by saying, not only with the surface transportation reauthorization but also with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is only a beginning—a beginning of big things, of good things, of hard compromises, of the success of regular order, of discussions between the House and the Senate that will hopefully bode well for future developments.

I am hopeful that we can get back to work after a long hiatus of gridlock and grandstanding. I hope this is the first of many.

I congratulate my colleagues for coming together on such a pivotal piece of legislation.

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

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

We have talked about how much work has gone into this bill—not days, not weeks, not months, but even years in trying to get here.

I want to say what I said when I began, which is, when Democrats controlled every single lever of government, they could not get a bill like this done. When Republicans controlled every single lever of government, we failed to get a bill like this done. Today, with the leadership of BILL SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO, we are getting that done.

But it is not just at the Member level. And I want to associate all of the hard staff work that goes into making something like this happen, Mr. Speaker. Chris Bertram, our staff director over on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; Matt Sturges, our deputy staff director over on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; Collin, Geoff, Murphie on my own staff, Alex Poirot—folks who have put in hour after hour after hour, right through the Thanksgiving holiday, making sure that America's priorities get done.

Folks back home don't care how much hard work it takes; they care that we put in the hard work. And this is an example of that success today.

Mr. Speaker, so often, I hear my colleagues say, ''If I had written this bill myself, it would have been different.'' Generally, when I hear my colleagues on the other side of aisle say, ''If I had written this bill it would be different,'' I think, ''Thank goodness you didn't write this bill.'' I have no doubt that they think the same thing when I say that.

We rarely get everything that we want, but we rarely have an opportunity to come together and be as successful as we are today.

The only roadblock between us and a long-term transportation bill for the first time in more than a decade is my yielding back the balance of my time.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 546 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 2. 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. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. 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 the Judiciary. 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

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. WOODALL. 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. POLIS. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 179, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 666]

YEAS—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
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
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
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
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—179

Adams
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
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, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Aguilar
Cuellar
Johnson, Sam
Maloney, Carolyn
Meeks
Payne
Rokita
Ruppersberger
Sanchez, Loretta
Takai
Williams

□ 1042

Messrs. WALZ, LEVIN, and Ms. ESHOO changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). 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. POLIS. 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 384, noes 40, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 667]

AYES—384

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McDermott
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—40

Becerra
Bera
Cárdenas
Castro (TX)
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Crowley
Delaney
Edwards
Fudge
Graham
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Huffman
Jeffries
Kennedy
Lieu, Ted
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Moore
Neal
Pallone
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Rangel
Ruiz
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Slaughter
Speier
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Aguilar
Cuellar
Johnson, Sam
Meeks
Payne
Ruppersberger
Sanchez, Loretta
Takai
Williams

□ 1051

Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Messrs. CUMMINGS, ASHFORD, BRAT, MOULTON, and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

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.

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to House Resolution 542 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 8.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1053

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to modernize energy infrastructure, build a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce, bolster America's energy security and diplomacy, and promote energy efficiency and government accountability, and for other purposes, with Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, December 2, 2015, amendment No. 38 printed in House Report 114–359 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114–359 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 26 by Mr. CRAMER of North Dakota.

Amendment No. 30 by Mr. ROUZER of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 37 by Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 170, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 668]

AYES—252

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
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
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
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
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—170

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

NOT VOTING—11

Aguilar
Cuellar
Diaz-Balart
Johnson, Sam
Meeks
Payne
Ruppersberger
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Takai
Williams

□ 1058

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. ROUZER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 177, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 669]

AYES—247

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
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
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
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
Pingree
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
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
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—177

Adams
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster

Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Aguilar
Cuellar
Johnson, Sam
Meeks
Payne
Ruppersberger
Sanchez, Loretta
Takai
Williams

□ 1103

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 670]

AYES—181

Adams
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
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
Meehan
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
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
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
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
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
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
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Aguilar
Cuellar
Johnson, Sam
Meeks
Payne
Ruppersberger
Sanchez, Loretta
Takai
Williams

□ 1106

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, 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. 8) to modernize energy infrastructure, build a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce, bolster America's energy security and diplomacy, and promote energy efficiency and government accountability, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 542, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I am opposed to it in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cartwright moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE ____—CLIMATE CHANGE

SEC. _____. CLIMATE CHANGE IS REAL.

In response to the overwhelming scientific consensus that climate change is real, United States energy policy should seek to remove market barriers that inhibit the development of renewable energy infrastructure.

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this motion represents an opportunity for Members of this House to acknowledge that climate damage is a threat, and that we have a moral obligation to fight it, an opportunity for Members to bring themselves into line with the overwhelming weight of scientific research and authority, bring themselves into line with a huge and growing mass of American corporations that have acknowledged climate damage, and have taken green energy pledges.

It is an opportunity for Members to bring themselves into line with over 200 other nations that are gathering, even as we speak, in France, people who are baffled that responsible adults in elected positions in our Nation continue to deny what is reality.

And it is an opportunity for Members to avoid a danger, a danger that their pollsters and their party leaders and their political advisers have failed to warn them about, and that is the danger of the judgment of history.

Make no mistake, future generations are watching. In fact, they are already judging our actions. Our young people in this Nation understand that they are the ones who will pay dearly for the politics that has taken over this issue, the politics that lead this Congress to inaction, despite the outcry from the scientific and worldwide community that we must act before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to condemn Members for initial hesitation on climate damage. Who am I to judge? After all, as humans, when we discover a threat, at first it is reasonable and natural for us to question or attempt to deny that the threat is real, especially when it is the kind of threat that, to meet it, requires strong, immediate, and decisive action.

In fact, denial is such a common reaction that aircraft pilots call it ''normalcy bias,'' the initial refusal to believe that things are not normal, the desire to not believe the warning signals when they say something is gravely wrong. They teach pilots about normalcy bias because, when the warning lights go on, wishing those lights were off or hoping that they are wrong is not a valid course of action. Instead, it is the very most dangerous way of handling the situation.

Mr. Speaker, the warning lights are on. So what we need to do is get past our denial phase, get past our normalcy bias, and take strong, immediate, and decisive action. And I say to you, that is the American way of handling a threat to our people.

What we do here in America, the best of us, we examine it closely, a threat. We put our best minds on the problem, and we tackle the problem and take immediate, strong, and decisive action.

□ 1115

That is how the bravest and the best of us in America have always behaved in the face of threat, and that is how the Greatest Generation did it. Sticking our heads in the sand, pretending a serious problem will go away on its own, and doing nothing in the face of a grave threat is not the American way, and it never was.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am not here to condemn anyone for his or her initial hesitation on climate damage. Instead, I offer this opportunity to my colleagues across the aisle because I refuse to believe that they truly do not understand the climate crisis we face.

I present this motion to recommit as a chance for this Congress to avoid the harsh light and the implacable judgment of the historians, who will not hesitate to include us on their lists of the greatest ignoramuses of all time, to lump us in without fear of contradiction, with the worst, lantern-jawed simpletons of history, historians who will unmercifully tell our grandchildren and their grandchildren just how dumb we were if we do not take action to prevent damage to our climate.

So I invite my fellow Members, all of you, vote ''yes'' on this motion, acknowledging that climate change is real. The warning lights are on, they are brighter than ever, and the rest of the world is taking them seriously. Let's show the world and all of history that America is ready to take the lead in tackling this threat.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, the world does face many challenges and risks, and when it comes to climate change, we on this side believe that we have to take an economically realistic and pragmatic approach.

To address climate as well as other risks, we support policies that will promote access to affordable and reliable energy that allows our communities to grow economically, to adapt to changes, and to be resilient both now and in the future. We also support technological innovation and the development of resilient, efficient infrastructure both to reduce emissions and to withstand climate-related events regardless of their causes.

The underlying bill that we are about ready to pass promotes access to affordable and reliable energy, diversity, efficiency, and modernization of all of our energy infrastructures. Passage of this bill would help ensure that we have critical energy infrastructure in place to withstand new threats, whether they be from climate or other risks such as terrorism and cyber attacks.

I would note, Mr. Speaker, that here in the United States, thanks to innovation—as we have expanded access to our abundant energy supplies as we have over the last couple of decades—energy-related carbon dioxide emissions have actually significantly declined, and they are projected to remain below 2005 levels through 2040 and will continue to decline as a share of worldwide emissions, particularly when compared to other nations like India and China.

So for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, 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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was 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.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 243, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 671]

AYES—180

Adams	Carney	Davis (CA)
Ashford	Carson (IN)	Davis, Danny
Bass	Cartwright	DeFazio
Beatty	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Becerra	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Bera	Chu, Judy	DelBene
Beyer	Cicilline	DeSaulnier
Bishop (GA)	Clark (MA)	Deutch
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Bonamici	Clay	Doggett
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cleaver	Doyle, Michael F.
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Duckworth
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Edwards
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Ellison
Bustos	Conyers	Engel
Butterfield	Cooper	Eshoo
Capps	Costa	Esty
Capuano	Courtney	Farr
Cárdenas	Crowley	Fattah
	Cummings	

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
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
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
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
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
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
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Aguilar
Cuellar
Delaney
Johnson, Sam
Meeks
Payne
Ruppersberger
Sanchez, Loretta
Takai
Williams

□ 1124

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on rollcall No. 671. Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 671, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 249, noes 174, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 672]

AYES—249

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
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
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—174

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
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—10

Aguilar
Cuellar
Johnson, Sam
Lawrence
Meeks
Payne
Ruppersberger
Sanchez, Loretta
Takai
Williams

□ 1131

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall Vote No. 672 on H.R. 8, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yes" when I should have voted "no."

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 8, NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 2015

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 8, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 8.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 22, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 546, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 22) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 546, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 1, 2015, at page H8679.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 22.

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

There was no objection.

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

I am very pleased that today the House is considering the conference report to H.R. 22, the Fixing America's Surface Transportation, or the FAST Act.

I believe this bill will be one of the most important things this Congress can accomplish for our country. This conference report is appropriately named the FAST Act for a few reasons.

It will certainly help fix America's surface transportation infrastructure. The process has been fast. In fact, from the day of introduction until today is 44 days that we have moved this bill forward; so, it happened fast.

I think some of our staff, who worked very hard in this process to help get this bill done, actually had to fast over the Thanksgiving holiday. So my thanks go out to staff on both sides of the aisle for working through the holiday as they did to get this bill put together and brought to the floor.

Ranking Member DEFAZIO and I worked diligently with our House and Senate conferees to put together this conference report. I want to thank Mr. DEFAZIO for all his efforts.

Before I describe the transportation provisions in the conference report, I do want to note that the conference report includes numerous other provisions that were in either the House- or the Senate-passed versions of the bill. These provisions are in the jurisdiction of the Committees on Ways and Means, Financial Services, Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, and Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, since I became chairman, one of my top priorities has been to pass a long-term surface transportation reauthorization bill. For the last year and more, I have traveled across the country to talk to transportation and business leaders about the need for a reauthorization bill. What I have heard is that all States and communities have significant infrastructure needs and they all need long-term certainty to address them.

The FAST Act represents a bipartisan and bicameral agreement to provide that certainty. This is the first time we have come together in a long-term bill in 10 years. It is fully paid for and reauthorizes Federal surface transportation programs for 5 years.

It improves our Nation's infrastructure, including our roads, public transportation, and rail systems; reforms our Federal transportation programs; refocuses these programs on national priorities, including the flow of freight and commerce; provides greater flexibility for States and local governments to address our needs; streamlines the Federal bureaucracy and accelerates project delivery; promotes innovation to make our surface transportation system and programs work better; and maintains a strong commitment to highway, rail, and hazmat safety.

This bill also includes robust reforms of Amtrak, which the House already passed overwhelmingly this year. It cuts waste, holds Amtrak accountable, and increases transparency. It enhances opportunities for competition on routes and increases private sector participation in station development and right-of-way leveraging. It gives States more power and control over their Amtrak routes.

This legislation has wide support from throughout the stakeholder community.

The FAST Act invests in America, continues the essential Federal role in transportation, and helps keep our country economically competitive.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to support this conference report.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

I want to thank the chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee for their tremendous cooperation and hard work.

I certainly want to thank the staff, who spent the whole Thanksgiving break pulling this together and negotiating with the Senate, and I want to thank our colleagues in the Senate.

We have something that is very rare in Washington, D.C., these days here on the floor of the House: a truly bipartisan approach to very real problems confronting our Nation.

I have been to the floor many dozens of times to talk about our country falling apart, and I won't reiterate all those statistics again today. They are in the RECORD.

But this is now 10 years and 3 months since Congress last passed a long-term bill. This 5-year bill will give States and local jurisdictions, cities, and counties the capability of dealing with bigger problems that confront our system of transportation.

The series of short-term fixes we have had over the last 5 years and 3

months, or the MAP–21 bill, did not give them the long-term certainty they needed.

There is predictability in this bill. They know how much money they will be receiving, and the levels are higher than current expenditures.

Sure, I think we should invest more, but the bill also contains a provision I championed that says, should a future Congress allocate more funds to Transportation and Infrastructure, that money will flow through the policies and the formulas in this bill with no further action required and no tampering by this or future Congress; i.e., it would be expedited and it would go right into the investments we need to put more people back to work.

This will be the biggest jobs bill passed by this Congress. There is no way we can do more for the American economy than making these long-term investments, putting hundreds of thousands of people to work rebuilding our critical infrastructure. It also doesn't just go to construction, design, engineering, and small business, as do highway contracts. It also has a major investment in transit.

We increase the Buy America percent for transit vehicles to 70 percent. So that will create more American jobs. There are many other critical things.

We create for the first time—amazingly, for the first time, given the importance of our country—a major Federal freight program, an intermodal Federal freight program, that will help us be more competitive in the world economy and make major investments in more efficiently moving goods into our country and out of our country in accessing ports.

It invests in workers with reforms of the workforce retraining program. It promotes local control. We are increasing the share that flows through to local jurisdictions. The chairman already addressed that. It invests in all modes. It preserves the existing split between transit and highways and includes alternate modes.

It includes a new safety grant program to prevent bicycle and pedestrian deaths, which would go to local or State jurisdictions that put forward comprehensive plans that deal with that growing problem.

It provides grants to States that come up with innovative future ways to fund transportation for them to experiment, laboratories around the country experimenting with vehicle miles traveled or other programs that could pave the way for future bills in terms of spending and investing in our infrastructure.

It improves hazmat safety very significantly in this bill. It also invests in rail—Amtrak—and will help local communities who are dealing with passenger commuter rail implement positive train control.

This is a true bipartisan product. I recommend a ''yes'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in enthusiastic support for this conference report, which reauthorizes the surface transportation program for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would argue that few investments made by the Federal Government are more important than the ones we are discussing here today. We depend on a very well-run transportation network for just about everything we do in this country. Improving that system becomes more critical as we become more mobile as a society.

In the immediate future, this conference report is going to allow States to plan and execute some much-needed infrastructure repair. In Missouri alone, long-term surface transportation reauthorization translates into improvements for 35,000 miles of highway and 10,000 bridges.

Specifically, this conference report reforms the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration and increases transparency within its compliance, safety, and accountability program. These reforms will fundamentally change the way the agency analyzes and develops rules for the trucking industry.

This is an industry that we all rely on as Americans, but Federal regulations continue to make it harder and harder for small and independent truckers to do business.

The FAST Act also increases efficiency within high-cost construction programs. It uses existing funding to develop a new formula for highway freight projects and creates a competitive grant program for projects of national or regional importance.

While this 5-year reauthorization is fully paid for, it doesn't address the long-term funding issues staring down the highway trust fund. That is why we directed research into more sustainable long-term funding sources, including a user-funded model that does more than just rely on the existing gas tax.

But, looking ahead, this bill sets the stage for us to continue reshaping and rethinking America's transportation network. It will allow us to modernize roads and transit systems using innovations from the private sector. It is going to help us employ advances in technology and interconnectivity to improve safety on America's highways.

Ultimately, this report guarantees that local governments are going to no longer be forced to operate off of one short-term extension after another. This gives the States the certainty and the funding they need to improve their roads, rebuild their bridges, and invest in their infrastructure.

I am proud of the bipartisan work that the House and the Senate have done to finalize this long-term Federal reauthorization. I would like to echo the words of the ranking member.

This was a very bipartisan bill. Thanks to Ranking Member DEFAZIO, Chairman SHUSTER, and Ranking Member NORTON, I think we did a fantastic job when it comes to putting the bill together. I look forward to seeing the President sign it.

□ 1145

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the ranking member on the subcommittee.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the reputation of our committee is that we are the most bipartisan committee in the Congress, and I think we have shown it with this bill.

I can't thank my partners enough—Mr. GRAVES you just heard from; Chairman SHUSTER; Mr. DEFAZIO, who is the ranking member; both good friends and, of course, the staff—for their countless hours, including missing Thanksgiving. I particularly thank the conference committee Members because this bill needed compromises on both sides if we were going to get it done this year, and that is what we have done.

This bill was improved in conference in many ways. If you are in the States, you will probably say the most important way is that you are getting more funding than anticipated. There was a tradeoff, of course, because it is now a 5-year rather than a 6-year bill, and we needed the longest term bill we could get; but it does mean almost $13 billion more annually in funding for the States, and they were so starved for funds that, I believe, this 5-year tradeoff was most important for us and for them.

The reason I have come to the floor with this chart is not to show you something about my own district, but because this chart is emblematic of what this bill will do for your district and for districts all over the United States. I chose it because one of my major projects is the H Street Bridge. I didn't just choose a bridge; I chose a bridge with intermodality at its vortex. This is the bridge that runs over Union Station. All you have to do is look at it, and you will see the trains; and there is freight beneath this bridge, and major freight is in this bill. You will see Amtrak. Across the H Street bridge itself runs inner-city buses, local buses, and streetcars.

You see how transit is the key to development itself. So, if you don't get the transit done, if you don't get the infrastructure done for our bill, then other infrastructure which depends on it will not occur.

We are trying to expand Union Station here. This bridge has to be done if they are to accomplish this. They are going to expand the Union Station concourse. This bill will allow the improvements in the Northeast corridor, which is so important to so many Members. In a real sense, this bridge and this poster tell the story of this bill.

There were so many of my major priorities in this bill that I would just

like to say something about a couple of them.

One is the way we are now trying to get a hold of the highway trust fund which is a trust fund in name only—the $15 million to $20 million—that will allow for the States to experiment with new ideas. States are the only ones that are doing it, which is going to be absolutely necessary before the next long-term bill. We didn't have anything of the kind in MAP–21.

Look what we had to do instead. We took money to pay for this bill, for example, from the Federal Reserve and from the strategic oil reserves, for the first time in history—that is the cutest one—because oil is worth less than when it was used as an offset. We had to face down this highway trust fund, and that is why my major priority was new trust fund ideas.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. NORTON. Finally, I want to say that I am very pleased that we worked together to get the Disadvantaged Business Enterprises provision done, and there is funding in this bill for a very important issue in our country for grants to address racial profiling.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials. The gentleman did a lot of work on the Amtrak bill, which made it into this final bill.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I appreciate the opportunity to have been a conferee on this important piece of legislation.

This piece of legislation was a bipartisan effort between not only Republicans and Democrats in the House, but as a conferee who has been working between the House and the Senate, we have now culminated a number of different issues that, for years, we have had hearings on. Specifically, in the subcommittee that I chair—Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials—we are dealing with passenger rail in this bill, with rail safety, and with hazardous material.

Under the hazmat title of this bill, it contains many important provisions on crude-by-rail safety:

First, we require all new tank cars carrying flammable liquids to actually have a thermal blanket and top fittings protection, which is something that the DOT failed to include in its rule;

We also ensure that railroads provide States and local emergency responders with information on crude-by-rail shipments within their States. In my community, this is a huge issue for our first responders, who want to know exactly what is traveling through our community;

We also include a provision that fixes a loophole that would have allowed more than 35,000 legacy DOT–111—these old tank cars—to actually remain in service.

The rail title follows closely the PRRIA bill of 2015—the passenger rail reauthorization—which we passed out of this House in March of this year:

In the bill, we reform Amtrak to actually run more like a business, ensuring that Northeast corridor profits get reinvested into the corridor and make Amtrak more accountable to the States;

In the wake of the Philadelphia crash, we make a number of safety improvements, including having cameras in the locomotives. I will remind you that the purpose of this video footage is to assist crash investigators, which is something that would be important in Philadelphia. Let's make sure that this does not punish or retaliate against the employees.

Separately, this bill includes reforms that I have long championed and have based on legislation that I have authored in committee, the NEPA Reciprocity Act. We need to eliminate the duplicative environmental reviews. It will save us millions of dollars and years in project delivery time while still ensuring that appropriate steps are taken to mitigate the environmental impact. In California, we have the California Environmental Quality Act. We want to make sure that we have a strong environmental policy. Let's just not waste years in duplication to get these projects done. Let's do them quickly. Let's do them efficiently. Let's save millions of dollars in the process.

The bill also provides a much-needed boost in funding to fix our crumbling bridges in our communities. In my community, I continuously talk about the Seventh Street Bridge in Modesto. It is ridiculous that we have any bridges that are below satisfactory, but in this case, this bridge is rated 2 out of 100.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DENHAM. It is so bad that we don't allow school buses on this. We have passenger cars as well as trucks—trucks that carry goods through Modesto and through our community—yet it is unsafe for school buses and our kids. This much-needed bridge funding will help us to fix many of these threats around our State and around the country.

Finally, this legislation will codify pets on trains. For years now, pet owners have been able to take their pets on airplanes. I can go from California to D.C. with my dog; yet I can't take my small dog onto Amtrak. This now changes that. I know that it is a big deal for those who travel on trains frequently to be able to take their pets with them.

In conclusion, this is a great bipartisan, long-term highway bill, and I am excited that we are going to finally give certainty to our States.

Again, I thank the chairman, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. CAPUANO—all who worked hard to make this a great bipartisan effort.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 22, the FAST Act. I do associate myself with the remarks of Chairman SHUSTER, of Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and, of course, of their extraordinary staffs, including mine, who have been very effective in working on this very bipartisan and very thorough bill.

I have been honored to serve on the conference committee, thanks to Leader PELOSI's appointment. I especially thank our transportation stakeholders in my district—California, of course—for their input on the policies included in this bill, which will benefit not only California but many of our Nation's constituencies by improving their commutes, by enhancing the transportation of goods to market, and by increasing transportation safety and air quality.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Those entities that really sent good, solid information to this committee were the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, the San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership, the Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority, the Foothill Transit, the Gold Line Foothill Transit Project, the Gateway Council of Governments, the Access Services of Los Angeles, the LA Metro, the Southern California Association of Governments, Caltrans, the California Department of Natural Resources, and the California Department of Labor.

I ask my colleagues for their support, and I ask for an ''aye'' vote from all of us. This is a great bill thanks to their bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a list of the items that were able to be included in the bill.

OVERALL FUNDING LEVELS

The bill authorizes Highway, Transit and Railroad programs at $305 billion over 5 years. $281 billion is directly funded from revenues in the bill (aka ''contract authority programs'') which is for highway programs and most transit programs. This is $12.8 billion higher than the House passed bill. This higher funding level was requested by California transportation agencies including Caltrans, the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and the California Councils of Governments (COGs).

$24 billion is authorized to be appropriated annually. The programs needing appropriations are New Starts Transit construction grants (which the larger California Transit Agencies strongly support) and Amtrak passenger rail investments (California has 3 of the top 5 Amtrak rail corridors).

LOCAL CONTROL—INCREASED LOCAL SUBALLOCATION OF TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

The bill increasie's the percentage of funds that flow directly to local regions (instead of the State) within the Surface Transportation Program (STP) from the current 50% to 55%

(1% per year). This issue was supported by CAL COG and local CA Transportation agencies.

TRANSIT FUNDING INCREASES

The bill provides $13 billion over 5 years for the state of good repair transit formula program. These funds are distributed to state and local governments for repairs and upgrading of rail and bus rapid transit systems. This is a 20% increase over current funding. The bill provides $3.7 billion over 5 years for bus and bus facilities and sets aside $1.5 billion for a competitive bus grant program. This is a 75% increase over current funding. California Transit agencies strongly supported increased transit funding.

FREIGHT PROGRAMS

The bill creates two funded freight programs. The first is a Formula Freight program funded at $6.3 billion over 5 years which is allocated to the states. The second is a Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects Competitive grant program funded at $4.5 billion over 5 years that state and local governments can apply for.

Creating these funded freight programs was a big priority of California Transportation agencies including Caltrans, California Association of Councils of Governments, League of CA Cities, Metropolitan Transportation Commission of the SF Bay Area, Southern California Association of Governments, San Diego Area Association of Governments, L.A. Metro, and Sacramento Area Council of Governments.

In addition, language was included that many CA Transportation agencies care about to make local transportation agencies (such as JPA's) eligible recipients of grant funds and to address local environmental impacts of freight movement.

TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES—BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, TRAILS, SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROJECTS

The bill funds transportation alternatives at $835 million per year in 2016 and 2017 and $850 million per year in 2018, 2019 and 2020, which is more than the House bill level of $819 million per year. The bill gives Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) new flexibility to use up to 50% of this funding for other Surface Transportation Eligible projects. California transportation agencies, environmental organizations, bike associations, and safe route to school advocates strongly support this program.

TIFIA LOAN PROGRAM

The TIFIA loan program is funded at $275 million/year in FY16 & 17 and $300 million/year in FY18, 19, 20. This is more than the $200M/yr in the House bill. TIFIA is strongly supported by many California transportation agencies (especially those with local transportation funding sources such as sales tax measures) because they can use the government backed loans to expedite their projects and save money in the long run.

Language was included to allow unused TIFIA funds to go back into TIFIA and to provide eligibility to Transit Oriented Development projects. This language was also a priority of CA transportation agencies.

RAILWAY HIGHWAY GRADE CROSSING PROGRAM

The bill maintains the current railway-highway grade crossing program and increases funding by $5 million/year to $245 million in FY20. California Transportation agencies, including the Alameda Corridor East Construction Authority in my district strongly support this program because safety issues around highway rail grade crossings are a big concern in our state.

POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL GRANTS

The bill provides $199 million for positive train control grants that commuter railroads can apply for. This was a big priority of Metrolink as they are currently developing and implementing positive train control safety systems.

NEW STARTS TRANSIT CONSTRUCTION PROJECT CHANGES

The bill allows local transportation agencies to use Surface Transportation Program funding as the local match for New Starts. This was a priority of CA MPOs and CALTRANs because the original House bill prohibited this flexibility in funding.

TRANSIT WORKFORCE TRAINING PROGRAMS

The bill focuses transit workforce training programs on the front line workforce (bus drivers, rail operators, mechanics, etc.). The bill also focuses on career opportunities for underepresented populations, including minorities, women, veterans, low-income, and the disabled. This was a priority of LA Metro and California Transit Unions.

TRANSIT OPERATOR SAFETY

The bill requires DOT to perform a rulemaking on transit operator safety to address the growing concern of violence against transit workers. This was a priority of California Transit Unions.

ALLOWING PARATRANSIT COORDINATED FARE STRUCTURES TO CONTINUE—LOS ANGELES COUNTY ISSUE

The bill allows Access Services paratransit provider of Los Angeles County to continue using a tiered, distance-based coordinated paratransit fare system. For over 20 years, Access Services has had a DOT approved tiered fare structure that averages all the fares of 44 transit agencies into 2 fares. For riders traveling under 20 miles the fare is $2.75 and for riders traveling over 20 miles the fare is $3.50 (these paratransit fares are dramatically lower than the rest of the country). DOT was going to require Access Services to change their fare structure by Jan. 1, 2016 based on confusing formulas for each individualized trip a disabled customer takes. 95% of the public comments from the ADA community strongly opposed this change. This provision will allow Access to continue operating with their current tiered fare structure.

BUY AMERICA

The bill increases the domestic content requirement for buses and transit rail cars from 60% to 70%.

INNOVATIVE FUNDING ALTERNATIVES GRANT PROGRAM

The bill creates a $15–$20 million/year grant program to allow states to experiment with alternative transportation user fees such as vehicle miles traveled taxes. California would benefit from this program because we are implementing one of the only alternative transportation user fee pilot programs in the country.

NATIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND INNOVATIVE FINANCE BUREAU

The bill creates a new Bureau within the office of the Secretary to streamline the administration of the TIFIA and RRIF loan programs, private activity bonds, and the new freight program. California and Los Angeles County in particular has been a large recipient of TIFIA and RRIF loans but many agencies have complained at how long, burdensome, and bureaucratic the process is. This Bureau will address these concerns.

FUNDING FOR LOCALLY OWNED BRIDGES ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

The bill fixes a major concern Los Angeles County had with the last transportation bill (MAP–21) which only allowed bridges on the National Highway System to be funded by the National Highway Performance Program. A lot of locally owned bridges in California are on the federal-aid highway system and previously received direct bridge funding but no longer do because they are not on the National Highway System. This bill allows all locally owned bridges on the federal-aid highway system to be eligible for funding in the National Highway Performance Program.

PARK AND RIDE RELINQUISHMENT

The bill allows states to relinquish ownership of park-and-ride lots to local governments if they wish. This was a big priority for CALTRANs and local CA MPOs like LA Metro because some local agencies would like to take ownership of state park-and-rides in order to invest in them and improve their performance within regional, multimodal transportation systems.

HOV DEGRADATION STANDARDS IMPACT ON CALIFORNIA

The bill allows for California or a local transportation agency to apply for a waiver from the current HOV degradation standard. It also requires the state or local agency to have a plan to improve their HOV operations. Fixing problems with how the current HOV degradation standard works in California was a major priority of CALTRANs and local MPOs.

The current HOV degradation standard requires HOV lanes to maintain an average speed above 45 mph 90 percent of the time during peak hours. This standard does not take into account the specific transportation concerns of each state. The most recent data indicates that 60 percent of California's HOV network is degraded under the current federal standard, but it also indicates that ''recurrent congestion'' is not a primary source of degradation in California. Other variables such as inclement weather, traffic incidents, or unforeseeable nonrecurring congestion have a greater impact on HOV lane performance in California. The point of the federal standard is to address manageable traffic policy which is recurrent congestion. Since degraded facilities must be brought back into compliance under this federal law, the high levels of degradation in our state will require scarce resources to correct a problem that, in the majority of cases, is relatively infrequent and unpredictable. This bill allows the state to request a waiver from this unreasonable standard.

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT (CMAQ) PROGRAM FUNDING FOR LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

The Conference Report continues to allow local California Transportation agencies to fund transit, congestion management, and bicycle/pedestrian projects with Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program funds. The original House and Senate bills contained provisions that local CA transportation agencies strongly opposed that would have restricted their ability to use CMAQ funds for actual transportation projects.

NO PREEMPTION OF CA MEAL AND REST BREAK LAWS FOR TRUCKERS

The conference report does not include a provision from the House bill that would have preempted state meal and rest break laws as they apply to the trucking industry. The original provision in the House bill was a direct attack on a recent court decision in California that ruled that California truck drivers were entitled to meal and rest breaks under California labor law.

The California Department of Labor and the California Teamsters strongly opposed the original House bill provision.

NO COMPREHENSIVE OIL SPILL RESPONSE PLAN SECTION THAT WAS OPPOSED BY CALIFORNIA

The bill does not include Section 7011 of the original House bill that required federal

oil spill response plans for railroads. This section was strongly opposed by the California Department of Natural Resources because it would preempt state law and California's ability to impose their own rail oil spill response plans.

PRIVATIZING ENGINEERING

The bill does not include language requiring or incentivizing states to outsource public engineering work. We must continue to support states that hire public engineers in order to protect the public interest.

NATION-WIDE TRUCK SIZE AND WEIGHT ISSUES NOT IN THE BILL

The bill does not increase truck sizes with double 33s or weights to 91,000lbs. (l.c. ''el''). There were attempts to increase truck size and weights but they were strongly opposed by CA Sheriffs Association, CA Peace Officers Assoc. (PORAC), and CA highway safety groups.

PORT PERFORMANCE INCLUDED WAS A CONCERN

I am concerned that the bill includes a provision to require the Bureau of Transportation Statistics to collect data on port performance freight statistics at the nation's top 25 ports. I am glad this provision was amended in Conference to create a working group which includes labor representatives and port representatives that will determine how the port performance statistics program will be implemented.

WIFIA FIX INCLUDED

The Conference Report fixes a problem with the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (WIFIA) loan program from WRRDA 14 that prohibited local water agencies from combining tax exempt debt (i.e. municipal bonds) with WIFIA loans. This Conference Report changes that and allows water agencies to use municipal bonds (which are a major source of their revenue) as the local match to federal financing provided by the WIFIA. This fix to WIFIA was strongly supported by CA water agencies including ACWA and CASA.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 22, Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, Chairman GRAVES, Ranking Member NORTON, and my colleagues on the committee for coming together to craft bipartisan legislation that provides States with the certainty they need with this 5-year bill, which will provide long-term infrastructure planning.

The FAST Act builds on the reforms that we did in MAP–21 to ensure that projects are completed in a timely manner. I was pleased to see that a number of priorities that are important to my district have been included in this legislation, including that of reforming the broken Compliance, Safety, Accountability program, which ensures that motor carrier safety ratings are fair and accurate.

As the subcommittee chairman on Water Resources and Environment, we worked to get a provision into WRRDA called WIFIA. In this bill, we put in a provision to allow WIFIA loans to be used in conjunction with tax-exempt bonds to leverage private capital. This will help our infrastructure needs and clean water projects. This is an important loan guarantee program that is similar to TIFIA, which provides municipalities with additional funding for water infrastructure projects. This will complement programs like the Clean Water SRF Project.

I urge the support of this bipartisan legislation, which provides certainty and makes a good investment to provide transportation in order to move commerce and people in the future.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the FAST Act, which authorizes $305 billion over 5 years for highways, transit, and rail, including Amtrak. Although many of us would have preferred much higher funding levels, the conference agreement provides an increase in funding of $12.8 billion above the House bill and $26.8 billion in guaranteed funding above fiscal year 2015 levels. The funding increase allows us to preserve core highway and transit programs and to still invest in new key areas.

New York State will get an additional $1.5 billion above current levels in highway and transit formula funding over the life of the bill, of which an estimated $500 million will go to projects in New York City.

The bill provides $4.5 billion for the new freight program, originally created in the House bill for large-scale, multimodal projects that are critical to our regional and national economy. This was a key recommendation of the freight panel on which I was the ranking member, along with Mr. DUNCAN as chairman, and I am very proud that it is included in the final conference report.

The bill increases funding for transit, including the major programs that benefit New York, such as section 5340—High-Density States program, the State of Good Repair program, and capital investment grants, and it preserves the ability to flex other transportation funding toward major transit projects.

I am mostly pleased that the conference report authorizes $10.2 billion over 5 years for intercity passenger rail, including $8 billion for Amtrak; dedicates resources for Northeast corridor improvements; and provides $200 million to help commuter railroads implement positive train control. It also increases the liability limit on rail passenger accidents to $295 million, retroactively, to help cover claims for those killed or injured in the Amtrak derailment outside of Pennsylvania last May.

I commend Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and my fellow conferees for all of their hard work in finally bringing a long-term transportation bill to fruition. It has been too long. I am glad we finally did it. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Transportation Conference Report, now called the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015. I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER, and Ranking Member DEFAZIO, for developing a bipartisan bill that we can all be proud to support.

The Conference Report authorizes $305 billion over five years for highways, transit and rail, including Amtrak. Although many of us would have preferred higher funding levels closer to the Administration's GROW America Act, the conference agreement provides an increase in funding of $12.8 billion above the House bill and $26.8 billion in guaranteed funding above FY15. Every state will get an increase in transportation funding. New York State will get an additional $1.5 billion above current levels in highway and transit formula funding over the life of the bill, of which an estimated additional $500 million will go to projects in New York City. The funding increase allows us to preserve these core programs, and still invest in new key areas.

The bill provides $4.5 billion for the new freight program, originally created in the House bill, for large scale multimodal projects critical to our regional and national economy. This was a key recommendation of the Freight Panel that I co-chaired with Mr. DUNCAN, and I am very proud that it is included in the final Conference Report.

For over a decade, we have made various attempts to address major freight projects that are too big or complex for states to address on their own. The PNRS program that we created in SAFETEA–LU was meant to address such projects, but was divvied up into many, relatively small, earmarks. In MAP–21, the PNRS program was reauthorized, but subject to appropriations, and never received any funding. This bill finally gets it right, and provides guaranteed, dedicated funding to address goods movement throughout the country.

In addition to the grant program for large multimodal projects, the bill includes a new freight formula program to the States passed as part of the Senate bill, and it requires strategic planning at the state and federal level. All of these programs together will bring about unprecedented resources to fund freight projects that are long overdue and critical to our economy. It is a ground breaking achievement, and one of the things that sets this bill apart from its predecessors.

The bill increases funding for transit, including all the major programs that benefit New York. The Conference Report not only restores, but increases, funding for the High Density State program under Section 5340 that provides approximately $100 million for transit projects all across New York State. The bill includes a 20% increase in funding for the State of Good Repair program, and it increases funding for Capital Investment Grants.

The conference report does not include language restricting the ability of transit agencies to use other transportation programs, such as CMAQ and TIFIA, to fill the gap in federal funding for transit New Starts, which Mr. LIPINSKI and I fought against in the House bill. The bill maintains the historic 80/20 split between highway and transit funding, and it provides enough finding to create a robust Bus & Bus Facilities grant program that will benefit all fifty states while dedicating resources to the programs upon which our urban centers rely.

I am also pleased that the Conference Report authorizes $10.2 billion over five years for intercity passenger rail, including $8 billion for Amtrak, and dedicates resources for improvements along the Northeast Corridor. The bill includes language to help the Gateway project compete for future funding, and it authorizes a new consolidated grant program to help railroads make safety and reliability improvements. Additionally, the bill dedicates $200 million to help commuter railroads implement Positive Train Control, and it increases the liability limit on rail passenger accidents to $295 million retroactively to help cover claims for those killed or injured in the Amtrak derailment outside of Philadelphia in May of this year.

Overall, this is a balanced bill that will provide certainty and reliability for transportation agencies over the next five years. It would have been my preference to provide significantly more funding to address the major backlog of investment needs on our roads, bridges, transit and rail, but given the political reality this Conference Report is something we can all be proud to support. It increases funding for core programs, addresses new critical areas, and although it includes a few objectionable provisions, it is generally free of major poison pills.

I commend Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and my fellow conferees, for all their hard work in finally bringing a long term transportation bill to fruition. I urge all my colleagues to vote for this Conference Report.

Thank you.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express concerns regarding a particular provision in the bill before us today. The provision in question retroactively increases a Federal statutory cap on liability to cover one railway accident that occurred earlier this year.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, retroactive legislation is not always unconstitutional, but it is clearly disfavored. The Supreme Court outlined in a case called Eastern Enterprises v. Apfel, and I quote:

''Retroactivity is generally disfavored in the law, in accordance with the 'fundamental notions of justice' that have been recognized throughout history. In his 'Commentaries on the Constitution,' Justice Story reasoned: 'Retrospective laws are indeed generally unjust; and, as has been forcibly said, neither accord with sound legislation nor with the fundamental principles of the social compact.' ''

Mr. Speaker, while recognizing that retroactive legislation is constitutional in some instances—limited instances, I might add—none of those instances would clearly appear to apply to the provision in question.

The Supreme Court further stated, ''Our decisions . . . have left open the possibility that legislation might be unconstitutional if it imposes severe retroactive liability on a limited class of parties that could not have anticipated the liability, and the extent of that liability is substantially disproportionate to the parties' experience.''

In the case of the provision in question in the bill before us today, the retroactivity imposes severe increases in liability—almost a 50-percent increase, in this case—on a limited class of parties who could not have anticipated that liability.

While I support reasonable compensation for those who have been done legal injury, I am concerned that this particular provision may not pass constitutional muster. For that reason, I would register my concern.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the FAST Act, which will create jobs, boost the economy, ease congestion on our roads and rails, and improve our quality of life.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for producing this bill and thank them for working with me in committee, on the House floor, and on the conference committee to make this bill better.

Recommendations made by our Freight Panel, led by Chairman DUNCAN and Ranking Member NADLER last Congress, led to new provisions that will improve the efficiency of freight movement and ease congestion on our roads and rails. This is critical for our Nation's freight hub in northeastern Illinois as we continue the CREATE rail program and other large freight projects.

The bill includes revisions I authored to create Buy America content, deploy zero-emission buses, and improve tank car safety standards, which will produce more American jobs, protect the environment, and improve community safety.

The FAST Act will also improve public transit and active transportation infrastructure and safety. Commuter rail safety will be increased through PTC grants, and this bill prepares us for the future by including research provisions from my FUTURE TRIP Act.

I would like to thank Science, Space, and Technology Committee Chairman SMITH for working with me on this. Thanks, finally, to my staff—Andrew Davis, Jason Day, Eric Lausten, and Shawn Kimmel—and all the committee staff for their work on this bill.

We have more work to do. This bill will not solve all of our transportation problems, but this bill is a big step forward for jobs and for surface transportation in our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to approve this conference report.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY), a hardworking member of the committee.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and ranking member for all their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the long-term nature of this highway bill.

After 35-plus extensions, the upper and lower Chambers of Congress are sending the President a 5-year highway bill. I want you to think about that. We haven't had legislation this long that provided certainty and confidence to our States in over 10 years.

Before coming to Congress, I was a general engineering contractor. I built those highways, roads, bridges, and dams. I also previously served on the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada, and I know what it takes to invest in infrastructure.

I will be honest. These short-term patches would have been a disservice to our States and our districts. They need long-term certainty to build a master plan for the future.

Many may not understand the aspects of what it takes to actually build infrastructure in our Nation. It is not all about just going out and investing a dollar and going and building a highway, a railroad, or other infrastructure. It takes a lot to go through the NEPA process and the engineering processes before you can even get to the point where you can turn a shovel of dirt.

So we need to make sure that we find other funding mechanisms for the future. We need to start today and recognize that we need to plan for the future and invest in this country so it has quality infrastructure for our safety and the needs of this country.

While the funding mechanisms are not perfect, we are moving in the right direction and putting our Nation back on the path to prosperity. That is why I proudly stand here today as a conferee to support this long-term funding bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this certainly is a great day for the people in this country, and I want to thank the leadership on this committee.

I believe wholeheartedly that this surface transportation bill will give the economy just the type of boost it needs. A long-term transportation bill will strengthen our infrastructure, provide quality jobs, and serve as a tool to put America back to work long-term.

This important legislation includes a critical freight grant program, additional funding for transit systems and pedestrian safety program, includes funds to speed the implementation of positive train control, improves the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing loan program, and creates a disadvantaged business enterprise program at the Federal Railroad Administration.

It also includes additional funds for Amtrak, moves us closer to restoring passenger rail for the Gulf States, and protects our ports from unnecessary paperwork.

Transportation and infrastructure funding is absolutely critical to this Nation. If properly funded, it serves as a tremendous economic boost. For every billion dollars we spend in transportation, it generates 44,000 permanent jobs. When we pass this legislation, we will put millions of hardworking Americans back to work to fix our Nation's crumbling infrastructure and prepare our country for the future.

Mr. Speaker, there is no better present for the people in this country than to pass this transportation bill.

Merry Christmas, and God bless America.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), a hardworking member of the committee.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants this body the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States as well as the power to establish post offices and post roads.

Maintaining and improving our Nation's infrastructure is an important constitutional responsibility that we, as Members of this body, have, which is exactly why I told voters what I wanted to do when I came to Washington was to work together in a bipartisan fashion to address issues just like this transportation bill is going to address.

What does this bill mean to the voters in central Illinois who sent me here? It means about 80 percent of all of the road projects that are funded in my State of Illinois are funded by Federal dollars.

The vision that has been laid out in this bill—and we could argue about the pay-fors, whether they are not perfect. But we can also show the American people that we can work together to rebuild our Nation's crumbling infrastructure.

I am confident that as soon as this bill passes overwhelmingly today, under the leadership of Chairman SHUSTER, he will begin debating how we move into the future in our next transportation bill. That is what is great about service on this committee.

I want to commend Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman GRAVES, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and all the hardworking members of this committee who put a great bill together.

Everybody has stood up and said it is not perfect, but no bill that comes out of this institution is perfect. We don't always get everything we want, Mr. Speaker. But what we get is a long-term plan that is allowing our States to continue to plan and rebuild our roads and bridges.

I also want to thank Chairman SHUSTER because he helped new leaders on our committee become leaders in transportation. I want to talk about CRESENT HARDY, who just spoke a few minutes ago. He was able to show his constituents that he is able to lead on transportation issues and work together to get things done.

JOHN KATKO, GARRET GRAVES—these are new members of the committee that are able to go back to their constituents and show governing and bipartisan success.

This is what we came here to address, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I want to congratulate both Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO for their work on this bill. I want to thank the Senate, as well, for their work and their leadership.

This is a good week, in many respects. We passed yesterday, on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, a bill to make sure that our education system works better. Today, we will pass, by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, a bill to give more stability and investment to our infrastructure in America. Those are good things.

I lament the fact that, although the previous speaker talked about a sound, long-term fiscal path for infrastructure investment, my own view is we don't do that. We do better than what is but not what we ought to do.

My own view is that we need to dedicate the user fee we call the gasoline tax at a level which has not been raised since 1993 to a level that will in fact put us on a path to fiscal stability and certainty for our infrastructure package.

But this is a good package, and I want to thank my friend BILL SHUSTER for his leadership. Very frankly, that was critical to getting us to this point, not only on his side on the aisle but on our side of the aisle as well. And I want to thank Mr. DEFAZIO.

As has been said, this is not a perfect reauthorization. We ought to stop saying that because nothing we pass is perfect. What we hope for is the good, and this is good. It is a compromise. All these efforts are critical to creating the kind of environment that encourage private-sector development and job growth.

At the same time, I am very pleased that a wide majority of Members, nearly every Democrat and most Republicans, worked together to ensure that this conference report includes a multiyear reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, supported by a majority of Republicans and all but one Democrat.

It is unfortunate that Congress, through inaction by the Congress, allowed the Ex-Im Bank to shut down in July. Now, it didn't actually shut down, but it had no authority to guarantee loans, which cost us jobs.

We are changing that policy in this bill. Today, we are coming together to reopen it so that it can help American businesses and workers compete on a level playing field in overseas markets.

During the time the Bank was shut down, businesses began shifting jobs overseas and others refrained from investing here because of the uncertainty over whether it would reopen. Today, that certainty will be restored.

To that extent, the Export-Import Bank is in the same position that Governors and mayors and county executives all over this country will be put in by this bill, giving them some degree of certainty that there will be a cash flow for infrastructure projects, bridges, roads, and other transportation items.

I want to thank again Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS for her work on the Export-Import Bank and DENNY HECK and GWEN MOORE for their work that led to this provision in the transportation bill.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I also want to thank, who showed great courage and great leadership, STEPHEN FINCHER of Tennessee and FRANK LUCAS of Oklahoma, my Republican colleagues, without whom this Export-Import Bank provision would not be in this bill. I congratulate them for their courage and their leadership.

I thank again PETER DEFAZIO and BILL SHUSTER.

This is a good day for our country. This is a bipartisan day for this Congress. And I urge my colleagues to support this product.

□ 1215

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS), one of the newest members of our committee.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report for the FAST Act.

As a member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I am pleased this bill reflects the committee's hard work. This legislation makes a fundamental investment in our Nation's roads, bridges, and infrastructure, providing long-term certainty for local governments and ensuring the efficient movement of consumer goods.

Importantly, it also streamlines the environmental review and permitting processes to ensure transportation projects stay on time and on budget.

I was pleased that three provisions of significance to my district were included in the final bill. One directs Department of Transportation to study the effects of marijuana-impaired driving. The second would incentivize the use of innovative pavement material. The third would help address congestion in HOV lanes.

This 5-year bill is fully paid for and will put a stop to short-term extensions that are costly to taxpayers and create significant uncertainty for local and State governments.

I am pleased to support this historic bill coming before the House floor today, and I thank Chairman SHUSTER for his hard work in making this bill a reality.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the FAST Act, our first long-term surface transportation bill in nearly 10 years.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their bipartisan leadership. It has truly been an honor to work on a committee where we can show the American people that we know how to work together.

Mr. Speaker, transportation moves our economy. Passing the FAST Act will shift America's infrastructure into higher gear. This legislation brings American families tens of thousands of new good-paying jobs while promoting safer, more efficient travel on our transportation infrastructure. It sends more dollars to our local communities, who know their needs best.

I will associate myself with the remarks of my colleague Representative BROWN when I say that this is a wonderful gift to the American people for this holiday season.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their work and express my appreciation for the opportunity to serve as a conferee.

There are several significant items in this bill that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Chairman GOODLATTE and I were also deeply involved in another part of this important bill: efforts to enact meaningful and effective permit streamlining reforms. Enacting legislation to streamline the Federal permitting process has been among my primary goals.

The RAPID Act, my bill to improve and review permitting timelines, has passed this House on three occasions on a bipartisan basis. Our goal has been to fix the flaws in our Federal permitting process that too often doom projects, leaving millions of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars in economic activity on a bureaucrat's desk.

This year, we worked with our colleagues Senators PORTMAN and MCCASKILL on this important project. The amendment we offered on the floor during House consideration of this measure represented a carefully crafted compromise that further achieves these goals. It was the product of a bipartisan cooperation, and I am proud that these provisions were included in the conference report we are considering today.

This conference report is an example of the many ways that we can reach across the aisle to find solutions to problems facing us. Our priorities will make lasting reforms that are sure to improve our infrastructure and strengthen our economy. I am glad they will be made law through the enactment of this conference report.

This 5-year bill establishes certainty, stability, confidence, and, most importantly, trust. I am a States' rights guy, and the less Federal Government in my life, the better. Congress has removed obstacles for the States, who know best what is needed for their infrastructure. We must continue to remove impediments for our States to move into the 21st century without job-crushing regulations.

Please support this bill. This bill will improve the quality of life for all Americans.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by getting the attention of our chairman over there and thanking him for the terrific job that he did, as well as our ranking member, Mr. DEFAZIO. It was a real treat. It was, for me, a take-back to an earlier time when regular order prevailed around this place.

Quite frankly, that is how you fix things and get things done. It is not always just a matter of attitude; it can be a matter of process. When you have a chair and a ranking member that welcome all members to bring their ideas before the committee, to have an opportunity to have them discussed, examined, argued, and debated, that is how you bring people together. That is how you fix things. That is how you get things done.

I would also be remiss if I didn't thank the staff, both the Republican and Democratic staff. You all worked so hard and late into the night and long hours, day after day, getting us to this point. I thank my own staff assistant, Eddie Wytkind, in particular, for the work that he has done on this.

With regard to the bill itself, you know, finally, after kicking this can down the road some 34, 35 times, we finally have the kind of long-term surface transportation legislation that people in this country have been crying for and begging for so that we could begin fixing the roads and the bridges that are falling down and the trains that have been coming off the tracks.

It is a good, nonpartisan piece of legislation that will allow our States, our counties, and our cities to plan accordingly. Of course, that brings with it greater efficiency.

It will put a lot of people back to work. Everyone has told us that infrastructure, transportation is fundamental to our ability to grow jobs, to grow our economy, and to strengthen business opportunities.

I am particularly grateful for our Duluth amendment that solves a particular little problem, but an important one, that we have there with regard to logging trucks on our Main Street.

Last but not least, I want to commend the leadership for including the reauthorization of Ex-Im Bank with this. As we all know, it is a great banking institution that helps us reduce the deficit and creates jobs throughout the country, including the Eighth District of Minnesota.

Thank you to all who were a part of moving this important legislation forward.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here today.

This is a historic event. For 10 years now, we have been doing patches and temporarily providing funding for our roadways. It costs taxpayers money to do that, to do these temporary extensions, to compartmentalize the funding. You have to take projects, and you have to separate them into smaller pieces. You have to pay for contractors to come out and to leave and to come back again. I will say it again: It costs taxpayers money to continue to do these patches and these temporary extensions.

This is historic because it provides 5 years of funding. It provides funding certainty.

Having run a large-scale infrastructure program for a number of years, I am well aware of the difficulty caused by doing these temporary patches and the increased cost. I will tell you, I think it results in less safe roads. It absolutely doesn't deliver what taxpayers deserve.

The other great thing about this bill and a reason that it is historic is that it is bipartisan, something that has been lacking for some time now, to see that Members on both sides come together on something as important as infrastructure funding.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER, I want to thank Ranking Member DEFAZIO, respective staff directors Chris and Kathy, and everyone who worked on this bill on the conference staff. I know you put in a lot of time and you gave up your Thanksgiving. I want to thank you very much for all the work that has been done.

This bill also increases funding for transportation. It results in nearly a 10-percent increase in investment in infrastructure. In the case of Louisiana, we will see a $100 million increase in the fifth year of this bill—a $100 million increase just in that one year as compared to current funding levels. We need these funds.

Something else important in this bill is the grant program that was established in the House bill for nationally significant corridors, for freight corridors, $800 million to $1 billion a year to address these large-scale infrastructure needs that have not been addressed.

In the case of my home State of Louisiana, we are in dire need of a new crossing on the Mississippi River. Getting across that extraordinary bottleneck, where the interstate drops down to one lane—the only place in the United States—is a great need that we have. It causes incredible traffic problems.

Addressing roads that need to be upgraded, like LA 1, Highway 30, connecting Walker to Gonzales, addressing a Pecue Lane exit, upgrading Highway 90 to interstate standards—projects that are in dire need and cause national implications because of their inability to efficiently move commerce across this country, Louisiana being one of the top export States in the United States.

This bill also ensures that the roads are safer, ensures that we address at-grade rail crossings, ensures that we have the right safety mechanisms in place to ensure that we are not going to have fatalities associated with driving and traffic accidents.

Importantly, this bill addresses technology. Mr. Speaker, we are still using traffic light technology from the 1920s. It is 2015. We can actually do on our telephones what took mainframe computers decades ago.

This bill establishes a framework to ensure that innovation, to ensure that competition is actually integrated into our traffic management systems so we are not sitting around at traffic lights when no other cars are there, to ensure that our cars can communicate with one another, our phones can communicate with traffic lights, where we can really take intelligent transportation systems to the next level.

It expedites the NEPA and environmental review process to ensure that we are getting dirt turned and getting roads in place as soon as possible while still respecting the environment.

It, importantly, includes something that we were pushing very hard, the Sport Fish Restoration and the Boating Safety Act, ensuring that boat safety, ensuring that sport fish and restoration, ensuring that the CWPPRA program continues to move forward and we have those important restoration activities.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say I appreciated very much the opportunity to be a conferee. This is a historic bill. And I want to urge: Increased funding, safer roads—this is the right direction for this country. Support this conference report.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Oregon for yielding.

The bipartisan highway conference compromise before us is just that, a compromise. But, despite its faults, I will support it.

While this bill adequately funds our Nation's long-term highway infrastructure needs, which our communities desperately need, it does fall short of making the robust long-term investments our crumbling infrastructure truly needs.

I am pleased the bill does take an important step to protect consumers by prohibiting companies from renting or loaning out dangerously recalled vehicles for the first time. I have spearheaded this effort for years in honor of Raechel and Jacqueline Houck, two young sisters who were killed by their rented vehicle that was under recall.

To be clear, this is an important step for consumer safety. But I am disappointed that, during conference, companies with fewer than 35 rental or loaner vehicles were exempted. Unfortunately, by our bowing to special interests, some consumers will still be at risk.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. CAPPS. However, we will continue to build on the important step of holding large rental companies and auto dealers accountable until, one day, all Americans can be confident that the cars that they drive are safe. This is our goal: that all rental cars be safe for their drivers to engage in as they rent them.

□ 1230

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have already thanked the committee staff. They did do a fabulous job.

I also want to recognize others who were involved: the Senate staff of the Committee on Environment and Public Works; the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; and the Committee on Finance.

Over here, we are a little more consolidated when we deal with these issues. The Senate is a little more spread out, but that is the Senate. They were all involved and all a critical part of this product.

I also want to thank some others, beyond committee staff. The House Legislative Counsel, led by Curt Haensel, has provided a tremendous assistance in the drafting of this very extensive legislation, as well as the staff of the U.S. Department of Transportation, particularly the Federal Highway Administration.

Curt Haensel and Carolyn Edwards of FHWA have been involved in every surface transportation bill since the nineties, and their expertise was invaluable. We come up with policy ideas, but they have to figure out a way to lay down the legislative language so that we accomplish those goals. So they did great work.

Mr. Speaker, this is, as many have said, historic for this Congress and recent Congresses in terms of the bipartisan nature of it and the fact that we are putting in place long-term assurances for major investments that our country needs for our transportation infrastructure. But it is a starting point. This is not the end.

It provides certainty and modest funding increases for the next 5 years, but it does not even rise to the level of assuring that our transportation infrastructure 5 years from today will be in a better state of repair than it is now.

There are tremendous unmet needs out there. This will help, but it is not the overall solution. Numerous times we have moved money from the general fund into the highway trust fund. We are again engaging in that activity here. The total, at this point, is $145 billion.

I don't resent moving general fund money, but I think there are better ways and more certain ways and more robust ways to finance the future of our investments in infrastructure.

So we can say today we are celebrating, as we should, but there is more work to do. Next week, we should begin anew and recognize that we have to work together—Democrats and Republicans, truckers, transit agency, builders, and shippers—to find a way to restore the user fee mechanism to finance these investments.

President Eisenhower is often credited with establishing the Interstate Highway System, which now bears his name. Actually, Congress designated the system in the forties, but it was not until 1956 that Congress, with then-President Eisenhower, developed a user fee system to actually construct our incredible interstate system.

So we need to work together to renew the mandate and find a path forward for long-term, sustainable funding for these critical investments. Celebrate today, but it is back to work tomorrow.

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

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

In my closing, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my House colleagues on both sides of the aisle, members of the committee, and the conferees.

There was broad, bipartisan support of this bill. There are over 250 Members of this House that contributed to the bill. Working together on this important piece of legislation I think proves to the American people that we can get big things done.

I would also like to thank Mr. DEFAZIO. He has been a real partner in this. We certainly had our moments of disagreement, but we were able to work through it and get a bill which he and I say is a good, solid piece of legislation. And, through that effort, we were able to achieve that.

I also want to thank Chairman GRAVES and Ranking Member NORTON for their hard work and support in this effort.

I want to thank the vice chair of the full committee, Mr. DUNCAN, who

chaired two important panels last Congress, one on freight movement and one on public-private partnerships. From that work with a cross-section of the committee and across jurisdictional lines of the subcommittees, they were able to produce recommendations that became critical parts of this bill. So I thank Congressman DUNCAN from Tennessee for his work.

Finally, I thank the Speaker of the House. In becoming Speaker, he told the Conference and our House he was going to make sure we did regular order. This bill is a product of regular order. He had an open process on the House floor. We dealt with over 103 amendments specific to the transportation portion of the bill but then another 20 or so that dealt with provisions in this bill.

So it was an open process, and, again, I want to thank Speaker RYAN for keeping his word to the Members of this body to have regular order and an open process.

I also want to thank my Senate colleagues and their conferees for their efforts in putting together this bill.

I want to thank the House and Senate Legislative Counsel, who don't often get a whole lot of credit, but I thank Curt Haensel, Tom Dillon, Rosemary Gallagher, Karen Anderson, and Tim Brown, for their efforts in writing up this bill and helping us throughout this process.

Finally, I want to thank the staffs of both the majority and minority of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. As I said in the opening remarks, they worked through the Thanksgiving holiday, a lot of long hours, and they are dedicated to the work of this committee. We wouldn't be here today without their efforts. I thank them from the bottom of my heart for their efforts.

I will include in the RECORD the names of those committee staff people because it is a long list and I don't want to screw anybody's name up. I just want to say thanks again for their long hours in getting this bill put together and brought to the floor.

TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE STAFF

REPUBLICAN T&I STAFF

Chris Bertram, Matt Sturges, Jennifer Hall, Murphie Barrett, Geoff Gosselin, Mary Phillips, Alex Etchen, Caryn Moore Lund, Nicole Christus, Kristin Alcalde, Jim Billimoria, Clare Doherty, Keith Hall, Justin Harclerode, Holly Woodruff Lyons, Hannah Matesic, Collin McCune, Tracy Mosebey, Anna Oak, Max Rosen.

Beth Spivey, David Connolly, Arielle Giordano, Fred Miller, George Riccardo, Adam Twardzik, Kevin Rieg, Isabelle Beegle-Levin.

DEMOCRAT T&I STAFF

Liz Cooney, Kathy Dedrick, Jen Gilbreath, Ashley Guill, Russ Kelley, Ward McCarragher, Ben Lockshin, Auke Maher-Piersma, Andrew Okuyiga, Luke Strimer, Helena Zyblikewycz, Ryan Sieger, Jennifer Homendy, Alexa Old Crow.

Mr. SHUSTER. The FAST Act is absolutely critical to America and our economy. I think everybody speaking here today laid out the many provisions. It is important to America.

I would encourage my colleagues to all support this bipartisan, bicameral agreement. And I believe it will have strong support today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everybody to vote for this bill. It is good for America.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCE H.R. 22, FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

Title XLIII of the Joint Explanatory Statement provides a summary of section 43001 concerning requirements in agency rulemakings pursuant to this Act. Section 43001 of the House amendments to H.R. 22 was not agreed to in conference and does not appear in the conference report to accompany H.R. 22. The summary of section 43001 in the Joint Explanatory statement therefore appears in error. Accordingly, title XLIII of the Joint Explanatory Statement has no effect.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we were able to come together to find a longer-term solution for our nation's infrastructure. We cannot keep operating on short-term fixes. Investments in our country's infrastructure need certainty. Though I would have preferred to see greater funding levels across the board, I am pleased to see provisions such as the High Density States Program are protected and funded for the next five years. While I will vote for this bill because it puts Americans back to work and allows our state and transit authorities to do long-term planning for our crumbling infrastructure, I must highlight some of the reasons this bill falls short.

The most substantial decreases in injuries and deaths on our roads and highways occurred as a result of major safety advancements, such as requiring seatbelts and airbags in all new cars. Today, we have a vehicle title that does not include such a safety advancement and does little to improve safety. This was a missed opportunity. This bill could have included meaningful safety improvements, such as imminent hazard authority to allow NHTSA to expedite a recall order when necessary, a requirement that ensured recalled used cars are repaired before they are sold, safety standards for rear seat crashworthiness, and the elimination of regional-only recalls that no longer make sense for our increasingly mobile world. And civil penalties should have been higher so that sacrificing safety will not be treated as a "slap on the wrist" or just another cost of doing business.

Instead, this vehicle title includes provisions that take a step backwards on safety and that could actually lead to more injuries and deaths on our roads. For example, it includes a provision that exempts an unlimited number of replica cars—that is, new cars made to resemble old cars—from vehicle safety laws, clean air requirements, and state emissions testing. It also includes a whistleblower provision that will not encourage, and may effectively discourage, whistleblowers from reporting serious safety problems to the government. And even the promising rental car provision section, which requires rental car companies and auto dealers to repair recalled cars before renting or loaning them to customers, was weakened by excluding those that have a fleet of fewer than 35 vehicles.

I am disappointed that the bicameral, bipartisan process failed to craft a vehicle title that actually enhances safety.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan transportation authorization, the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, also known as the FAST Act.

I thank the Chairman for his leadership on this bipartisan transportation reauthorization.

This is a 5-year bill that provides both budgetary certainty and project flexibility for our states and localities so that they may invest in and upgrade our transportation system and do so with more innovative technologies and approaches.

The certainty provided by this long-term bill also saves money by stopping the short term patches that complicate planning and yield cost overruns.

As a representative in Northern Virginia, I know too well the traffic congestion issues we face and appreciate that this bill provides much-needed assistance in this area.

I am pleased to have served on the Conference Committee for this bill, and pleased that numerous provisions from one of my bills on congestion relief and research were included.

This measure will help promote the development of transportation technologies and tools for congestion relief.

The bill also includes some of my provisions related to Metro safety and accountability that I worked on with my DC and Maryland counterparts, Ms. HOLMES NORTON and Ms. EDWARDS.

Again, I thank everyone involved in this process.

I urge my colleagues to support the FAST Act.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, now that the House has approved the conference report I would like to recognize and commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting the inclusion of bill language in H.R. 22 (Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act of 2015) that will help protect consumers from the longstanding problem of predatory towing.

For some time now, egregious vehicle towing and storage practices performed by some unscrupulous companies have been a serious concern in many parts of the country. While the vast majority of towing and storage firms are honest and well-intentioned, some have been engaged in predatory business tactics designed to delay access to vehicles and increase costs for consumers. Because these companies have possession of vehicles, they are in a position to take advantage of consumers and charge excessive towing and storage fees.

For reasons that are not entirely clear, current Federal law allows states to regulate some, but not all aspects of tow truck operations, limiting their ability to protect consumers from predatory towing tactics. The language included in the amendment introduced by myself and Rep. VAN HOLLEN broadens the authority of states and localities to regulate tow truck operations, which is limited by current motor carrier law. This additional authority will now allow states and localities to regulate all aspects of tows conducted without the prior

consent or authorization of the owner or operator of a vehicle. The language is also intended to apply to accident scene and breakdown towing, to allow states to protect consumers who are often unable to make an informed choice and give meaningful consent or acknowledgment on towing in those situations.

I want to thank the conference chair and vice chair for their support of this important provision. I would also like to thank my predecessor, Jim Moran, who was a champion on this issue for so long and first introduced this language during the 109th Congress.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, today is a historic day, as we are voting for a five year surface transportation reauthorization bill that provides critical investment to our roads and bridges. This will help keep America competitive and provide certainty to states and communities planning infrastructure projects.

However, it is irresponsible that neither the House nor the Senate has worked on serious reforms. We have not adjusted the user fee for our infrastructure in 20 years or considered new, sustainable revenue streams. Instead, we have spent valuable time searching for short term gimmicks. Make no mistake; I am disappointed with the offsets in this bill. We should not be robbing the banks or Customs to pay for our roads and bridges.

This is fiscally irresponsible. At some point, we have to say enough is enough. That time has come. We need a long-term, robustly funded bill. We missed an opportunity with this legislation, but we in Congress must work together to continue finding common ground on innovative ideas to ensure the Highway Trust Fund has a sustainable revenue source. We cannot allow our children and grandchildren to pay for the investments we should be making now.

As a Conferee, I was happy to work with Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and my Senate Colleagues on important roadway safety issues, such as preventing heavier trucks from driving on our local roads.

This bill fully funds the Highway Safety Improvement Program, which invests in infrastructure like guardrails, rumble strips, and retroreflective signs. While you will never read the headline, ''Rumble strip saves family of four,'' this program saves lives every day and for that reason alone, I urge my colleagues to support this bill today.

Additionally, I was pleased to see commonsense provisions that I championed included in the final agreement. For example, I introduced the Local Farm Vehicle Flexibility Act to make sure farm vehicles are not regulated like long haul trucks. Today, this highway bill includes language to prevent farmers from getting tickets for driving from field to field without covering their load.

It makes crude oil being transported by freight rail safer and gives first responders more time to react in the unlikely event of a derailment by including top fitting protections for the pressure relief valves. It also includes language that I strongly support to reduce paperwork burdens on concrete truck drivers.

I worked with my fellow conferees to encourage the use of U.S. iron and steel in rolling stock frames and car shells. This provision will increase use of U.S. iron and steel in the fabrication of rolling stock frame and car shell components and subcomponents.

Finally, many of the policy ideas that I introduced in the Safer Trucks and Buses Act were incorporated in this final version. We must work to make sure we fix the important safety score program so that good decisions can be made on scores that actually represent truck and bus safety records.

Investing in infrastructure is good for the economy and good for America. I am happy to vote for this long term bill and look forward to working with my colleagues on policy ideas that could be included in a comprehensive tax reform bill to ensure the Highway Trust Fund has a sustainable funding source.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report to H.R. 22, the ''Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2015,'' a bill to authorize Federal Funding for highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs.

I thank Transportation and Infrastructure Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO and the House and Senate Conferees for their work in bringing the Conference Report for the Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act to the floor for a vote.

It is good to see the spirit of bipartisanship return to the process of funding our nation's transportation needs.

As the former Ranking Member of the House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation Security, I am well aware of the importance of our nation's transportation system.

A well-functioning transportation system is critical to the nation's prosperity.

Whether it is by road, transit, aviation, rail, or waterway, we rely on our transportation system to move people and goods safely, facilitate commerce, attract and retain businesses, and support jobs.

Houston is the fourth most populous city in the country; but unlike other large cities, we have struggled to have an effective mass transit system.

Over many decades Houston's mass transit policy was to build more highways with more lanes to carry more drivers to and from work.

The city of Houston has changed course and is now pursuing mass transit options that include light rail.

This decision to invest in light rail is strongly supported by the increased use by Houstonians in the light rail service provided by previous transportation appropriations bills.

The April 2014, Houston Metropolitan Transit Authority report on weekly ridership states that 44,267 used Houston's light rail Service—representing a 6,096 or 16% change in ridership in April of last year.

This increase in light rail usage outpaced ridership of other forms of mass transit in the city of Houston: metro bus had a 2.3% increase over April 2013; metro bus-local had a 1.3% increase over April 2013; and Metro Bus-Park and Ride had an 8.0% increase over April 2013.

On February 5, 2013, the Houston Chronicle reported on the congestion Houston drivers face during their daily commute to and from work.

The article reported that Houston commuters continue to experience some of the worst traffic delays in the country, according to the 2012 urban mobility report. Houston area drivers wasted more than two days a year, on average, in traffic congestion, costing them each $1,090 in lost time and fuel.

Funds made available by the legislation will be available for the construction of the University rail line and support of local government decisions by the Houston Metropolitan transit Authority and the city of Houston to expand rail service.

More needs to be done to address the transportation needs of our nation from rural communities to major metropolitan areas.

I appreciate that two Jackson Lee Amendments are included in the underlying bill.

The first Jackson Lee Amendment ensures that the goals of improving transportation efficiency and safety take into consideration the topic of public safety, a rest stop, and public parking that is funded by this bill.

The Jackson Lee Amendment requires the Transportation Secretary to report to Congress on the security of locations that are intended to encourage public use of alternative transportation, as well as personal transportation parking areas.

An essential part of the success of public transportation usage is the ability of automobile drivers to park their vehicles in safety.

More than 1 in 10 property crimes occur in parking lots or garages.

The report will provide an opportunity for Congress to do more to enhance the safety of parking areas that are used by students, women, seniors, disabled, and other vulnerable members of the public.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics provides a detailed report on the place of occurrence for violent and property crimes from 2004 through 2008.

For example, purse snatchings and pocket pickings typically occur away from home.

According to Bureau of Justice Statistics 28.2% of purses snatched occur in open areas such as the street or on public transportation.

The inclusion of this Jackson Lee Amendment will lead to enhanced safety of car pool parking lots, mass transit parking; local, state, and regional rail station parking; college or university parking; bike paths, walking trails, and other locations the Secretary deems appropriate.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics reports that victimization and property crimes occurring between 2004 and 2008 in parking lots and garages include: 213,540 victimization crimes that occurred in noncommercial parking lots and garages; and 864,190 property crimes.

The Bureau's report on victimization crimes that occur at public transportation or in stations was 49,910 and property crimes was 132,190.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will make surface transportation travel safer.

More importantly, it will increase safety of the traveling public, especially women, seniors, students, disabled persons, and children.

The second Jackson Lee Amendment included in the Conference Report provides a report to Congress from the Secretary of the Department of Transportation on the ''Internet of Things'' (IoT) and its potential to improve transportation services to the elderly and persons with disabilities as well as assist local, state and federal transportation planners in achieving better efficiencies and cost effectiveness, while protecting privacy and security of persons who use IoT technology.

The IoT refers to the wireless environment that will support networking of physical objects or ''things'' embedded with wireless electronic components, software, sensors, and network connectivity technology, which enables these objects to collect and exchange data on people, places and things.

The IoT will introduce the functionality of computing into physical space as computing technology is integrated into devices and systems.

It will also challenge the privacy and security of users of the technology if precautions are not taken to ensure that information on these devices is not protected.

This Jackson Lee Amendment will allow Congress to take into consideration how IoT technologies can be used to make public transportation, safer, more convenient to the elderly and disabled, and how it may improve mass and personal transportation efficiency.

The ability to include wireless technology into physical things or support communication among digital devices that may be nearby or at distances will offer many benefits to consumers.

IoT products are already being deployed for personal, recreational, city planning, public safety, energy consumption management, healthcare, and many other applications.

Today, local governments are working to incorporate IoT services into transportation; garbage pickup, as well as the provision of wireless connectivity for their residents.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will help ensure that we harness the benefits of the ''Internet of Things'' for the travelling public and minimize the threats to privacy and cybersecurity presented by this new and exciting technology.

This is a good bill and I encourage my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer comment on the FAST Act.

I will support the bill. This is a strong, multi-year reauthorization which includes desperately needed funding for infrastructure repair and investment. I commend Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their work in producing a bipartisan bill

I will also take this opportunity to remind my colleagues of a priority of mine to promote storm-resilient construction projects within the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

The concrete products industries in my district in southern New Jersey has much to offer in helping the country build its transportation infrastructure. I know that many of my colleagues have similar constituent companies and workers, and I urge them to take note of my comments.

I was pleased to support language in MAP–21 that was designed to help incorporate permeable pavements into the FHWA mission. Many of us on the eastern seaboard learned the utility of permeable pavements on Superstorm Sandy, and what flooding can do to our districts without warning if we are not prepared. I am happy to report that that language in MAP–21 dealing with permeable pavements is making good progress toward technological innovation that will Improve storm water mitigation, water quality, and more while providing aesthetically appealing paving surfaces.

I will remind my constituents in New Jersey that, while the FAST Act overlooked an opportunity to take that technology further, I am still looking for ways to move permeable pavement technologies into the mainstream where they can benefit our constituents and save taxpayer money as well.

In accordance with that goal, I submit the following material on passage of the FAST Act, and I hope that staff at FHWA and that the House and Senate will take note as well.

MAP–21 authorized the Secretary to conduct technology transfer and adoption of permeable infiltration paving materials, practices, and systems that are designed to minimize environmental impacts, stormwater runoff, and flooding. Prior to MAP–21 and since, extreme rain events like Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and Superstorm Sandy, have underscored the need for stormwater mitigation. We encourage the Secretary to accelerate work on permeable pavements in anticipation of future events like Katrina, Rita, and Sandy. The Secretary is encouraged to conduct research on full scale load testing in permeable pavements for street, highway, and road shoulders to decrease environmental impacts and enhance sustainability. The Secretary is encouraged to conduct permeable pavement projects that demonstrate flood control and stormwater pollutant and volume reductions, including mitigation of impacts from superstorms and hurricanes, and life cycle cost analysis compared to conventional impervious pavements. Projects may include re-use and integration of permeable pavements with other cost-effective water conservation practices designed to treat, reduce, or remove pollutants by allowing stormwater runoff to retain infiltration capability similar to predevelopment hydrologic conditions, and for stormwater harvesting.

We hope that FHWA will act upon language in Sec. 1428 of the FAST Act and previously existing authority to improve infrastructure integrity by adding innovative segmental wall technology for soil bank stabilization and roadway sound attenuation, and articulated technology for hydraulic sheer-resistant erosion control—areas in which emerging technologies could improve deliver marked benefits in surface transportation. Examples of emerging technologies that could meet the goals of this Act include cost effective segmental retaining walls that can make use of native soils and reduce construction costs, durable geosynthetic soil stabilization and anchoring, more durable articulated segmental unit slope protection and erosion control that are more resistant to hydraulic sheer and overtopping than riprap, and segmental roadway sound attenuation barriers that can give planners more options and help reduce procurement costs. We hope the Secretary will place primary emphasis on activities designed to assist state and local transportation agencies in reducing initial cost of construction of retaining walls, slope protection and erosion control, and sound attenuation barriers using high-quality transportation-grade materials, designs and engineering techniques. Specific activities might include validation of technology materials, soils requirements, design methodologies and engineering data; research to develop current, accurate scientific data on the performance of geosynthetic reinforcement for structural characteristics; a cost-sensitivity analysis to assist state and local authorities in projecting initial construction cost savings to life cycle requirements while providing competitive reliability; calibrating design methodologies based on tests of instrumented, full-scale testing of walls and barriers, slope stability, and segmental sound attenuation assemblies.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 22, the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. This long-term authorization of surface transportation programs will provide the certainty that states and municipalities need to plan and build out critical transportation infrastructure projects.

This 5-year, $305 billion measure represents a bi-partisan compromise to help repair our crumbling infrastructure and secure our economic future while creating thousands of good paying jobs. As both a conferee to the transportation bill and the senior Texan on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I can say with strong confidence that this legislation is a good-faith effort to make the important investments in our transportation infrastructure that our nation so desperately needs. While there are some shortcomings in the bill and some of us would like to have higher levels of investments be included, this bill will still help to further new and existing projects for the long-term.

I am pleased to see that this bill supports research and development, including expanding university transportation center outreach to women and underrepresented populations. In going forward, I hope that we can do more to elevate our nation as a leader in multimodal transportation innovation.

Mr. Speaker, Americans demand more investment in infrastructure and it is the responsibility of this Congress to make that investment. I applaud Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO and other members from the various committees of jurisdiction for their hard work on this bill. Passage of this legislation is a strong first step in keeping America competitive and helping to build and maintain our nation's critical transportation infrastructure.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 546, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 359, nays 65, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 673]

YEAS—359

Abraham	Brown (FL)	Comstock
Adams	Brownley (CA)	Conaway
Aderholt	Buchanan	Connolly
Allen	Bucshon	Conyers
Ashford	Bustos	Cook
Babin	Butterfield	Cooper
Barletta	Byrne	Costa
Barr	Calvert	Costello (PA)
Barton	Capps	Courtney
Bass	Capuano	Cramer
Beatty	Cárdenas	Crawford
Becerra	Carney	Crenshaw
Benishek	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Bera	Carter (GA)	Cummings
Beyer	Carter (TX)	Curbelo (FL)
Bilirakis	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Bishop (MI)	Castro (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	DeFazio
Black	Chu, Judy	DeGette
Blum	Cicilline	Delaney
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	DelBene
Bost	Clay	Denham
Boustany	Cleaver	Dent
Boyle, Brendan F.	Clyburn	DeSaulnier
	Cohen	Deutch
Brady (PA)	Cole	Diaz-Balart
Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)	Dingell
Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)	Doggett

Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—65

Amash
Amodei
Blackburn
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Burgess
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Culberson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Grothman
Harris
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jones
Jordan
Labrador
Lamborn
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
Miller (FL)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nugent
Palmer
Pearce
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Salmon
Sanford
Schweikert
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Tipton
Walker
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Wilson (SC)
Yoder
Yoho

NOT VOTING—9

Aguilar
Cuellar
Johnson, Sam
Meeks
Payne
Ruppersberger
Sanchez, Loretta
Takai
Williams

□ 1325

Messrs. CLAWSON of Florida and WALKER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. HOYER, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 672 on final passage of H.R. 8, the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015, I would have voted ''aye,'' which is consistent with my position on this legislation.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, on December 3, 2015, I was unable to vote on the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 22, the Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2015 (rollcall No. 673). Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to vote today for medical reasons.

Had I been present on rollcall vote 666, I would have voted ''no.''

Had I been present on rollcall vote 667, I would have voted ''yes.''

Had I been present on rollcall vote 668, I would have voted ''yes.''

Had I been present on rollcall vote 669, I would have voted ''no.''

Had I been present on rollcall vote 670, I would have voted ''yes.''

Had I been present on rollcall vote 671, I would have voted ''yes.''

Had I been present on rollcall vote 672, I would have voted ''no.''

Had I been present on rollcall vote 673, I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, December 3rd, I am not recorded on any votes because I was absent due to family reasons. If I had been present, I would have voted: ''nay,'' on rollcall 666, on ordering the Previous Question providing for further consideration of H.R. 22; ''yea,'' on rollcall 667, on H. Res. 546, providing for consideration of the Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 22; ''yea,'' on rollcall 668, on the Cramer Amendment to H.R. 8; ''nay,'' on rollcall 669, on the Rouzer Amendment to H.R. 8; ''nay,'' on rollcall 670, on the Pallone Amendment to H.R. 8; ''yea,'' on rollcall 671, on the motion to recommit H.R. 8; ''yea,'' on rollcall 672, on passage of H.R. 8; ''yea,'' on rollcall 673, on passage of the Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 22.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, December 3, I was absent from the House due to illness. Due to my absence, I am not recorded on any legislative measures for the day. I would like the record to reflect how I would have voted had I been present for legislative business.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall 666, the previous question providing for consideration of the Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 22.

I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall 667, the rule providing for consideration of the Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 22.

I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall 668, the Cramer Amendment to the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall 669, the Rouzer Amendment to the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall 670, the Pallone Amendment to the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall 671, the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 8.

I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall 672, final passage of the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall 673, Agreeing to the Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 22.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct the RECORD regarding my vote on H.R. 8, the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act.

On final passage, I voted ''yes'' and I actually intended to vote ''no.''

H.R. 8 contains a number of provisions that would negatively impact the environment and undermine our Nation's ability to move away from fossil fuel.

This legislation would undermine previously enacted initiatives to modernize America's energy infrastructure and increase our energy efficiency and capacity and would provide unnecessary handouts to the fossil fuel industry at a time when we should be focusing on expanding our Nation's clean, renewable energy portfolio.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule of the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and

2 p.m. for legislative business. No votes are expected in the House in order to accommodate Members going to the White House event.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. Members are advised that the first votes of the week are expected mid-afternoon on Tuesday.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

Last votes of the week are still to be determined, but Members are encouraged to keep their schedules flexible as we approach the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow. Included will be a bill to make urgent and necessary changes to the Visa Waiver Program.

H.R. 158, sponsored by Representative CANDICE MILLER, will close loopholes in the visa waiver system to prevent terrorists from exploiting the system to come to America to wreak havoc.

The House has identified a host of recommendations to improve the visa waiver system in a bipartisan way. I do want to thank the gentleman for his work and cooperation on this critical bill.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 2130, the Red River Private Property Protection Act, sponsored by Representative MAC THORNBERRY, which will provide legal certainty to property owners in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the House may also consider the conference report to H.R. 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, as well as a bill to extend certain provisions of the Tax Code.

Additionally, it is possible that the House will consider an omnibus appropriations act.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House may also consider budget reconciliation, if the Senate acts on that measure.

□ 1330

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

I want to also thank him for the work that he has done on the Visa Waiver Program. His staff and my staff and the staff on Homeland Security on both sides of the aisle and the staff on the Judiciary Committee on both sides of the aisle, including the leaders on both sides, have worked very hard.

I think we have come up with a bipartisan effort to keep America safer while at the same time providing for access to people who do not pose a threat to America or to Americans.

I thank him for his leadership on that. I am pleased to have had the opportunity to work with him, and I look forward to the bill's passing with big majorities next week. So I thank him for that.

Mr. Leader, there is indication that the appropriation bills, or the omnibus, as we are now calling it, will come to the floor. Can the leader tell me whether or not we are making any progress on riders?

Obviously, as I understand it, essentially, we have agreement on the allocation of the dollars, which of course is the responsibility of the Appropriations Committee, and that is what they do.

Clearly, we seem to be having difficulty with the so-called riders—that is, additions to the appropriations bill—which accomplish legislative objectives either through a ''none of the funds'' provision or a legislative provision which would require a waiver.

Does the gentleman know whether or not we are making progress on eliminating riders that are controversial so that we can move the bill in a bipartisan fashion next week?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, negotiations are ongoing. The appropriators are working hard in trying to wrap up the bill, and I will advise the Members as soon as action is scheduled in the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that.

Can I ask the gentleman again in terms of the timing of the omnibus. The existing CR, which is funding the government at the present time, expires as of midnight on the 11th. Does the gentleman have any insight as to the scheduling of the omnibus?

Presumably, we will have to pass it and give enough time for the Senate to consider it and then for the President to sign it.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, wrapping up legislative business in December is always unpredictable. In knowing that the omni is a larger bill, we want to allow plenty of time for Members to be able to see it and read it, but it is our intention to get it done by the deadline.

If we have to move it a few days later, we shall. We are scheduled to be here until the 18th, but we will get our business done.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I understand that we are here until the 18th. Does the gentleman contemplate the possibility of a short-term CR from the 11th to the 18th at any point in time?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Only if necessary. I would rather get it done by the 11th.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and I certainly share his view on that. It will be better for the country and better for the House if we do that.

The gentleman also referenced tax extenders. Obviously, we have tax extenders that expired in December of 2014, which have not been extended. Does the gentleman have any knowledge as to whether or not we have reached an agreement on a tax extender bill and, if so, the substance of that and when it might be scheduled?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, this side of the aisle did not want to wait on tax extenders, and many times we have passed the bills here to make them permanent.

There are ongoing negotiations. There is good movement, and I hope to see that done very soon. When it is, I will advise the Members of the action to be taking place.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Let me just observe to the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, that I have great reservations. I want to let the gentleman know that, on this side of the aisle, I think we have great reservations about doing in this short time that we have left any kind of comprehensive tax extender bill, which will adversely impact the possibility of tax reform, which all of us have said we want.

But if we make a major effort on taxes now, particularly making many, many items permanent, some of which I support making permanent, it will have an adverse effect on the ability to do a big tax reform bill, bring corporate rates down, look at preference items, and try to make sure that we have a fiscally responsible piece of legislation.

So I would hope that there is an alternative, obviously, and that is a short-term bill that the Senate has passed and that that would be part of the discussions as a fallback.

I don't know that I am for a larger bill that I have heard about, but I would hope, certainly, that the alternative that the Senate has passed would be an alternative if, in fact, we cannot get agreement on a bigger package so that we will have, at least for last year and the year to come, some certainty with respect to tax consequences of certain actions that private businesses may be taking.

I yield to my friend if he has any comment.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman.

As the gentleman knows, at times, we have philosophical differences. I think the greater certainty we can give to the American public, the more they can keep in their pockets and the stronger the economy is. I do not believe that if we solve tax extenders that that harms us in any way in getting overall tax reform.

But I do look forward to working with you on overall tax reform, and hopefully we can work in the same manner that we were able to on the Visa Waiver Program.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

As I said on the floor a little earlier today, this was a good week. We passed

an education bill in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion. Just a few minutes ago, we passed an infrastructure-highway transportation bill with overwhelming bipartisan support.

I hope America feels good about what we have been able to do this week, and I hope America and I and others can feel good about what we will do next week.

Unless the gentleman has any further comments, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2015, TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, December 7, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SHIRLEY JOHNSON

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Texas skies were not as big and they weren't as bright. We lost Shirley Johnson, the wife of our hero and our colleague, SAM JOHNSON.

They were high school sweethearts and were married for over 65 years. The entire 8 years that SAM was being tortured in Hanoi, Shirley kept a seat at the family dinner table for SAM. She knew SAM would come home.

SAM came home broken and battered. He worried, how would his family react to the new SAM? As you can see, SAM had nothing to worry about. Led by Shirley, he was swarmed with love back home in Texas.

Shirley is now among the heavens, and those Texas skies tonight will be as bright and big as ever.

God bless Shirley Johnson.

NEW MEXICO'S EDUCATION SYSTEM

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw attention to the concerns and frustrations among parents, educators, business leaders, and so many others in my home State of New Mexico.

Today, I voted in favor of the Every Student Succeeds Act because I believe this legislation is better, quite frankly, than the status quo, and it will work to improve our education system.

However, we cannot forget that many of New Mexico's schools are in trouble. These troubled schools stem from a lack of leadership at both the Federal and State levels.

Unfortunately, the U.S. Department of Education has not held New Mexico's leadership accountable for this failure. In fact, the Federal Government has enabled our States, including New Mexico, to put special interests ahead of student success.

That is why Education Week ranked New Mexico as 49th out of 51, with a D-plus in preparing kids for college and a D-minus in K–12 achievement.

This lack of accountability at the State and Federal levels is harming a generation of New Mexico students. New Mexicans deserve far better. It is time we had leaders who take responsibility for improving our schools and that hold each other accountable when their actions are failing students.

While the ESEA moves beyond the status quo, more needs to be done to help our students. I hope we will work together to do that.

JAMES ZADROGA 9/11 HEALTH AND COMPENSATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the House to bring the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Reauthorization Act to a vote before the end of the year.

On September 11, 2001, my wife and I were stationed at Fort Hood, Texas, celebrating the birth of our first son, Tommy. We watched in horror the attacks on the World Trade Center and on the Pentagon. Like many of you, we will never forget the brave efforts of the men and women who served as first responders on that tragic morning.

Today, Tommy is 14 years old, and my children have grown up in a post-9/11 America. They will never know what America was like before those attacks, but they have been taught to look with pride at the heroes who risked their lives to help others.

With that same pride, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support a bill that protects the benefits of those first responders.

How often do we as politicians show up at 9/11 memorials to honor the first responders? How often do we talk about the heroes who rushed into those falling buildings when everybody else was running out?

Now is our chance to do our part and give the men and women we call heroes the benefits they deserve. I encourage all of you to support the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Reauthorization Act and bring it to a vote before the end of the year.

GUNS

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, over a month ago, I stood in this Chamber and delivered a message from San Diegans who were calling on Congress to expand background checks for gun purchases. Since then, Congress has done nothing.

Last week, a gunman attacked a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado Springs. What did Congress do? Nothing.

Yesterday, there were deadly shootings in Houston, Savannah, and, in San Bernardino, 14 people were killed at a social services center.

Today, here we stand in the only building in the Nation that could do something to curb this awful violence, and we cannot even get the Speaker of this House to let Congress vote to let us act on one of the several proposed laws that many of my colleagues and I support.

Thoughts and prayers are not enough. Moments of silence are not enough. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, instead of a moment of silence, the American people could get a moment of action—a moment of action that might keep their communities from being next.

If we want to honor these victims and their families, then we should do our jobs, and we should act now.

FAIR BURDENS ACT

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, the mass production of cheap, reliable energy has powered the greatest expansion of wealth and opportunity in human history. It has resulted in higher living standards and improved health in the United States and around the globe.

Notwithstanding this too often ignored reality, the President wants to commit the United States to even more stringent, anti-energy regulations than those currently in place. The President's Clean Power Plan alone is expected to increase our energy prices by nearly $300 billion over the next 15 years and reduce annual job creation by over 200,000.

According to the EPA's only models, the impact of all of these rules on global temperature increases will be near zero.

The United States cannot effect change alone. China, the world's largest polluter, and other top emitters of global CO_2 emissions need to come to the table too.

That is why, today, I introduced the Fighting Against Imbalanced Regulatory Burdens Act, or H.R. 4169. This bill will prevent the EPA from imposing any restrictions on CO_2 emissions from power plants unless countries responsible for 80 percent of non-U.S. emissions have enacted similarly stringent policies.

I encourage my colleagues to support me in this effort.

□ 1345

REMEMBERING MRS. BETTY FISCHER

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of longtime Tarrant County Democratic leader, Ms. Betty Fischer.

In 1950, Ms. Fischer and her husband moved to Arlington, Texas, with their three children. Eight years later, she completely dedicated herself to Tarrant County Democratic politics. She served as a party volunteer. She was also the first woman chair of the party in 1982. She helped get one of our former Congressmen, Martin Frost, elected to office back during that time period. She was just a great person.

I can tell you that, in addition to her work for the Tarrant County Democratic Party and all her Democratic efforts, that she and her husband were also involved in the labor movement. She strongly believed that every man and woman in Tarrant County deserved the right to be able to take care of their family and make a decent living for them.

In short, Ms. Betty Fischer did it all. There are very few left like her today. We were blessed to have her in Tarrant County. I am glad that our time on this Earth overlapped with each other, and I just wish her family all the best during this time period as they cope with their recent loss.

ACCESS TO GUNS

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday two terrorists murdered 14 people in a gun-free zone in San Bernardino, California, and my heart certainly goes out to the residents of San Bernardino, all of California, and all of this country.

The President's response today, after revelations that these people had been radicalized and had traveled to the Middle East recently was that he felt they had ''mixed motives.'' His solution to this is to propose restrictions for law-abiding citizens' access to guns.

I have two questions for the American public:

One, do you believe that further restricting law-abiding citizens' access to guns would have solved this tragedy?

Two, do you believe that this is the last time we will see radical Islamic terrorism on our shores?

HONORING PARKER WESTBROOK

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of one of Arkansas' great leaders, my friend, Parker Westbrook, who passed away last month at the age of 89.

Parker and his vast love for historic preservation will be missed in Arkansas and throughout our country. Throughout his life, he was at the forefront of preserving Arkansas' history, earning the nickname, ''Arkansas's father of State preservation.''

Parker received numerous awards for his work, including the Preservation Honor Award from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and was acknowledged as a national treasure.

For over 20 years, Parker and I worked together on the Historic Arkansas Museum, passionately expanding its exceptional museum and collections of Arkansas-made art, furniture, and mechanical arts. I will miss his encyclopedic knowledge of all things Arkansas.

I extend my warmest regards to and prayers for Parker's many friends and loved ones. Parker Westbrook's name will forever be preserved in our State and national history.

HONORING DARRELL ALLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Darrell Allen of Garland, Texas, who passed away on November 10, 2015, as a result of wounds received while he was serving his community.

Darrell Allen was chief of police for the city of Marlin. He selflessly served his community, and he will be greatly missed.

Darrell was born January 17, 1972, in Galveston, Texas. He graduated from Texas City High School and went on to obtain an associate's degree in criminal justice from McLennan Community College in Waco, Texas. In his pursuit to better serve his community, Darrell returned to school and received his bachelor in criminal justice in May of this year.

Since he was a child, Darrell dreamed of becoming a police officer. He began his career in law enforcement in 1994 with the Galveston County Sheriff's Department. Darrell's distinguished career also included service with the Alvin Independent School District, the Hitchcock Police Department, the Danbury Police Department, the Arcola Police Department, the Harris County Precinct 6 Constable's Office, and chief of police at the Lott Police Department.

In 2005, Darrell joined the City of Marlin Police Department, where he proceeded to climb through the department ranks. He was promoted to assistant chief of police in 2006 and elevated to chief of police in 2009.

As Marlin's chief of police, Darrell focused his efforts on building police community relations and increasing juvenile safety. He consistently drove down the community's crime rate. Today Marlin is one of the safest communities in America. His efforts garnered recognition for the Marlin Police Department from the Texas Police Chief Association's Foundation for Law Enforcement Agency Best Practices Programs.

Darrell worked tirelessly to better our central Texas community. He loved his city, and he left an enduring impression on those he served. This is evident from the scores of residents who gathered together recently in memory of their fallen chief. He will forever be remembered for his devotion to public service, as a father to his children, and as a friend to countless Marlin citizens.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Allen family. We also lift up the family and friends of Darrell Allen in our prayers.

As I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country, for our military men and women who protect us abroad, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

Honoring Diana R. Garland

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Diana R. Garland of Waco, Texas, who passed away on September 21, 2015.

Diana Garland was a teacher, dean, and a valued leader in the Baylor University community. She led a full life and will be greatly missed in our community.

Diana was born on August 18, 1950, in Oklahoma City. She earned her undergraduate, master's, and doctoral degrees from the University of Louisville. After completing her degree, she went on to serve as professor of Christian family ministry and social work at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville.

In 1997, Diana and her husband, David, moved to Waco and joined the faculty at Baylor University. One year later, Diana was named the director of the university's Center and Community Ministries. Under her leadership, Baylor University expanded its social work program. Later when the university created the School of Social Work, she was appointed its founding dean.

During the following decade, Diana oversaw the school's rise to national recognition. Under her guidance, the School of Social Work grew to 20 full-time faculty members and 240 graduate and undergraduate students. During her tenure, she helped raise more than $7 million for research and established an endowment of $14.5 million.

In 2010, Diana administered the school's move to downtown Waco. This move allowed the school to triple its teaching and lab space. To commemorate her achievements as the school's dean, the Board of Regents recently voted to name the university's School of Social Work in her honor.

In addition to her teaching duties, Diana was the author, coauthor, and editor of 21 books and more than 100

academic articles. Her literary works included: ''Flawed Families of the Bible: How God's Grace Works Through Imperfect Relationships''; ''Inside Out Families: Living the Faith Together''; and ''Why I Am a Social Worker: 25 Christians Tell Their Life Stories.''

Diana was also the first lady of Baylor University while her husband, David Garland, served as the interim president from 2008 to 2010.

Diana stepped down as dean on June 1 of this year due to her battle with cancer. She enjoyed the last few months of her life taking in God's beauty in Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, Diana Garland left a strong legacy at Baylor University and touched the lives of many. She will be forever remembered as a cherished mentor, a loving wife, and a visionary servant leader.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Garland family. We also lift up the family and friends of Diana Garland in our prayers.

As I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us abroad, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

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

EXCESSIVE USE OF FORCE BY POLICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address this esteemed House of Representatives on an issue that is facing the American people, an issue that is facing our great Nation from coast to coast. This is the issue of wanton, senseless murders of unarmed young Black men and women throughout this Nation.

This past year, Mr. Speaker, we have all seen on the many news platforms all across this Nation—the morning news, the noon news, the evening news—all have been punctuated with videotapes of unarmed Black men mostly, Hispanic men, men and women, boys and girls, teenagers, being shot down in cold blood by just a few—I want to emphasize ''a few''—rogue cops that hunt our Nation's cities, that hide behind a badge and a gun. These rogue police officers operate not to serve and protect, but to commit murder and mayhem and use their badge, their official status to get away with it.

□ 1400

This popular television show, ''How to Get Away With Murder,'' could use many departments all across this Nation as a formula, indeed as the plot of ''How to Get Away With Murder.''

I bear witness that this has been going on, these murders—wanton, senseless, lawless murders—have been going on in this Nation for far too long.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, at this same time I stood before the Members of this body sharing with the Members of Congress the life and the murder of my best friends in Chicago, Fred Hampton and Mark Clark. They were both members of the Illinois chapter of the Black Panther Party.

They were young men full of leadership abilities, young men who were committed to serving their neighbor, young men who were committed to try to uplift the African American community and similarly situated communities all across this Nation.

At this very time last year, I talked about December 4, 1969, the day that Fred Hampton and Mark Clark were killed by the Chicago Police Department and the State's Attorney's police department in my city of Chicago. They were shot.

Our pathologists indicated that, at the time that the police raided their apartment, Fred Hampton lay sleeping in his bed, that he had been drugged with a drug called Seconal, and that Fred had in his body at the time of his murder enough Seconal to immobilize an elephant. That is what the science and our pathologists indicated to us.

On December 4, 1969, at 4 o'clock in the morning, members of the Chicago Police Department sneaked into the streets on the west side of the city of Chicago in utility trucks, trucks that had been decorated with the signage of the local gas company, and came in with murder in their hearts. They knocked on the door of the apartment.

Mark Clark answered: ''Who is it?''

The police at the front door said: ''Tommy.''

Mark said: ''Tommy who?''

The police at the front answered: ''Tommy Gun, Tommy Gun.''

At that time, after kicking the door down, they came in shooting with a machine gun and other automatic weapons, aiming to kill everybody in that apartment.

After the first shot was fired in the front door, then that was a signal to those who were gathered in the rear, and they came bursting in, firing. Ninety-nine shots all total went into that apartment.

A Federal grand jury indicated after the investigations were concluded that possibly only one shot exited that apartment. One shot fired out and 99 fired in. Cold-blooded murder 46 years ago.

Fast-forward to today. All across this Nation cops are killing citizens, cold blooded, without any justification, and getting away with it. It is not only in Chicago, but all across this Nation, all across America.

Dontre Hamilton was a 31-year-old African American male killed by the Milwaukee Police Department in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, on April 30, 2014, just a little over a year ago.

Eric Garner, an unarmed 43-year-old father, was killed by the New York City Police Department on July 17, 2014, a little over a year ago.

On August 9, 2014, Michael Brown, an 18-year-old unarmed teenager, was killed by the Ferguson, Missouri, police department, a little over a year ago.

A little over a year ago, Mr. Speaker, Ezell Ford, an unarmed 25-year-old mentally ill man, was killed by the Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles, California, August 11, 2014, a little over a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, Laquan McDonald, a 17-year-old teenager, was killed by a member of the Chicago Police Department on October 20, 2014, a little over a year ago.

A little over a year ago, Mr. Speaker, in Cleveland, Ohio, Tamir Rice, a 12-year-old boy, was killed by the Cleveland Police Department on November 22, 2014.

In the State of my birth, in DeKalb County, Georgia, Anthony Hill, a 27-year-old unarmed Air Force veteran, was killed by the DeKalb County Police Department on March 6, 2015, less than a year ago.

Less than a year ago, Nicholas Thomas, a 23-year-old unarmed Black man, again in my birth State of Georgia, in Smyrna, Georgia, was killed by the Smyrna Police Department on March 24, 2015, less than a year ago.

Less than a year ago, Mr. Speaker, Freddie Gray, a 25-year-old Black man, while in custody of the Baltimore Police Department in Baltimore, Maryland, was killed on April 12, 2015, less than a year ago.

We all remember Sandra Bland, a 28-year-old woman who was found hanging in a jail cell in Waller County, Texas, on July 13, 2015, less than a year ago.

The list goes on, Mr. Speaker.

November 16, 2015, Jamar Clark, a 24-year-old unarmed Black man, was killed by a member of the Minneapolis Police Department, less than a month ago.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many others. In my city, a few years back, about 3 years ago, Rekia Boyd was killed by a police officer who was out of uniform, firing over his shoulder and striking Rekia Boyd in her head, killing her.

The now-terminated ex-police superintendent of the Chicago Police Department, Garry McCarthy, at the time of Rekia Boyd's murder had the unmitigated gall to stand before the citizens of Chicago and say that this unarmed, young Black woman who was killed was the target, that the police officer aimed at the person who he killed.

□ 1415

This statement has been repudiated so many, many times. He fired over his shoulder into a crowd of people.

There is a conspiracy in our police departments, a cancer in our police departments, all across our very Nation. State by State, urban area by urban

area, large cities and small cities, young Black men and young Black women are targets, fair game, for some who are wearing a badge and a gun and hiding behind a uniform and a vow that they don't believe in and that doesn't govern their lives and their official and unofficial duty.

They don't believe in serving and protecting. They believe in: How can we commit murder and get away with it? How can we murder those who don't look like us, murder those who we stereotypically view as criminals and thugs? We have a right because we wear a badge. We have a gun and we have a uniform to hide behind. We have an unmitigated right to shoot them down at will.

There are laws in this Nation that protect even wild animals from being killed.

In Chicago, Illinois, my city, there are only about 30 officers who have in excess of 10 citizen complaints against them. This police officer who was just indicted for the first time in the history of our city—only one police officer indicted for the murder of an unarmed Black man in Chicago—had 18 citizen complaints against him—18—mostly for excessive use of force.

Why was he even on the street? Why was he wearing a uniform? Why were our tax dollars being used to pay for his livelihood when he had no appreciation for the lives and the rights of American citizens 18 times?

He shot Laquan McDonald while Laquan was walking away from him. That is what the video showed. Laquan McDonald wasn't even within 20 feet of this police officer, now ex-police officer.

But he shot him 16 times, 15 times when Laquan McDonald was on the ground. He couldn't have threatened him at all. He fired 16 rounds, 15 of them while Laquan McDonald was on the ground. He fired 16 rounds in 15 seconds.

Forty-six years later we have these kinds of police atrocities occurring throughout the Nation. It is up to this body, Mr. Speaker, this Congress, to finally stand up and protect all of the people of this great Nation from these rogue cops who are roaming to and fro in our communities mercilessly, wantonly murdering our citizens, mostly Black and Latino young men and young women.

Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing in a matter of days a resolution to establish a permanent select committee on the excessive use of force by America's police departments, a permanent and select committee on excessive use of force by America's—yours and mine, the Members of this body—police departments.

Mr. Speaker, if we can have a select committee on Planned Parenthood and women's health, we can have a select committee on excessive use of force by America's police departments.

This select committee will be authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study and to issue a report and recommendations of its findings to the House of Representatives regarding each of the following:

Number one, a uniform definition of excessive use of force;

Number two, create national guidelines on excessive use of force;

Number three, collect accurate and reliable data on police shootings and use of excessive force, both lethal and nonlethal;

Number four, implement and create a national database to make available public data of citizen complaints filed against police officers and departments;

Number five, include demographic data on police officers involved in shootings in the Uniform Crime Reporting Program;

Number six, require mandatory FBI reporting of police departments on the number of justifiable homicides committed by those departments;

Number seven, create effective training methods and mental counseling of police officers to increase their understanding of the word ''threat'' and weed out any indication of racial animus and hostility;

Number eight, create adequate training for police officers dealing with mentally ill persons.

Yes, we have mentally ill patients and police do not know how to deal with them. Under this resolution, this select committee will require training for our Nation's police to deal with mentally ill patients.

Number nine, require transparency of internal police discipline and police accountability;

Number ten, report to this Congress on the rising cost of lawsuits and settlements that are indicative of problematic policing and civil rights violations and civil rights abuses.

This is the resolution that I will be introducing over the next few days, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude by repeating something that I said last year, and I intend to repeat this throughout the remaining days of my life.

□ 1430

The murders, the political assassinations, the cold-blooded murders of Fred Hampton and Mark Clark on December 4, 1969, will not be in vain.

The murders of American citizens, particularly young, unarmed African American boys and girls, Hispanic American boys and girls, other minorities, unarmed mentally ill Americans, unarmed White Americans, these murders by America's police agencies must come to a screeching halt. Justice demands it. This Congress ought to promote it.

This Congress, this esteemed body, ought to protect all of our citizens. We have to show and demonstrate, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that just because you have a badge, you wear a badge, just because you are dressed in a uniform, just because you have a gun, with a license to arrest and detain, just because you have those assets, those powers, you do not have a right, the authority, the power to commit cold-blooded murder. And don't believe, not for 1 millisecond, that you will continue to get away with it.

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

JUST ANOTHER DAY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today, like so many Americans, we are in utter disbelief that our country is once again left reeling after yet another horrific massacre of innocent Americans. There is grave concern that this has become the norm.

In fact, this is how the BBC characterized the shootings in California yesterday:

> Just another day in the United States of America—another day of gunfire, panic, and fear. This time in California.

But it could have been, as it was last week, in Colorado, or in Arizona, or Oregon, or South Carolina, or Nevada, or Wisconsin, or D.C., or in Georgia, where it also transpired.

In the capital city of Connecticut, in Hartford alone, there have been 28 deaths this year as a result of gun violence.

In 11 days, we will be passing and observing the third anniversary of the mass murder of schoolchildren and their teachers at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut.

In the 3 years since that tragic day in 2012, when many thought, ''Well now, finally now, this innocence, this slaughter of innocent children, surely there will be change. Surely the United States Congress will take a vote. Surely Congress will respond. They will take a vote. They will take action,'' but as we did then, we will do next week. We will stand in silence, a respectful and heartfelt silence, for victims of what happened in California and Georgia just yesterday. It is something this Congress repeats in such a way that the BBC characterizes it as just another day in America.

In the 3 years since that tragic day in December, in fact, there have been an additional—additional—1,000 mass shootings in the United States of America. One thousand mass shootings in the United States of America—that averages almost a mass shooting per day—and yet not a single vote, not a vote. Irrespective of where you stand on the issue, in the great Chamber

where the country looks to for leadership, not a single vote.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put up this chart that I think graphically displays what has been going on in this country to illustrate a point—a sad point, no matter how you view this chart.

Between 2001 and 2013, guns killed more people in the United States of America than AIDS, illegal drug overdoses, wars, and terrorism combined. Gun violence has taken more individuals than all these other tragedies and calamities combined.

Far more Americans have faced and, as the families of victims, they hear the remorse, they hear the platitudes, they observe the moments of silence and the laying of wreaths, but there is no action that comes from the United States Congress. These statistics should stagger anyone who reads them and compel Congress to take action, any action, to address this epidemic of gun violence.

Now, I say ''any action.'' Whether you believe, as I do, that we should have commonsense, universal background checks so that we keep guns out of the hands of criminals, the mentally ill, and terrorists on a watch list, this is common sense. This is what I believe the Nation should be doing, and I believe, frankly, so do a majority of people in this Chamber and throughout this country, but we have yet to take a vote. We have yet, though there are bills on the floor, though they are bipartisan. At least the Senate, in a bill sponsored by Senator JOE MANCHIN, Senator PAT TOOMEY, put forward a reasonable proposition.

Whether you believe that it is a panacea or not or that it will somehow help, or maybe not, aren't the citizens of this country, aren't the families of the victims entitled to a vote? What do we owe our constituents if not a vote?

If the United States Congress continues to remain silent, as it has, I submit, we are complicit in these deaths every time we remain silent and every time we take no action.

It doesn't take a lot of courage, frankly, to vote. We are protected in this building by police. We are surrounded by armed guards. There is nothing that threatens any Member of Congress from doing his constitutional responsibility to vote.

What takes courage is what Officer Garrett Swasey did just last week, giving his life in the line of duty, defending and protecting people under siege.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, do you want to talk about terrorist threats? There is real terrorism happening in America every day: more than 1,000 mass shootings since Sandy Hook, deaths on our streets due to gun violence.

We could rush in a matter of days to this floor when an outrage occurred in Paris, rush to this floor in days with legislation to deal with refugees, and yet, in our own country, in our own cities across this Nation and throughout our States, can we not have a vote in Congress?

I recognize and respect the fact that people will disagree and perhaps think that background checks are not necessary or won't solve the problem. Maybe that is true. I don't believe so. But aren't we entitled to a vote? Aren't those victims of those families entitled to a vote? Do their voices mean anything?

If the vote fails, the body will have spoken, and if the vote succeeds, this body will have spoken also and will have an opportunity to see its results and observe it.

Mr. Speaker, that is how this great body works. To be denied the opportunity to vote only, in my mind, makes us further complicit to the tragedies that are happening all across this country.

Another day in America, another day of gunfire, panic, and fear. How about a day where Congress actually votes, where Members actually stand up and are accountable for what they say they believe in so no matter how you feel on this issue—and I truly respect people who disagree with me.

But I would like to have the opportunity to vote the conscience of my constituency and the beliefs that I deeply hold. It would seem to me that, in this day and age, in this body, we ought to be able to do that.

I recognize that there are probably not many people listening to my remarks right now, and I realize that Americans are incredibly frustrated with the United States Congress in general because of its inaction on so many levels.

But I urge anyone who is listening across America, whether you are opposed to universal background checks or you are in favor of them, to call their Representatives and demand of them before they go home to enjoy the Christmas holidays, before we adjourn, that we take a vote on this issue. Demand that we show you where we stand on commonsense background checks.

If you really believe in your position, what is there to hide from? We need to take a vote. Americans need to know where we stand. This isn't a profile in courage; this is our responsibility.

This issue has been looked at, it has been studied, and it has supporters on both sides. There is a discharge petition on the floor, but, frankly, this bill ought to be brought to the floor and voted on.

It should be voted on in the Senate Chamber. It is my understanding that HARRY REID will include it as an amendment. The Senate then will have voted twice, and the House remains silent. We need to vote.

In this body, in this great Chamber, I would much rather be known by the votes I have taken than the speeches I have made, the press releases that have gone out, and the 30-second sound bites that will follow. I would like to be known, as I believe all Members of this body would, for the votes I have taken standing up on behalf of my constituents.

Above the podium of the Speaker, there is a famous quote from Daniel Webster, and I paraphrase that quote. Webster asked aloud of all Members of this body whether, in our day and generation, we will perform something for which we will be remembered. I ask this body for a vote for which we will be remembered.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

SELF-DEFENSE ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it was 2 years ago this week that a precious life was cut short tragically. Kari Renee Hunt, a resident of Marshall, Texas, was murdered by her estranged husband in a hotel.

They were in the hotel room. While the estranged husband was assaulting Kari, her 9-year-old daughter, while witnessing the murder, did what most parents teach their kids to do in an emergency. She dialed 911—and got nothing.

Because what this precious 9-year-old—and the family hasn't used her name publicly, so I will not either—what the precious girl didn't know is what a lot of folks dialing 911 in that situation wouldn't know, that you have to dial 9 before you can dial 911. In order to dial the 911, you need to dial the 9 prefix in order to get an outside line.

Mr. Speaker, she didn't know that. She was desperately trying to get help to save her mother before the assault turned into murder. She never got help, not in time.

Kari's father, Hank Hunt, has worked tirelessly to try to get something done. The State legislature in Texas has enacted a law, but from the Federal Government end, we can make it universal across the country.

I do thank my friend Kevin Eltife for his work in the State legislature.

Mr. Speaker, our bill is a little different. I was surprised to find out that, actually, most of the time, there is no cost whatsoever to requiring that a phone be furnished to a business or a home or anywhere where there might be a need to punch 9 to get an outside line—there is no cost to having a default that you can dial 911 without the prefix, and it will go straight to the emergency help.

Once I learned that, it became clear there was no reason not to have a law that just tells providers, provide the phone so that the default when you dial 911 is to get emergency help, that

you don't need a prefix to get an outside line.

So, today, after a lot of help—again, I am thankful to Hank Hunt for his tireless work—a number of groups have made this easier to come together on language that was acceptable to most. There were a couple of objections, but this is the final language.

So I want to thank Mark Fletcher with AH&LA, the American Hotel & Lodging Association; FCC Commissioner Pai; and the 911 Association.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we filed today is H.R. 4167, and, as it says in the bill, the purpose is to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require multiline telephone systems to have a default configuration that permits users to directly initiate a call to 911 without dialing an additional digit, code, prefix, or postfix. That is the purpose.

It is a short bill of three pages. If it had been the law 2 years ago, help would likely have gotten there before Kari's murder was final. So, while this legislation will not reverse the heartbreaking loss of Kari, Kari's law should prevent it from happening again. And when it doesn't cost anything, why not?

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of those who have helped, and, actually, I want to thank the news media in east Texas for being so helpful in bringing attention to this issue and helping us get to the point where we are.

Now we have to get through committee and get it to the floor. We have Senators, one in particular, looking at it to bring to the Senate floor so we can get this done and make it law.

There has been no veto threat on this bill, so I would doubt the President would refuse to sign it if we would just pass it.

Since the shootings in San Bernardino, I guess it shouldn't have been surprising that so many people would immediately call out for gun control even before they knew how Farouk—the defendants, the shooters, the evil shooters, acquired their guns.

It is interesting that I believe there were 13 bombs already made, a number of bombs already made. So if guns were completely outlawed in the United States, it wouldn't change the evil in the hearts of radical Islamists who are bent on terrorizing and killing people.

Mr. Speaker, it gets tiresome hearing people feel like they always have to say, ''All Muslims we know don't feel this way,'' yet they have no conviction and no compulsion, when they condemn Christians as being guilty of crusades, of saying, ''But we know all Christians don't feel this way.''

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the fact is I don't know whether that shooter in Colorado Springs was self-described as a Christian or not. He obviously was confused about his gender.

□ 1500

Maybe the next thing we will hear is that—since he apparently checked off—or it is reported that he had filed a registration where he indicated he was an unaffiliated female, perhaps the next we will be told is that maybe, if he had been allowed to go into the little girl's restroom in elementary school, he wouldn't have later snapped and did those merciless killings.

It has also been interesting—and, as a former prosecutor, a judge, also—I don't know if there is anybody else in this body of 435 representatives or anybody in the Senate—I don't know—who has ever been court-appointed to appeal a death penalty conviction as I was.

Even though I begged the judge not to appoint me, he did. And I do believe in our adversarial system to the point like John Adams said after the Boston Massacre, for our system to work, it requires adversaries on both sides doing the best they can legally and ethically.

When I got into it, it appeared clear he had not gotten a fair trial. I later convinced the highest court in Texas to reverse his capital murder conviction, which it did. I don't know how many others in this body or the Senate have appealed and reversed a capital murder conviction. People always think I am such a heartless guy, but I do believe in the rule of law and I do believe it should be followed.

I don't believe it helps the lawlessness that is breaking out across our land to have an administration that picks and chooses the laws that it likes to enforce and have an IRS that abuses their positions in the law, that has Homeland Security that deletes thousands of documents that would help us identify terrorists and then go after the guy that preserved them on his own classified IronKey.

He is a real hero, but he has now been forced out of Homeland Security. He resigned. But after they empanelled a grand jury to investigate him, became terrorists in the way that the government treated them, not with guns, but with the power of this administration.

I mean, with somebody as law-abiding as some of our whistleblowers have been only to find that this administration will come after you if you try to stand up for truth and integrity, can we not expect lawlessness to break out? John Adams wrote: This government was intended for the governing of a moral and religious people. It is not fit to govern any others.

I know the President and others keep saying there is nowhere in the world that has the frequency of shootings like this or mass murders like we do in the United States. But, as I have mentioned before, there was an article by Kyle Becker 4 months ago. He has a chart and says, if you don't compare apples and oranges, if you actually compare the number of rampage shooting fatalities to the number of people in the country, then Norway is first, 15.3 per million; 1.85 per million in Finland; 1.47 per million in Slovakia; 1.38 in Israel; .75 in Switzerland; and .72 per million in the United States.

The trouble is the loss of even one life is unnecessary, and appropriate steps should be taken to prevent them.

My friend John Lott has an article out today in National Review. He says—this is John Lott:

''On Sunday, Hillary Clinton slammed Republicans for not being serious about protecting Americans from terrorism. 'How many more Americans need to die before we take action?' Clinton asked in response to Friday's shooting at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado Springs. She believes that stopping such attacks involves 'common-sense steps like comprehensive background checks, closing the loopholes that let guns fall into the wrong hands.' Within minutes of the attack in San Bernardino, California, yesterday, Clinton pushed again for more regulations.

''Clinton also wants to crack down on terrorism by prohibiting people on the no-fly list from buying guns. 'If you are too dangerous to fly in America, you are too dangerous to buy a gun in America.' ''

And I will insert parenthetically that I have got one of the most patriotic friends I know who is a highly decorated general in the United States Army who lived just outside Marshall, Texas.

We have had a number of times tried to help the general, this patriotic freedom-loving American, who has put his life on the line repeatedly. We have had to repeatedly work to get his name off the no-fly list because, apparently, there is someone with a similar name. And whoever that person is, this patriot's name is on the list.

Well, John Lott goes on:

''Are Republicans really putting Americans in danger by opposing new gun-control laws?

''After every mass shooting, Clinton and President Obama have called for 'comprehensive' or 'universal' background checks, which would apply not only to the purchase of guns from a dealer, but also to private transfers of guns. However, it wouldn't have stopped any of the mass shootings during Obama's tenure. Last weekend, Clinton, Obama, and other Democrats issued their calls for new legislation before anyone even knew how the Colorado shooter had obtained his rifle.

''Colorado already had expanded background checks two years ago. So had Oregon before the Umpqua Community College shooting in October. France also has a background-check system. So too does California, which experienced yesterday's attack. Yet, while the existing laws didn't stop shootings of the very kind Clinton claims that they will stop, she uses these failures to justify imposing similar laws on the rest of the country.

''The American background-check system is supposed to prevent the purchase of a gun by anyone who has been convicted of a felony or certain misdemeanors. The Feinstein amendment would also ban the sale of guns to anyone who is on the terrorist watch list.

Now, being on the watch list sure sounds bad, but it doesn't mean that a person has been convicted of anything. In fact, it is pretty easy to get on the watch list; you can be on it simply because the FBI wants to interview you about someone you might know. According to the TechDirt website, about 40 percent of the people on the watch list are considered to be under 'reasonable suspicion' even though they have absolutely 'no affiliation with known terrorist groups.'

''The number of people on the list has grown dramatically during the Obama administration; by 2013, there were about 700,000 people on the list. As of 2014, about 50,000 people were on the no-fly list. This is a ten-fold increase since Obama became president.

''Between February 2004 and December 2014, over 2,000 people on the watch list bought one or more guns. The government has not identified a single one of these people as using a gun in a crime.

''Should the government be able to deny you the right to protect yourself simply because it wants to ask you about someone you might know? And that isn't the only problem posed by the proposed expanded background checks. In New York, today's background checks add about $80 to the cost of transferring a gun. In Washington State, they add about $60. In Washington, D.C., they add $200. In effect, these laws put a tax on guns and can prevent less affluent Americans from purchasing them. This disproportionately affects poor minorities who live in high-crime urban areas.

''While some people on 'no-fly' lists are there because they are suspected of terrorist activity, you can also get added because you are a suspect in a criminal case, made controversial statements or tweets unrelated to terrorism, are the victim of a clerical error, or refused to become a government informant.''

And I might add, last November, as I was leaving London, I had a security person tell me they realized I was a U.S. Congressman and, ''We are very sorry,'' but that our Homeland Security Department here in the United States said I was to be thoroughly personally searched along with my bags.

I don't know. Maybe they didn't like my questioning of the Secretary of Homeland Security and were threatened by my questions trying to get truth out of them.

''Between February 2004 and December 2014, over 2,000 people on the watch list bought one or more guns.'' It is pretty amazing there. But not one of them—not a single one of those people have been accused of using a gun in a crime.

So even if these people wanted this law to be changed, it would not have changed the outcome in Oregon, Colorado, or California. It seems as if my well-meaning friends proposing tougher and tougher laws to take away our Second Amendment rights mean well, but they are proposing things without even knowing whether they would save a single life. Certainly they will take away rights of law-abiding Americans, but they certainly would not have changed the outcome in Colorado or California.

''The error rate for identifying potential terror threats is probably similar to the error rate for background checks on gun purchases. Over 94 percent of 'initial denials' for gun purchases are dropped after just a preliminary review. These cases were dropped either because the wrong person had been stopped or because the covered offenses were decades old and the government decided not to prosecute. The total error rate comes to about 99 percent.

''Putting people on a list and prohibiting them from legally purchasing guns doesn't really stop them from getting weapons. The fact that people are prohibited from buying certain drugs doesn't mean people can't get them. It's the same with guns. And, incidentally, drug gangs supply both illegal drugs and illegal guns.

''Indeed, since Clinton wants to make a comparison to last week's Paris attacks, we should point out that France's strict weapon bans didn't stop the terrorists from getting the AK–47s and explosive belts they used in the attacks.

Strangely, the Oregon, Colorado, California, and Paris shootings are being used to push for additional gun-control laws of the sort that failed to prevent those attacks.''

That is John R. Lott, Jr., today writing.

When I proposed and filed Kari's Law today, I had to be sure that it would make a difference and that the added burden would not cause any extra effort, cost money, hardly ever, just something that needed to be done.

Kari's Law would be a great law for our country, whereas, the laws being hailed as something we must pass wouldn't have saved a single one of the lives that we will pause in silence and for whom most of us will pray.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, I know that Christians are being reviled. Certainly, in the Middle East, they are being beheaded. Here, in the United States, after leaders talked about praying for the victims' families, there have been belittling comments made.

But I look at the quote that Thomas Jefferson provided. It is inscribed in his memorial:

''God who gave us life gave us liberty. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God? that they are not to be violated but with His wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that His justice cannot sleep forever.''

Jefferson, on March 4, 1805, in his second inaugural, said:

''. . . I shall, need to the favor of that Being in whose hands we are, who led our forefathers, as Israel of old, from their native land and planted them in a country flowing with all the necessities and comforts of life.''

James Madison made many declarations and statements.

On July 23, 1813, in the National Day of Public Humiliation and Prayer Proclamation, James Madison, who is given credit for being the most prolific author in the Constitution, said:

''If the public homage of a people can ever be worthy of the favorable regard of the Holy and Omniscient Being to whom it is addressed, it must be that in which those who join in it are guided only by their free choice, by the impulse of their hearts, and the dictates of their consciences; and such a spectacle must be interesting to all Christian nations as proving that religion, that gift of Heaven for the good of man, freed from all coercive edicts, from that unhallowed connection with the powers of this world which corrupts religion . . . and making no appeal but to reason, to the heart, and to the conscience, can spread its benign influence everywhere and can attract to the divine altar those freewill offerings of humble supplication, thanksgiving, and praise, which alone can be acceptable to Him . . . ''

We have observed a time now in our country's history where we have gone from, not nine Supreme Court Justices—most of the time, it is just five—who have said, even though the Founders have been requiring every day to start with prayer since the beginning of the new Constitution, we don't think you should have prayer in public places.

That was a shocker. It would have been a shocker to the Founders since they started with prayer in the very beginning and have continued through to this day.

The Supreme Court goes on to say that they don't think you should talk about Jesus. You can talk about Mohammed, and you can talk all about Islam, but you can't talk about Jesus Christ. We have even had Federal judges say you can't mention the name ''God'' in your graduation ceremony. Our judicial system has a small group of judges who has run amuck, who has lost its way, and it has taken the country with them.

Abraham Lincoln said:

''It is the duty of nations as well as of men, to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God, to confess their sins and transgressions, in humble sorrow, yet with assured hope that genuine repentance will lead to mercy and pardon; and to recognize the sublime truth, announced in the Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord.''

It is remarkable that this is 2 years and 40-something days before his assassination.

Abraham Lincoln, with people dying all over the country, put this in print

in his National Day of Humiliation, Fasting and Prayer Proclamation.

Abraham Lincoln said:

''We have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.

''It behooves us then to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness.''

I will just share one more, Mr. Speaker.

William Howard Taft is the only man in U.S. history to have been President and Chief Justice—or any Justice—on the Supreme Court.

In 1908, William Howard Taft said:

''No man can study the movement of modern civilization from an impartial standpoint and not realize that Christianity and the spread of Christianity are the only basis for the hope of modern civilization and the growth of popular self-government. The spirit of Christianity is pure democracy. It is the equality of man before God, the equality of man before the law, which is, as I understand it, the most godlike manifestation that man has been able to make.''

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a medical appointment.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 7, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3630. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter reporting a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Navy case number 14-01, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258, Sec. 1351; (96 Stat. 926); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3631. A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's report on the impact of the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009 on the consumer credit card market, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1616(d); Public Law 111-24, Sec. 502(d); (123 Stat. 1756); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3632. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Changes to Accounting Requirements for the Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) Program [Docket No.: FR 5797-I-01] (RIN: 2506-AC39) received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3633. A letter from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2014 Annual Report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 78ggg(c)(2); Public Law 91-598, Sec. 7(c)(2); (84 Stat. 1652); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3634. A letter from the Program Analyst, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — List of Nonconforming Vehicles Decided to be Eligible for Importation [Docket No.: NHTSA-2015-0087] received December 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3635. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's eleventh annual report on Ethanol Market Concentration, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(10)(B); Public Law 90-148, Sec. 1501(B) (as added by Public Law 109-58, Sec. 1501(a)); (119 Stat. 1074); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3636. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Cyber Security Event Notifications, Regulatory Guide 5.83, received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3637. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's Fiscal Year 2015 Agency Financial Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a); (104 Stat. 2849); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3638. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's semiannual report to Congress for the period from April 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3639. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's semiannual report to Congress covering the 6-month period that ended September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3640. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3641. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period ending September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3642. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the Authority's FY 2015 Performance and Accountability Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a); (104 Stat. 2849); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3643. A letter from the Chairman and Members, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the Authority's semiannual report for the period April 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3644. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2015, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a); (104 Stat. 2849); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3645. A letter from the Chairwoman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Fiscal Year 2015 Agency Financial Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a); (104 Stat. 2849); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3646. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Management Report to Congress for the period of April 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3647. A letter from the Labor Member and Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's semiannual report for the period April 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3648. A letter from the Chairwoman, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report for the period from April 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3649. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Amendment to List of Field Offices: Expansion of San Ysidro, California Port of Entry to include the Cross Border Xpress User Fee facility [CBP Dec.: 15-17] received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3650. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3620; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-029-AD; Amendment 39-18319; AD 2015-23-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3651. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3969; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-010-AD; Amendment 39-18318; AD 2015-23-

02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3652. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Martin Corporation/Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1425; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-185-AD; Amendment 39-18312; AD 2015-22-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3653. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0244; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-127-AD; Amendment 39-18313; AD 2015-22-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3654. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4211; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-150-AD; Amendment 39-18311; AD 2015-22-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3655. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0593; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-08-AD; Amendment 39-18254; AD 2015-17-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3656. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0649; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-132-AD; Amendment 39-18314; AD 2015-22-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3657. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0454; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-138-AD; Amendment 39-18298; AD 2015-21-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3658. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2461; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-202-AD; Amendment 39-18310; AD 2015-22-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3659. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Van Nuys, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1138; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-3] received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3660. A letter from the Ombudsman, FMCSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibiting Coercion of Commercial Motor Vehicle Drivers [Docket No. FMCSA-2012-0377] (RIN: 2126-AB57) received December 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3661. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA FAR Supplement: Safety and Health Measures and Mishap Reporting (RIN: 2700-AE16) received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); ; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 195. A bill to terminate the Election Assistance Commission (Rept. 114–361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 412. A bill to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns (Rept. 114–362, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3869. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require State and local coordination on cybersecurity with the national cybersecurity and communications integration center, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3106. A bill to authorize Department major medical facility construction projects for fiscal year 2015, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the administration of Department medical facility construction projects, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2915. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to identify mental health care and suicide prevention programs and metrics that are effective in treating women veterans as part of the evaluation of such programs by the Secretary; with an amendment (Rept. 114–365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1107. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to manage its infrastructure assets; with an amendment (Rept. 114–366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. S. 1580. An act to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates (Rept. 114–367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. S. 1629. An act to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DOLD (for himself and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 4165. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax incentive for the installation and maintenance of mechanical insulation property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARR (for himself and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 4166. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide specific credit risk retention requirements to certain qualifying collateralized loan obligations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. CULBERSON):

H.R. 4167. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require multi-line telephone systems to have a default configuration that permits users to directly initiate a call to 9-1-1 without dialing any additional digit, code, prefix, or post-fix, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIQUIN (for himself and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 4168. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Incentive Act of 1980 to require an annual review by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the annual government-business forum on capital formation that is held pursuant to such Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BARR, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 4169. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit any regulation under such Act concerning the emissions of carbon dioxide from a fossil fuel-fired electric generating unit from taking effect until the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency makes certain certifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4170. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to draft disclosures describing the rights and liabilities of customers of domestic care services and require that such services provide such disclosures to customers in any contract for such

services; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 4171. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the operation of certain aircraft not complying with stage 4 noise levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 4172. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify Federal law with respect to reporting certain positive consumer credit information to consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 4173. A bill to provide that an alien who has traveled to Iraq or Syria during the 5-year period prior to the alien's application for admission is ineligible to be admitted to the United States under the visa waiver program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Mr. ASHFORD):

H.R. 4174. A bill to establish a program that promotes reforms in workforce education and skill training for manufacturing in States and metropolitan areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Appropriations, 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. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for conservation expenditures to reduce groundwater consumption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 4176. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to limit the recovery of damages in a civil action related to the disclosure of certain personal information from State motor vehicle records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BUCK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JONES, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 4177. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit the acceptance by political committees of online contributions from certain unverified sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 4178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity tax credit and to allow small employers a credit against income tax for hiring individuals receiving unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. WELCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 4179. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations requiring material in the online public inspection file of a covered entity to be made available in a format that is machine-readable; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 4180. A bill to improve Federal agency financial and administrative controls and procedures to assess and mitigate fraud risks, and to improve Federal agencies' development and use of data analytics for the purpose of identifying, preventing, and responding to fraud, including improper payments; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 4181. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the incentives for the production of biodiesel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida (for himself and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida):

H.R. 4182. A bill to require the lender or servicer of a home mortgage, upon a request by the homeowner for a short sale, to make a prompt decision whether to allow the sale; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 4183. A bill to increase the penalties for fentanyl trafficking; 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. HIMES (for himself, Ms. ESTY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. POCAN):

H. Res. 548. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 12, 2016, as ''Darwin Day'' and recognizing the importance of science in the betterment of humanity; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. POCAN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESTY, Ms. MENG, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KIND, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. PINGREE, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BEYER, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H. Res. 549. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June 26 as ''LGBT Equality Day''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H. Res. 550. A resolution honoring the achievements of Berry Gordy, Jr. and the musical history he created through Motown Records; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 551. A resolution recognizing the importance of the United States-Israel economic relationship and encouraging new areas of cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H. Res. 552. A resolution expressing support for health and wellness coaches and ''National Health and Wellness Coach Recognition Week''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ZINKE (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MESSER, Mr. YODER, Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LONG, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SALMON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mrs. BLACK):

H. Res. 553. A resolution urging the President and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to submit to Congress the text of all side agreements entered into between the IAEA and Iran with respect to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DOLD:
H.R. 4165.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.
By Mr. BARR:
H.R. 4166.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mr. GOHMERT:
H.R. 4167.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, ''The Congress shall have Power . . . to regulate Commerce . . . among the several States.'' Telecommunication devices, such as a multi-line telephone system (MLTS), enable the interstate transmission of voice telephony communication. Additionally, MLTS devices enter the stream of commerce as part of an economic enterprise and affect interstate commerce in that they are bought, sold and transported across state lines, and under Article I, Section 8 Congress has the authority to regulate products in interstate Commerce. See also, U.S. v. Lopez, 514 U.S. 549 (1995).
In addition to Congress's power under the Commerce Clause, ''Congress shall [also] have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution'' its power to regulate Commerce among the several States. U.S. Constitution Article I, §8, clause 18.
By Mr. POLIQUIN:
H.R. 4168.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes:'' as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. ROTHFUS:
H.R. 4169.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1: All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives. Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 4170.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I; Section 8; Clauses 3 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. CROWLEY:
H.R. 4171.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have Power [. . .] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States . . .''
By Mr. ELLISON:
H.R. 4172.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.
By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 4173.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause
By Mr. CÁRDENAS:
H.R. 4174.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, 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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;
By Mr. CRAWFORD:
H.R. 4175.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution that states ''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. DEUTCH:
H.R. 4176.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. GOSAR:
H.R. 4177.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause
In 2011, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia held in Bluman v. FEC that ''It is fundamental to the definition of our national political community that foreign citizens do not have a constitutional right to participate in, and thus may be excluded from, activities of democratic self-government.'' Bluman specifically addressed and prohibited political campaign contributions to U.S. elections.
In 2012, the United States Supreme Court affirmed, holding that the prohibition in 2 U.S.C. 441 (e) on campaign contributions by any ''foreign national'' was narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling government interest.
Given that the Stop Foreign Donations Affecting Our Elections Act supplements the intent of these rulings and the 1966 law that banned such contributions, it is both within the scope of Congress's power and is thus constitutional.
By Mr. LOWENTHAL:
H.R. 4178.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States
By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:
H.R. 4179.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.
By Mr. MEADOWS:
H.R. 4180.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.
By Mrs. NOEM:
H.R. 4181.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;
By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:
H.R. 4182.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—The clause that states Congress has the power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''
By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:
H.R. 4183.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—The clause that states Congress has the power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 158: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PITTENGER, Ms. ESTY, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. STEWART, Mr. COOK, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 170: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 317: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 344: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 363: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 379: Mr. GIBSON and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 430: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 546: Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 592: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 721: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 746: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 921: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1076: Mr. HONDA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1197: Ms. GRAHAM and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1220: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 1288: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 1309: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1342: Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 1399: Mr. WELCH and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 1421: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1427: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1457: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1475: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1586: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1670: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 1671: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1728: Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1733: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1736: Mr. DOLD, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 1769: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1786: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 2058: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 2125: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2138: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2156: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 2228: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2293: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2302: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2342: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2382: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 2477: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 2493: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2612: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 2680: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2716: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2802: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2850: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2874: Mr. ISSA and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 2880: Mr. RUSH, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3036: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 3051: Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 3119: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3159: Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 3180: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3183: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 3222: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 3225: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 3268: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3314: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3323: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 3326: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 3437: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BARTON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 3455: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3497: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 3520: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 3551: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3565: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3667: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3706: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3713: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Ms. VELÁQUEZ, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 3721: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3734: Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 3760: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3785: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 3808: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3846: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 3852: Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 3880: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 3888: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 3917: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 3926: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 3940: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 3965: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 3986: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 3997: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 4014: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 4019: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 4032: Mr. CULBERSON and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 4040: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 4062: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4084: Mr. KNIGHT and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 4087: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 4109: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4113: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4122: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 4131: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. KIND, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 4153: Mr. HANNA.
H. J. Res. 11: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H. J. Res. 23: Mr. GRAYSON.
H. J. Res. 74: Mr. FORBES.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. HILL.
H. Con. Res. 98: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H. Res. 130: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H. Res. 220: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H. Res. 265: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H. Res. 343: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 393: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 419: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H. Res. 432: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. PETERS.
H. Res. 467: Mrs. TORRES, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H. Res. 523: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Res. 535: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H. Res. 536: Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H. Res. 544: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2015 No. 175

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our helper, as a tragic pattern of insane violence continues to bring pain to our Nation and world, we turn our eyes to You. Thank You that though evil seems undeniably strong, You continue to rule in Your universe. May we refuse to be intimidated by the adversaries of freedom, as we remember Your sacred words, ''There is no fear in love.''

Lord, lead our Senators with Your wisdom. As they focus on Your presence and power, shield their hearts with Your peace. When they seek Your guidance, direct their steps in the path of truth.

Give us all the sensitivity to comprehend the holy meaning and the sacred mysteries that reside in every moment. And, Lord, be near to all who are affected by the mass shooting in San Bernardino, CA.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I hope all Members of Congress—Democrats and Republicans, Members of the House and Senate—take a long, hard look this morning, maybe in the mirror, and ask themselves: Where do I stand?

Yet again our country is faced with another sickening act of gun violence. Yesterday's shooting rampage took the lives of 14 people and wounded at least 17 more, a number of those grievously injured. That wasn't the only shooting yesterday; a gunman in Georgia killed a woman and injured three others.

So where do we stand? We have an epidemic of gun violence in America, and it is nothing less than sickening.

Fort Hood, 13 dead; Tucson, 6 dead; Carson City, 4 dead; Aurora, 12 dead; Newtown, 20 little children, 6 educators; the Navy Yard in Washington, DC, 12 dead; Las Vegas, 3 dead, two of whom were police officers. And I have heard this talk: Oh, it is so unusual, a husband and wife. These three people killed in Las Vegas were killed by a husband-and-wife team. In Charleston, nine dead; Moneta, VA, two dead—on live television, he came to kill two people. At Umpqua Community College, nine dead; Colorado Springs, three dead.

That tragic list is nowhere close to being comprehensive. The one in Georgia yesterday—one dead, two wounded. It hardly made the press. But the ones I just mentioned are a few that we picked up earlier this morning in my office.

It would be very difficult to list all the mass killings that have taken place in recent years. Why? Because we are 337 days into 2015 and we have had at least 355 mass shootings—355 mass shootings in 337 days. We are averaging more than one a day.

Two months ago I came to the floor very sad. I was here mourning the murder of innocent community college students attending class in Roseburg, OR. I said then that each time our Nation endures one of these mass killings, we go through the same routine. First we are shocked. Then we ask questions about the killers, their motives, and how they got their hands on those guns. Then we wonder, what could we have done to prevent this terrible thing from happening?

As I said, the disturbing part is that we don't do anything. We don't do anything. We, as the legislative body of this country, do nothing. So I have a question for every Member of this body: How can we live with ourselves for failing to do the things that we know will reduce gun violence? Will it get rid of all of it? Of course not. But will it reduce it? Yes. We are complicit through our inaction, and if we continue to fail to act, we will be complicit today and every day into the future. We will keep ending up right where we are, mourning innocent victims in San Bernardino, CA, or Charleston or Newtown. When victims turn to us for leadership and help, we will have nothing to show but empty hands and a few empty gestures. It is despicable.

For far too long we have done nothing, even as the gun violence shakes our Nation to its core. We must do something. We can start by passing improved background check legislation. Is it asking too much that if someone is crazy or a criminal, they shouldn't be able to walk into any gun shop and buy a gun? Of course not. But that is the law in America.

I know the thought of upsetting the National Rifle Association scares everybody—oh, especially my Republican colleagues. Do you know what scares the American people? Gun violence. These mass shootings at holiday parties frighten the American people. Is it unreasonable that they are frightened?

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Of course not. People are afraid to go to a movie theater or to a concert.

The bill before the Senate today is to get rid of ObamaCare, and everybody knows it is just a gesture in futility. They have tried it 60 times or 48 times—I don't know; we lost track—in the House, and every time, the same answer: No. In the Senate, we have done it 14, 15 times—always the same answer. Einstein said the definition of ''insanity'' is when someone does the same thing over and over again knowing they are going to get the same result. So we are wasting our time today. Everyone knows the result.

But we have the opportunity to cast a vote here today—or we will shortly—because we are focused on doing something. People on this side of the aisle are focused on doing something to stop this gun violence, and we are going to force amendments to that end today—not many but a few. We will try to do something, anything.

Are we going to vote on expanded background checks? Shouldn't we do that at least? We are going to vote to prevent criminals convicted of harassing women's health clinics from buying a gun, owning a gun.

Senators will have to decide where they stand on these amendments. Do they stand with babies who were killed in Connecticut, families who want to do nothing more than go about their day without the daily threat of shootings? My friends in Nevada, two police officers in uniform sitting down to have a lunch break, and two people walk in behind them and shoot them in the back of the head and kill them. They went over to Walmart and killed another person.

People are afraid.

There was a time in my legislative career that I tried to work with the National Rifle Association, but the NRA today is a far cry from the sportsmen's organization I once supported. The NRA once called mandatory background checks ''reasonable.'' That is what they said; I am not making this up. But now its leadership and organization have transformed into a quasi-militant wing of the Republican Party. They are being pushed more and more into the camp of guns for everybody anytime they want them, and they are being pushed by the—they have a competitor now: Gun Owners of America.

Those who choose to do the NRA's bidding will be held accountable by our constituents. Their vote against these sensible measures will be a stain for all of the American people to see.

Something has to be done. We must take a stand. The American people are desperately looking for help—some help, any help. It will never be possible to prevent every shooting. We know that. But we have a responsibility to try. There are certain things we can do. If someone is mentally deranged and a criminal, should they be able to walk in and buy a gun anyplace? Of course not. We have a responsibility as lawmakers to enact commonsense reforms that have been proven to stop attacks and save lives. I hope Republicans will find the courage to join with us and pass meaningful legislation to prevent further gun violence.

I apologize for speaking before the Republican leader, but I was told he was going to be late.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

TRAGEDY IN SAN BERNARDINO

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the senseless loss of life in San Bernardino continues to defy explanation. We have faith that law enforcement will continue working hard to uncover the truth behind this tragedy. Today, what we should all agree upon is that we will keep the victims and the families in our thoughts, that we as a Senate offer condolences to them, and that we as a Senate recognize the continuing efforts of law enforcement officials and first responders.

OBAMACARE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, middle-class Americans continue to call on Washington to build a bridge away from ObamaCare. They want better care. They want real health reform. For too long, Democrats did everything to prevent Congress from passing the type of legislation necessary to help these Americans who are hurting.

Well, today, Mr. President, that ends. Today, a middle class that has suffered enough from a partisan law will see the Senate vote to build a bridge past ObamaCare and toward better care.

The Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act we are debating deserves the support of every Member of this body because here is what we know. ObamaCare is a direct attack on the middle class. It is riddled with higher costs and broken promises. It is defined by failure. It is punctuated with hopelessness. And the scale of its many broken promises is matched only by the scale of its defenders' rigid and unfeeling responses to it.

Let us consider just a few right now. Americans were promised they could keep their health plans if they liked them. It was a promise Democrats made to sell ObamaCare and it is a promise they broke. Americans could only keep their plans if the President liked them, not if they liked them. Americans could only keep their plans if the President liked them.

Millions saw the coverage they liked ripped away as a result of a callous and partisan law.

Democrats' response to their broken promise? They tried to dismiss stories about folks losing insurance by saying they had lousy plans anyway and that they should be grateful the government was taking them away. The American people took a different view.

Here is a note I received from a constituent in Caldwell County when her family lost their plan. Here is what she said:

> I was lied to by the President and Congress when we were told the ''Affordable'' Care Act would not require us to switch from our current insurance provider. My husband and I work hard, pay a lot of taxes and ask for little from our government. Is it asking too much for government to stay out of my health insurance?

Americans were promised that ObamaCare would lower costs and even bring down premiums by $2,500 per family. It is a promise Democrats made to sell ObamaCare, and it is a promise they broke.

Just last night, we learned from the government's own actuaries that ObamaCare is leading to higher health care costs. We also know that premiums continue to shoot up by double digits in many areas, including Kentucky.

Democrats' response to their broken promise? President Obama said Americans who already had health insurance ''may not know that they've got a better deal now [under ObamaCare] than they did, but they do.'' Obviously, the President thinks he knows more about our health insurance than we do. Of course, the American people took a different view.

One Kentuckian wrote me after being forced into an ObamaCare plan she called ''subpar'' with a nearly $5,000 deductible. ''I cried myself to sleep,'' she said. ''I work hard for every penny I earn,'' and this ''is unacceptable.''

Americans were promised ObamaCare would create millions of jobs. It is a promise Democrats made to sell ObamaCare, and it is a promise they broke. ObamaCare is leading to fewer jobs, not more of them. In Kentucky, our Democratic Governor once declared it an ''undisputed fact'' that ObamaCare's Medicaid expansion had added 12,000 jobs to Kentucky's economy. But as Kentuckians now know, he was undisputedly wrong. Not only did those jobs fail to materialize, but health care jobs have actually declined in Kentucky since the passage of ObamaCare.

Democrats' response to their broken promise? I think this headline about the comments of a senior Democrat captures it perfectly: ''ObamaCare allows workers to 'escape' their jobs''—to escape their jobs. Well, the American people took a different view.

A constituent from Somerset wrote to tell me that ObamaCare's mandates were causing her to lose up to 11 hours—up to 11 hours—per week at work, which meant about $440 less in her pocket every month. ''ObamaCare,'' she said, ''[is] causing us to lose hours [and] lose wages, yet expecting us to spend more.''

Now, Americans were promised ObamaCare wouldn't touch Medicare. Americans were promised that taxes

wouldn't increase. Americans were promised shopping for ObamaCare would be as simple as shopping for a TV on Amazon. Three more promises, three more betrayals, and on and on and on it has gone for more than 5 long years.

Democrats need to understand it is time to face up to the pain and the failure their law has caused. They can keep trying to talk past the middle class. They can keep trying to deny reality. But they have to realize that no one is buying the spin but them.

Americans are living with the consequences of this broken law and its broken promises every single day. Its negative effects are often felt in the most personal and visceral ways, and Americans are tired of being condescended to. They want change, and they want a bridge to better care, not ObamaCare, and this bill offers it.

I think Democrats have a particular responsibility to the millions their law has hurt already to help pass the law we have before us. I think the President has a particular responsibility to the millions his law has hurt already to then sign it. That is the best way to build a bridge to a fresh start—to a better, healthier, and stronger beginning.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE NEW SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, on another matter, every day this week I have mentioned some of the significant accomplishments of a Senate under new management—a Senate that has put its focus back on the American people.

After years of inaction, this Senate took bipartisan action to help the victims of modern day slavery. Many said the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act would never pass the Senate, but we proved them wrong. We proved it could actually pass by a wide bipartisan margin. In a new and more open Senate, Senator CORNYN was able to work with Democratic partners to ensure it ultimately did.

After years of inaction, the Senate took bipartisan action to protect the privacy of Americans. Many said the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act would never pass the Senate, but we proved them wrong. We proved it could actually pass by a wide bipartisan margin. In a new and more open Senate, Senator BURR, a Republican, and Senator FEINSTEIN, a Democrat, were able to ensure that it ultimately did.

After years of inaction, the Senate took bipartisan action to lift children up with better educational opportunities. Many said the Every Child Achieves Act would never pass the Senate, but we proved them wrong. We proved it could actually pass by a wide bipartisan margin. In a new and more open Senate, Senator ALEXANDER, a Republican, and Senator MURRAY, a Democrat, were able to ensure that it ultimately did.

And after years of inaction, the Senate took bipartisan action to meaningfully improve our roads and infrastructure over the coming years. Many said that the long-term Highway and Transportation Funding Act would never pass the Senate, but we proved them wrong. We proved it could actually pass by a wide bipartisan margin. In a new and more open Senate, Senator INHOFE, a Republican, and Senator BOXER, a Democrat, were able to ensure that it ultimately did.

Today, we are on the verge of passing that bill again. We are on the verge of passing it into law. The revised legislation we will consider provides 5 full years of highway funding. It would be the longest term bill to pass Congress in almost two decades, and it would provide long-term certainty in a fiscally responsible way. In other words, this bill will finally provide State and local governments with the kind of certainty they need to focus on longer term road and bridge projects. This is a significant departure from years—years—of short-term extensions.

There is a lot more to say about what the new Congress has been able to achieve on behalf of the American people. I look forward to continuing to share these successes here on the floor.

Tuesday's announcement on the highway bill is just the latest reminder of what is possible in a new and more open Senate. It builds the basis for more wins into the future. And most importantly, it is an achievement for the American people—an achievement that only a new Congress has been able to deliver.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

WORK OF THE SENATE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, no matter how many times my friend—and we have served together in this body for a long, long time—comes here and talks about how wonderful this Senate is under Republican leadership, the facts aren't on his side. He talked about getting things done after years of inaction. The inaction was the result of Republican filibusters—recordbreaking filibusters.

Bill after bill was blocked. Elementary and secondary education, cyber security, everything that he mentioned—everything, without exception—would have been done a long time ago except for Republican filibusters. To now come to the floor and claim: Isn't it wonderful we were able to get things done during this Congress, because we did not block things—no matter how many times he comes, we and the pundits have already said it is the most unproductive year in the Senate's history. We have had more revotes than at any time in the history of the country and less done than at any time in the country's history.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wonder what my Republican friends do when they are not here in Washington, DC. Do they bother to talk to their constituents? Do they sit down and meet them at townhall meetings or across a fence in someone's backyard? I have a hard time believing my Republican friends are spending much time listening to constituents' concerns. I already talked about guns today.

It seems to me what we are doing is counter to the needs of constituents. This absurd—absurd—attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act through reconciliation is a perfect example. Every day the Republican leader comes to the floor and rails against ObamaCare, yet more than 10 percent of his constituents are benefiting from the Affordable Care Act—500,000 people. I can't believe those people in Kentucky are telling the Republican leader to take away their health care.

Now, he is not alone in pushing the repeal that would expressly hurt people back home. He and the junior Senator from Wyoming both oppose the Affordable Care Act and the law's expansion of Medicaid, but their own Republican Governor—the Governor of Wyoming—is using ObamaCare to expand health coverage for the people of Wyoming.

Wyoming Governor Matt Mead is proposing a Medicaid expansion that will help 17,000 people. Now, 17,000 people in the sparsely populated State of Wyoming is a lot of people. Governor Mead wrote this to the State legislature:

> This economic boost would stabilize services and inject tax dollars paid by Wyoming citizens back into Wyoming communities. The numbers are compelling.

But apparently those facts are not compelling enough for the Senators from Wyoming, who are both voting for repeal.

The Republican Senator from North Dakota has also been a critic of the Affordable Care Act. Once again, his opposition does not jibe with what North Dakota's Governor is saying. North Dakota Governor Dennis Daugaard is fighting in the State legislature to expand Medicaid access to residents. He is a Republican and served for 10 years as JOHN HOEVEN's Lieutenant Governor, but Senator HOEVEN will vote for repeal.

The junior Senator from Montana is opposed to Medicaid expansion. Earlier in the month he seemed supportive of Montana's expansion of Medicaid saying:

> I respect the decision of our Legislature and our governor on Medicaid expansion. I'm one who respects their rights and voices.

But today, I am told, he will perform a breathtaking about-face and vote to do away with Montana's health care.

There is a longer list. Republicans from Ohio, West Virginia, and the State of Nevada have all embraced Medicaid expansion.

In Nevada, Governor Brian Sandoval is considered by many to be a star in the Republican Party. But notwithstanding his party's anti-ObamaCare

ideology, he displayed courage by expanding health coverage for tens of thousands of Nevadans.

I hope my friend and fellow Senator from Nevada will follow our Governor's example and stand for our constituents' health care. Too few Republicans will. If ObamaCare is so awful, why are Republicans from Kentucky, Wyoming, North Dakota, and New Hampshire so eager to use it? It is simple: The Affordable Care Act expands coverage and cuts costs. It is good for the States. That is why Arizona expanded Medicaid. It is insuring hundreds of thousands of Arizonans, as we talk now.

I was disappointed with my friend. We served together, we came to the House together, we came to the Senate together, and he is the senior Senator from Arizona. He made it clear that he will vote for repeal, in spite of all the people benefiting from ObamaCare back home. This is what JOHN MCCAIN said: ''Obviously the Governor and Legislature in my state decided that they wanted that program and so it is going to trouble me in the vote.'' The senior Senator from Arizona acknowledged that he is casting a vote in direct opposition to the needs of the people of Arizona.

So if Republicans aren't listening to their constituents or State leaders, to whom are they listening? As always, the answer is corporations. Billion-dollar companies have no trouble getting congressional Republicans to do their bidding. Even as they try to snatch health coverage from 17 million Americans, Republicans are throwing money at corporations. That is what they plan to do with the money saved by repealing the Affordable Care Act. They will hand it over to corporations in the form of tax breaks.

I have news for my own Republican friends: These multibillion-dollar companies don't need your help. They are doing just fine on their own. The American middle class needs help, but this Republican Congress is doing nothing to aid working families. Why are we here if we are not here to help people back home?

When Republican Presidential candidate John Kasich—somebody whom I came to the House with in 1982—was asked earlier this year why he chose to expand Medicaid in the State of Ohio, he gave this remarkable answer:

> When you die and get to the meeting with St. Peter, he's probably not going to ask you much about what you did about keeping government small. But he is going to ask you what you did for the poor. You better have a good answer.

That is from John Kasich. He is right. This is an opportunity to help unfortunate Americans who lack quality health insurance. I only wish Governor Kasich could convince the junior Senator from Ohio of that simple truth.

I say to my Republican friends: Do the right thing; stop this nonsense about repeal of ObamaCare. Everyone knows this repeal of the Affordable Care Act is going nowhere. Instead of wasting everyone's time and instead of ignoring the wishes of the people back home, let's work together to improve health care coverage. There are a lot of things we can do by working together to improve health care coverage for Americans. Let's move beyond repeal and start making the Affordable Care Act work even better for the American people.

Would the Chair announce the business of the Senate today.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTHCARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3762, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> A bill (H.R. 3762) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

Pending:

> McConnell amendment No. 2874, in the nature of a substitute.
>
> Murray/Wyden amendment No. 2876 (to amendment No. 2874), to ensure that this Act does not increase the number of uninsured women or increase the number of unintended pregnancies by establishing a women's health care and clinic security and safety fund.
>
> Johnson amendment No. 2875 (to amendment No. 2874), to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to ensure that individuals can keep their health insurance coverage.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could interrupt and apologize for that, I ask unanimous consent that the time in quorums called by the Chair be divided equally between the majority and minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the time until 1:30 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. DURBIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this morning I will be joining—at the President's invitation—a bipartisan group of Congressmen and Senators to discuss the need for criminal justice reform in the country. I am actually very glad the President has shown such an interest in this topic, one we have been working on in the Congress for a number of years.

I have said it before and I will say it again, I don't agree with the President on a lot of things, perhaps most things, but I am glad to know he is making this issue a priority. I think it is one of those rare, magical moments where you see things coming together on a bipartisan basis across the political spectrum, where we can actually make some real progress that will benefit the American people and make our criminal justice system fairer and more effective.

Of course, in the Senate, a diverse bipartisan group has shared this concern for a very long time. While I appreciate the President's vocal support and for convening the group to discuss it this morning, I want to make it clear that this legislation has been years in the making. Actually, the impetus for the part I contributed to the bill emanated from a 2007 experiment in Texas in prison reform. That legislation has manifested itself in the Senate and is now called the Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act of 2015. It is a result of a lot of hard work and some compromise, which is the only way things actually get done around here in order to build a bipartisan consensus, and it brings targeted and much needed reforms to the Federal justice system.

I am very glad to be able to join with the junior Senator from Rhode Island, somebody, again, who is probably at the opposite end of the political spectrum from me in terms of ideology, but we have found common ground on this important prison reform component.

Most prisoners will eventually be released into society, which is something we have forgotten. Unfortunately, our prisons have too often become warehouses for human beings, and we have forgotten the reality that many of them will be released back into society. Yet we have done very little to help prepare them to successfully reenter society rather than get into that turnstile that sometimes characterizes our criminal justice system and many end up right back in prison again. We can't save everybody, but I believe we can offer an opportunity for some who want to save themselves to improve themselves and be better prepared to reenter society as productive individuals.

As I said, this reform was based on an experiment in Texas starting back in 2007. People perhaps think of Texas as being tough on crime, and indeed we are, but we finally realized we also have to be smart on crime. Prisons cost money. Every time somebody reoffends and ends up back in the prison system, we have to pay the salaries of prosecutors, public defenders, judges, and others, and that is expensive. If we can find a way to be fiscally more responsible and actually be more effective when it comes to the results, we ought

to grab that opportunity. I happen to think it represents the way we ought to legislate here in Washington, DC, that is based on successful experiments in the States.

It is no coincidence that Louis Brandeis once called the States the laboratories of democracy, but it represents the opposite of what we have seen here in Washington, DC, when, for example, in ObamaCare the President decides we are going to take over one-sixth of the U.S. economy and we are going to mandate from Washington a one-size-fits-all approach for 320 million or so Americans. It just doesn't work, as we have documented time and time again on the floor.

I am optimistic we have found an area where we can work with the President and move this legislation forward. I ask that the President roll up his sleeves and work with us, along with the Democrats and both Houses of Congress, so we can make this criminal justice reform a reality.

Mr. President, I mentioned ObamaCare. That is my second topic for today.

This afternoon we will keep a promise we made to the American people that we will vote to repeal ObamaCare. ObamaCare—were this legislation signed into law—could not sustain this mortal wound that is going to be inflicted this afternoon. Are we doing this for partisan reasons? I would say, no, absolutely not. What we are doing is listening to our constituents who told us that they have had one bad experience after another with ObamaCare. They have been forced by the Federal Government to buy coverage that they don't want, don't need, and can't afford. So we proposed to send a bill to the President that would repeal ObamaCare and then replace it with affordable coverage that people actually want. We made it clear to the American people that if they gave us the privilege of leading in the Congress, we would keep this promise, and we will fulfill that promise in the Senate today.

I remember voting at 7 a.m. on Christmas Eve in 2009, when 60 Democrats voted to jam ObamaCare down the throats of the American people. They made promise after promise. The President himself said: If you like what you have, you can keep it. That proved not to be true. The President said a family of four would see an average reduction in their premium cost by $2,500, and that wasn't true.

So as somebody who has spent a little bit of time in law enforcement as a former attorney general in my State, I would call this a deceptive trade practice. This is defrauding the American people, selling them a product based on a set of promises that ends up not being true.

I believe it is time to repeal this bad law and to replace it with something that people want and that they can afford.

My State has been hit hard, as all States have been, including the State of the Presiding Officer, by the effects of ObamaCare. Almost every day we read news accounts of escalating health care costs, including premiums and fewer choices and options and less access for our constituents.

Just recently, the Houston Chronicle reported that next year the Houston-area patients won't have access to any plans on the ObamaCare exchange that cover costs at MD Anderson, the premier cancer-treating facility in America. If we can't buy insurance to cover catastrophic events like cancer at the hospital of our choice, what good is it?

As a matter of fact, I remember our former colleague, Senator Tom Coburn from Oklahoma, who has used up most of his nine lives, but he has experienced cancer at least three times, to my recollection, and he actually was seeking treatment at MD Anderson. He said that as a result of ObamaCare, he could no longer get coverage from the insurance policy he had because MD Anderson wasn't an acceptable provider under the ObamaCare policy.

So today I will provide a very quick snapshot of the thousands of letters I have received, and I am sure they are typical of the letters we have all received from our constituents about the problems they have encountered with ObamaCare.

One of my constituents recently wrote to me to tell me her story, and it is similar to the narrative I have heard from many others. Her insurance plan was canceled last fall because it didn't meet the mandates of ObamaCare. As a result, she had to switch to a more expensive policy, one with a higher monthly payment and an $11,000 deductible. What good is it to have an insurance policy with an $11,000 deductible? How many Americans can self-insure and pay that bill so that they can take advantage of what limited coverage they actually have under such a policy?

She went on to say that she was notified that her plan would once again be terminated for the next year, and her monthly costs would go up again as a result. To top it off, she would end up losing her primary care provider. In other words, the doctor she preferred would no longer be available to her under this new policy that she would be forced to buy at a higher price.

She is like a lot of folks around the country—full of questions and frustrations and seemingly nowhere to turn to find any relief for her spouse, for her children, or for their small business.

This particular constituent implored me and Congress to do something about it. She said: ''Senator CORNYN, this has caused turmoil throughout Texas . . . we are terrorized in our own country by the so-called benefit of the Affordable Care Act.'' Those are her words, not mine. She said her family was terrorized by ObamaCare.

The strong message she conveyed is not all that different from what I have heard from other people. Another constituent raised a similar issue. He is now, for the third time in as many years, searching for yet another health insurance plan after his was canceled. He went on to highlight another theme that is impossible to miss when I talk to folks back home about this topic. He said:

> I seem to remember the President saying something about liking your insurance and being able to keep it? For myself and my family it's been just the opposite. We loved our insurance prior to the passage of the act and have since been forced to purchase much more expensive insurance with much higher deductibles.

Well, he is right. And in just a few hours we are going to have a chance to vote on the Johnson amendment to this legislation we are considering, which is an ''If you like it, you can keep it'' amendment, to keep that guarantee. We will see how our friends on the other side of the aisle vote, who forced this flawed legislation down the throats of the American people, based on this experience.

Just like many other Texans, the people I have talked about back home have seen their premiums and their deductibles skyrocket to unaffordable levels. Along with this anemic economy and flat wages, people have found themselves with less and less money in their pockets and found themselves with a decreased and diminished standard of living, which has caused a lot of frustration.

This particular constituent ended his letter to me by asking the Members of Congress to ''do anything within your power to reverse this terrible healthcare trend. . . . I need relief,'' he said.

We have reached a pretty scary time in our Nation's history when we have Americans writing and calling their elected representatives saying they need relief from their own government. The threat is not outside; people are being threatened by their own government and the overreach they see and the negative impact it has on their quality of life and their standard of living.

So we have a duty now—we have a mandate, I believe—to repeal this terrible law and to make it a relic of the past, and we are going to do our duty. We are going to keep our promise to the American people today.

There was an outcry from my constituents back home on another topic that gripped our attention—the horrific videos released showing Planned Parenthood executives callously discussing the harvesting of organs from unborn children. We seem to have forgotten those terrible videos and what they have depicted.

This bill will also do something to defund Planned Parenthood and redirect those funds to the many community health centers that exist in Texas and across the country that day in and day out diligently provide health care to people in my State and around the country. There will be no less money directed toward public health care; it

will be redirected away from Planned Parenthood and to the community health centers.

By the way, there are a whole lot more community health centers, so there will actually be improved access for most Americans at community health centers.

By repealing ObamaCare, we are doing more than just delivering on a promise; we are providing a way forward for millions of Americans around this country who have been hurt—not helped but hurt—by ObamaCare. We will do our best to help them find some relief, as one of my constituents whom I just quoted implored.

We look forward to passing this legislation to scrap ObamaCare and to bring this country one step closer to making it history.

Again, this isn't just about repealing ObamaCare; this is about replacing it with coverage that people want and that suits their personal needs at a price they can afford. One would have thought that health care reform would be about making health care more affordable, but, in fact, ObamaCare was just the opposite. It made it more expensive and less affordable, as we have seen and as I have tried to point out in my remarks.

I don't see any other Senator seeking recognition, so 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. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAGEDY IN SAN BERNARDINO

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, when I woke up this morning, I had hoped that yesterday's tragedy in San Bernardino was just an unimaginable nightmare. Then, as I usually do in the morning, I went through the clips from my State and I read the headlines:

''Bloodbath in San Bernardino.''

''14 slain at California office party.''

''Carnage in California.''

''Shooting Rampage Sows Terror in California.''

''At Least 14 Dead in Mass Shooting.''

''Deadly rampage at holiday party.''

''A Day of Horror.''

''Horror Hits Home.''

'' 'Horrific'.'' Just one word.

''Masked Mass Murder.''

These are papers all over my State and a couple of national headlines.

My heart is broken after this rampage that led to the tragic loss of life, so many injuries, so much trauma and pain for the people of San Bernardino.

I thank the medical personnel who are working as we speak to save lives and all the brave, courageous law enforcement officers who rushed to the scene and later stopped these killers.

We know the victims in this attack were county employees at the San Bernardino Department of Public Health. I began my career as a county supervisor, and I oversaw in Marin County the Department of Public Health. I know how dedicated those county employees are. They are right there. They are right there in the communities. And the facility was dedicated to helping disabled people. So for this to happen at a holiday party where these employees were gathering in friendship—it is a stunning shock.

While details about the motive behind this despicable attack are still unknown, here is what we do know: Because these killers used military-style weapons, 14 people died and 17 people were wounded in a matter of minutes.

The purpose of these guns, these military-style guns, is to kill a lot of people very fast. The scene looked like a war zone, and there is a reason for that—again, because these weapons are designed for the military. They are designed for the police.

I have to be honest with my colleagues: I have never heard one persuasive argument about why anyone else would need to have this type of weapon. These weapons of war just don't belong on our streets and in our communities. My colleague Senator FEINSTEIN for years has been pushing sensible legislation that would keep these military-style weapons off our streets. We need to stand with her. We need to stand with her across party lines and pass it.

It is so discouraging that we can't even pass legislation here that would keep suspected terrorists who are on the no-fly list from legally buying a weapon—any kind of a weapon.

It isn't enough for us to keep lamenting these tragedies; we need to take action now, before something else like this happens again in the Presiding Officer's State, in my State. When we take an oath of office, we swear that we will protect and defend the American people. I just don't think we are protecting them when we allow these types of weapons to get into the wrong hands.

This year we are averaging more than one mass shooting every single day—multiple people killed by guns, innocent people, every day. This is America. This doesn't happen in other industrialized nations. Thirty-one people die every day from gun violence. After 10 years of the Vietnam war, we lost nearly 60,000 Americans, and people were in despair. We lose more than that in gun violence in less than 2 years in this great Nation. If there were anything else that caused the death of 30,000 Americans a year, every single Senator would be in their chair and we would be demanding action and we would be crossing over party lines to stop it because that, my friends, is an epidemic.

People deserve to feel safe in their communities. I don't understand it. They deserve to feel safe when they go to a holiday party at work. They deserve to be safe sitting in these galleries. They deserve to be safe going to a movie theater. They deserve to be safe in their school when they are 6 years old or 16 or 26. They deserve to be safe in their workplace, at a shopping mall, at a restaurant, and at a health care clinic.

This is our job, to keep our people safe. We know the threats that face us abroad, and we have threats at home. So we need to do both. We need to protect our people abroad from threats abroad and from threats at home. The very best way to honor the victims of gun violence is to take sensible steps that are supported by the American people, such as universal background checks, safety features on guns, keeping assault weapons in the hands of our military and our police, and keeping guns out of the hands of people who are unbalanced, unstable, criminals. Then we can prevent these tragedies.

Will we prevent every tragedy? No. I know my friends will say: Well, someone can have a knife. Yes. It is a lot easier to get away from a knife than an automatic weapon that mows you down before you can even look up and figure out what is happening.

I am crying out today for support for sensible gun laws, and regardless of motive—regardless of motive—we need to make sure that military weapons belong in the hands of the military and the police. It is pretty straightforward. Our people are not safe. I don't care what State you look at, I don't care what city you look at, I don't care what county you look at.

San Bernardino is a beautiful place. I don't live far from there. I have an office about 15 minutes or less from there. People deserve to feel safe in our communities. So I send my love, my prayers, my solidarity to the community, to the families, to the first responders, and to everyone there. Yes, we are going to pull together, as all these communities do, but we need to prevent these things from happening because if we don't, we are liable.

I believe we are liable. We know what is killing people every day. It is gun violence, and we know it. I am not a lawyer, but I have a lot of family members who are lawyers—my son is, my father was, my husband is—and I think once you know something is happening and you can do something about it and you don't do something about it, you are liable—maybe not in a legal sense, but in a moral sense.

So I hope we can come together around this. Every time the press comes in and asks me, tragedy after tragedy after tragedy: Will something happen now? After Sandy Hook, I said: Absolutely. We are going to come together. We did not. We did not.

I want to close with this. In California we have tough gun laws. I don't know how these weapons got where they were. We will find out. People say: Well, we have these gun laws. Look at this; we have had a 56 percent reduction of gun violence since 1993 in my great State because we have taken action. But this is one Nation under God.

If somebody comes from a nearby State, from the North, from the East, and they have a gun—that is why it is so important for us to work together to have sensible national laws and universal background checks. Almost 90 percent of the people support it. The majority of NRA members support it. What is wrong with us that we can't do that? What are we afraid of?

These military assault-style weapons kill so fast—and so many people. We should make sure they are in the hands of the military and the police.

My heart is heavy and will remain so. This is supposed to be a great day for a lot of us who worked so long and hard on the highway bill. This was a moment we were waiting for, and that is what life's about. You know, there are these moments that you savor, and there are moments that you wish to God you never had to talk about or experience. That is the kind of day it is for this particular Senator, and I know Senator FEINSTEIN feels the same way.

I thank you very much, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an amendment I filed to the reconciliation bill, amendment No. 2887, to strengthen Pell grants.

This amendment provides middle-class families with the kind of stable funding source that they can rely on when it comes to paying for college. Pell grants have historically been the key investment in helping low-income students pay for college. Most of my colleagues would agree that a good education is one of the surest paths to the middle class.

In 1980, the maximum Federal Pell grant covered about 77 percent of in-state, 4-year college tuition. Now Pell grants account for only one-third of those costs. Rising college costs prevent many low-income students, no matter how hard they work, from being able to go to college and thus from reaching the middle class.

If the Senate can accomplish one thing that invests in our Nation's future, it should be to enact policies that help to stabilize and expand the middle class. We all know there is a growing income disparity in our country that is whittling down our middle class and making it harder and harder for people to get ahead in the first place. Key to the path forward for many is college affordability. Pell grants are a critical part of college affordability.

Almost half of all college students in the United States receive Pell grants to help fund their education, including 23,000 students in my home State of Hawaii. Unfortunately, Pell grants—the largest Federal student aid program—which are primarily funded by discretionary, not mandatory, funding appropriations, do not provide the kind of stable funding source that families can rely upon. Each year Congress in its discretion determines how much funding goes to Pell grants. This should change. Federal financial aid should be a resource that students and their families can count on, that they can plan around.

To that end, the amendment I filed would do two things. First, it would convert the Pell Grant Program from the discretionary side of the budget to the mandatory side of the budget for 5 years. That way, eligible families won't have to worry each year about congressional appropriations, at least for 5 years, and they can plan their financing for an entire 4-year degree. Second, my amendment would index Pell grants annually for inflation. That means that as college costs rise, so, too, will they allow Federal aid to low-income students.

Students and their families should have confidence that if they commit to earning an education, Federal support will be there for their hard work. My amendment would give them that stability.

This amendment is paid for by closing tax loopholes for corporate executives and hedge fund managers and by instituting the Buffett rule, to ensure that Americans who earn over $1 million per year pay their fair share of taxes—tax fairness from those who earn more in a year than many college graduates may earn in their lifetimes.

To give a hand-up to the next generation of strivers is more than reasonable to me. Access to educational opportunity is not a handout. Graduates will still have to work hard to get good jobs, start businesses, and succeed, and when they succeed, our country succeeds.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to stabilize and strengthen the middle class and to invest in our next generation of leaders.

The amendment to the underlying bill would improve it, but the underlying bill is deeply flawed. The underlying bill before us would take away health care access for millions of women, seniors, and low-income working people by gutting the Affordable Care Act, defunding Planned Parenthood, and undermining investment and prevention and research. The resultant harm to our people is a poison pill that we cannot impose on American families. This Republican bill, which does little for the middle class and working people, will be vetoed by the President. The Republicans know this, and yet they are bound and determined to pass this harmful legislation as soon and as fast as possible.

I ask my colleagues to stop, pause, and get our country back on track by supporting and strengthening the middle class, by giving a hand-up to the people who represent our country's future, and by not yanking the rug out from under the millions of Americans who rely on health care.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, a few months ago I asked my Republican colleagues if they had fallen down, hit their heads, and thought they woke up in the 1950s. Today I am back to check on my Republican colleagues because it appears they are suffering from a serious case of memory loss.

Before I call the doctors at Mass General, I have to say this really isn't a joke. I truly, honestly cannot come up with a better reason why my Republican colleagues have forced us back to the Senate floor once again to talk about another reckless scheme to defund Planned Parenthood. What is with you guys?

Remember this summer? Republicans launched a deliberate, orchestrated plan to defund women's health care centers. Let me just clarify. This was not a plan to defund abortions because for nearly 40 years the Federal Government has prohibited Federal funding for abortion. Nope. The plan was to defund Planned Parenthood health care centers that nearly 2.7 million people use every year, health care centers that one in five women across America has used for cancer screenings, pregnancy and STD tests, birth control, and other basic medical care.

To a lot of women and to a lot of men, the effort to defund Planned Parenthood health care centers was an overt attack on women's access to needed and legal health care. When the Republicans forced the Senate to vote on a bill to defund Planned Parenthood, it failed—and rightly so. That should have been the end of it, but Republican extremists just won't quit. In fact, they are doubling down.

Today Senate Republicans will use a special maneuver to hold another vote to defund Planned Parenthood, this time needing only 50 votes to pass instead of the usual 60. Even if they pass this reconciliation bill, President Obama has said he will veto it, but some Republican extremists vow to press on, using the most extreme tactics possible, taking the government hostage. They want to attach a rider to the government funding bill and threaten to shut down the government 10 days from now unless the Democrats agree to defund Planned Parenthood. Does that sound familiar? Well, that is because it is the very same tactic used in 2013 when Republicans shut down the government over the Affordable Care Act and flushed $24 billion down the drain—the very same tactic that former Speaker John Boehner admitted was a ''predictable disaster.''

Republicans may like playing politics with Planned Parenthood, but this isn't a game for the millions of women who depend on Planned Parenthood for basic medical care every year and who have nowhere else to go. Threatening to shut down the government is certainly not a game. It is not a game for cancer patients who could be turned away from clinical trials at NIH. It is not a game for small businesses that depend on our national parks being open for tourist visits. It is not a game for seniors who need their Medicare paperwork processed or for the veterans

whose benefits could be at risk, and it is not a game for the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees across this country—from park rangers to scientists to cafeteria workers and janitors at government buildings—who could be sent home 2 weeks before Christmas with no paycheck coming in.

This radical assault on women's health care and reproductive rights has gone on long enough. So in case my Republican colleagues are suffering from short-term memory loss, let me spell this out again loud and clear. We will not allow you to turn back the clock on women's health and women's rights. If you try to sneak provisions into the government funding bill to defund Planned Parenthood, we will fight you every step of the way, and we will win. That is not a threat; that is a promise.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise this morning in opposition to the reconciliation bill that we are considering today. There are a number of reasons I have concerns, but one of the most important has to do with its repeal of the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act, while it is not perfect, is working. More Americans than ever before have access to health care.

In New Hampshire, almost 45,000 people have received health insurance through the exchange. Most of those people did not have health care coverage before the Affordable Care Act, and the majority of these people are getting insurance premium support to make it more affordable.

In New Hampshire, another 44,000 people are getting coverage through Medicaid expansion. The Governor and the State legislature worked long and hard to come to a bipartisan agreement—a Democratic Governor and a Republican legislature—on how to expand Medicaid in a way that works for New Hampshire. The reconciliation bill that we are considering today would turn back the clock on all of that work. It would repeal Medicaid expansion, and it would eliminate coverage for so many of the people who need it the most.

In short, this bill would wreak havoc on the lives of families and individuals, people such as Deborah from Conway, NH. She and her husband own a small business. They work hard, and they live within their means. But for 17 years, they have been without health insurance, and they have had to forego health care services because of costs.

As a result of Medicaid expansion, Deborah was recently able to go to the doctor for her first physical in 18 years. Imagine that; it was her first physical in 18 years. During that exam, she discovered that she has high blood pressure and that she is at risk for cancer. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, she is able to take the preventive measures. She expects to live a long, healthy life and is probably going to save money because she has received this preventive care. We cannot turn our backs on people such as Deborah and her family.

Finally, the reconciliation bill would defund Planned Parenthood, which would deny access to 12,000 women in New Hampshire access to health care providers they trust and to services they need. For many of those women, Planned Parenthood is the easiest, most affordable, and best way for them, and—in many cases—the only way for them to get the care they need. I proudly stand with the millions of women who rely on Planned Parenthood, and I will continue to oppose any attempt to defund such an important component of our health care system.

While I remain gravely concerned about the underlying bill, I am pleased to join Senators WYDEN and MURRAY today in offering an amendment to address an issue that is vitally important to New Hampshire, to northern New England, and to much of the country, and that is this epidemic of heroin and opioid abuse.

In New Hampshire and across this country, drug abuse has reached epidemic proportions. Each day 120 Americans die of drug overdoses. That is two deaths every hour.

In New Hampshire we are losing a person a day due to drug overdoses. Drug overdose deaths have exceeded car crashes as the No. 1 cause of fatalities in the United States. We just had a report come out that shows that for the first time in years, the lifespan of White Americans is going down. It is going down for one reason that was cited, and that is because of drug overdoses. Mental health illness and drug abuse is a national public health emergency, and it is time for us to act.

What the amendment we are offering will do is to take important steps to provide critical resources for the prevention, intervention, and treatment of mental illness and substance abuse disorders. The amendment will ensure that any health insurance plan purchased on the exchange is held to mental health parity and addiction equity standards, and it will make it easy for consumers to know what benefits are covered and the insurance plan's denial records.

Importantly, the amendment makes it easier for patients to receive medication-assisted treatment drugs—drugs such as methadone, naltrexone and naloxone, commonly known as Narcan, and it prohibits lifetime limits on those drugs.

Our amendment also strengthens Medicaid coverage of services to prevent and treat mental illness and substance abuse disorders. Again, not only do we have this epidemic, but we don't have enough treatment beds, we don't have enough treatment facilities, and we don't have enough providers to assist and support those people who are trying to get clean. For years, Medicaid has been prohibited from reimbursing medically necessary care to patients in residential or treatment facilities with more than 16 beds.

Historically, this has been a barrier for patients who need these treatments for drug abuse and who have limited access to that treatment. Our amendment would enable more people to receive these services by allowing reimbursement for these facilities in States that have expanded Medicaid, such as New Hampshire. The amendment will also provide additional Medicaid Federal funding to help States provide community treatment programs and health homes for those in need of help.

Finally, this amendment provides over $15 billion of needed funding to States and municipalities to help address the public health emergency in those States and communities that are the frontlines of this crisis.

Through the substance abuse prevention and treatment block grants and the community mental health service block grants, this service is targeted to those most at risk for substance abuse and mental illness, giving the States flexibility to develop and fund programs that work best for them. This prevention, intervention, and treatment of substance abuse and mental health disorders have the potential to make the difference in millions of lives.

The amendment is fully paid for by closing tax loopholes. With the tools provided in this amendment, we can change the lives of those struggling with mental illness and substance abuse disorders, and we can turn the tide of this national public health epidemic.

I thank you all, and I hope that as we consider this reconciliation bill, we will have the opportunity to vote on this amendment and that there would be support to address the critical crisis we are facing because of heroin and opioid abuse.

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. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I am going to take a few minutes to talk about the reconciliation bill that we are discussing and debating on the Senate floor this week, particularly the focus on repealing the Affordable Care Act, or what is called ObamaCare. There are many, many aspects of the bill that we are debating—the individual mandate, the Cadillac tax, the employer mandate. These will all be gone. Essentially, we will start the process of what I believe the vast majority of Americans want, which is real, affordable health care, not what we currently have.

I was recently home in Anchorage, AK. A lot of us get a sense of what our

constituents are feeling by going about doing our basic chores and running errands when we are back home. Two weeks ago, in the course of 2 hours of getting gas, at a grocery store, and at Lowe's, I had three different Alaskans come up to me and plead to do something about ObamaCare, how it was wiping out their home income and their small business—three in 2 hours.

Similarly, I was in Fairbanks a few days ago and heard from another small business owner. They made the same plea that many small business owners I have heard from in Alaska have talked about. They have had health insurance for their employees for years where they have taken care of them. Yet the increases in the costs of these plans are such that their companies will not be able to operate. They have this huge dilemma: to continue to cover their employees whom they care a lot about—some of whom have been working for decades—or to dump them into the marketplace, because that is the only way the company can survive.

That is the dilemma that this bill is putting people into. Hardly a day passes where I don't hear from constituents about the problems they are having. Let me give you a couple of examples.

A family in Eagle River, AK, will pay $1,200 a month in premiums with a $10,000 deductible under the new Affordable Care Act. A couple in Anchorage will be paying $3,131 a month in premiums—almost $38,000 a year.

Here is an excerpt from a constituent letter:

> The renewal paperwork that I just received estimated our new payment to be just over $1,000/month—doubling our monthly expense. . . . What is a young family to do?

Here is another constituent: ''There is nothing 'affordable' about the Affordable Health Care Act.''

Another constituent said:

> Insurance rates are killing my small business. . . . We have tried to keep our employees and their families covered but don't see how we can continue to [be in business].

Here is another constituent of mine: ''Please, please help us!!'' They are begging for help.

Teachers, construction workers, small business owners, self-sufficient Alaskans—so many of them—are asking for help because of what this Federal Government did to them.

The numbers don't lie. In Alaska and throughout the country, workers and families are suffering. Small businesses are being squeezed. Job creation is being stymied. Nearly every single promise made by the President of the United States and the supporters of this bill in the Congress has been broken.

Let me remind my colleagues what some of those promises were. Here is one from the President: ''If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan.''

Here is another one from the President: ''If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor.''

The law, he told the American people, ''means more choice, more competition, lower costs for millions of Americans.''

He told the American public that premiums would be reduced on average for Americans for their health care plans by $2,500. But again, the numbers we see don't lie. Costs are soaring all over our country. For example, a bronze plan under ObamaCare, the least expensive insurance available on the exchange, costs on average—this is a national average—$420 a month, with an average deductible of $5,653 for an individual and close to $11,600 for a family.

Remember former Speaker of the House and ObamaCare promoter NANCY PELOSI with her line about how important it was to pass ObamaCare so we could all figure out what was in it. She promised that ObamaCare would create ''4 million jobs—400,000 jobs almost immediately.'' That was the former Speaker.

Let's see what the Congressional Budget Office says about that promise. Recently, the CBO projected that ObamaCare will result in 2 million fewer jobs in 2017 and 2.5 million fewer jobs in America by 2024. Obviously, that promise didn't come true. Promise after promise was unfulfilled. It is no wonder the American people have such a low opinion of the Federal Government and the Congress.

What is of the laudable goal of health insurance for the uninsured? It is a very laudable goal, and there is no doubt about it—affordable health insurance for the uninsured. ObamaCare is barely moving the needle. Today there are 35 million people who don't have health insurance. According to the CBO, 10 years from now there is still going to be approximately 27 million people who don't have coverage under this system.

Let me get a little more specific in terms of my State. Probably no other State in the country has been more negatively damaged by ObamaCare than Alaska. Five insurance companies originally offered coverage in our exchanges in Alaska, offering a glimmer of hope of what is really needed in the health care market, which is competition. Today only two are left to provide individual insurance on the health care exchange. Both will be increasing premiums by approximately 40 percent this year. In Anchorage, for the lowest level plan—a bronze plan—premiums are going to go up 46 percent.

There you go—major metropolitan areas in the United States. Look at the far left. That is Anchorage, AK, and at 46 percent in 1 year, it will make it one of the most expensive and the biggest increase in terms of metropolitan areas in the United States.

Let me give you another example. A 40-year-old nonsmoker—individual—who doesn't receive subsidies will pay anywhere from $579 to $678 a month in premiums for a bronze plan with a deductible of either $5,250 for the more expensive premium or $6,850 for the less expensive premium.

Remember, ObamaCare requires Alaskans and Americans to purchase these plans. Remember what it did for the first time in U.S. history. The Congress of the United States told the American people: You must buy a product; you have to or you will be penalized.

That brings me to the penalties. Because of the prohibitive costs, some in Alaska and many across the country have chosen to go without coverage and pay the yearly fine under ObamaCare. But that fine is also very expensive. Alaskans and Americans are asking: What is the point? What is the point of having health insurance that has been forced on them by their Federal Government and that they can't afford? Others are foregoing seeing their doctors altogether.

A recent Gallup poll found that in 2014 one in three Americans says they have put off getting medical treatment they or their family members need because with these numbers it is too expensive. They are not going to the doctor. Again, what is the point? You have health insurance, but you can't go see your doctor because it is too expensive. That number, by the way—one in three—is among the highest number in the Gallup poll's 14-year history of posing this question.

As the costs rise, the numbers will continue to rise. Not surprisingly, given all of these numbers, given that number, a recent poll found that despite 6 years of being under ObamaCare, where our citizens of the United States were supposed to finally be comfortable with it, to understand it, to have it working, still 52 percent of Americans have an unfavorable view of it—only 44 percent, favorable.

For Alaskans, this is only going to get worse. The so-called Cadillac tax—one of the numerous taxes embedded in ObamaCare—is going to kick in for 2018. It will be devastating for individual Alaskans, for union members, and for small businesses across Alaska. It has been estimated that as many as 90 percent of Alaska businesses will be faced with the increased Cadillac tax. That is a tax of an additional 40 percent on these benefits. Many small businesses in Alaska will not be able to afford this. An employer with 20 employees, under the Cadillac tax will pay an estimated $28,000 a year more in taxes—just for the Cadillac tax on a small business. That can be the difference between make or break for that business.

Who is going to get hurt by this? Small businesses, but more importantly, their employees, their workers will. Those extra costs are going to trickle down to the workers, likely in the form of reduced benefits and reduced wages and more problems with their health insurance plan.

As I mentioned, it is not just small businesses. Hard-working Alaskans covered under union plans will also very likely be hit by the Cadillac tax, requiring them to pay much more, and

so will State and local government employer plans.

For all of these reasons, one of my campaign promises was to vote to repeal ObamaCare. I certainly plan to do it today when we take up this reconciliation measure. I certainly hope it is going to pass.

When this legislation gets to the President's desk, what will happen then? Well, he is likely going to veto it again. I hope he looks at these numbers and recognizes what a mistake this bill was and agrees with us to work together to replace it, but he is likely going to veto it, and in doing so will likely mislead Americans again by claiming that ObamaCare is working. It is not working.

Let me give you another example of how it is not working. UnitedHealth, one of the Nation's biggest insurance companies, recently announced that because of its huge losses, it may pull out of ObamaCare altogether. If United pulls out, then others are likely to follow.

Premera Blue Cross Blue Shield of Alaska, one of the only health insurers left in Alaska offering coverage on the exchange, said that it can't continue to sustain losses under the exchange.

As bad laws often do, ObamaCare contains the seed of its own destruction. But for the sake of millions of Americans and thousands of Alaskans who have been sold a false bill of goods, we can't simply wait to see it self-destruct. This was not the health care that was promised to Americans, and we can't let it get worse. We need to act, and that is why I am joining with my colleagues today to repeal this law. We need to look at replacing it with one that includes provisions that are missing, such as tort reform. We need a system that encourages purchasing insurance across State lines, encourages patient-centered care, and allows the kind of doctor-patient relationship that has been the hallmark of American care for many years.

Contrary to what some on the other side of the aisle have claimed, there have been many alternatives proposed to ObamaCare. The plan in the Senate has been introduced by Senators HATCH and BURR and Congressman FRED UPTON on the House side. Their legislation includes many of these important reforms. It will allow people to actually get involved in their own health care and not watch this train wreck in terms of health care becoming unaffordable for Americans throughout all of the different States.

When selling the law to the public, President Obama talked about the fierce urgency of now. That is exactly what I am hearing from my constituents when they write: Please, please help us. What is a young family to do? The fierce urgency of now is now.

Finally, I wish to comment on a number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have been lamenting that this reconciliation vote we are going to take today is going to be along party lines. They have been lamenting that this might be some kind of partisan vote.

As the Presiding Officer knows, this is a bit rich and a bit ironic. It is very important to remember that 6 years ago, almost to the day, this legislation passed in the Senate and the House by a party-line vote—a partisan vote—so to hear their concerns now rings a little hollow. That was not a wise move back then.

One important lesson of U.S. history is that most, if not all, major pieces of legislation in the Congress on important social issues have been passed with bipartisan majorities, which helps to make legislation sustainable. That happens when the American people back that kind of legislation.

The American people have never backed this legislation, but democracy has an interesting way of working—not always quickly, but eventually. This law is not popular. It was never supported by the American people, and they are noticing. As a matter of fact, of the 60 U.S. Senators who voted for this law 6 years ago, 30 are no longer in this Chamber. That is democracy working.

We are going to take that vote again today. I am hoping some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us in repealing a law that doesn't work and is dramatically harming Americans so we can move on to a health care plan that helps us, helps families, and prevents constituents from writing to their Members of the Senate and begging for help, which is what is going on right now because of this bill.

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. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to speak about some of the matters we are working on today with regard to votes that will take place later on.

We now are in a period in our economic history where we have had a significant recovery, but we still have a ways to go and still have families across the country who are living with some economic uncertainty. We can take steps today and certainly over the next couple of days and, we hope, in 2016 to ease some of that uncertainty or to create more economic certainty for our families, especially middle-class families.

One of the most important steps we can take to address some of the challenges our families face is to boost middle-class incomes. The most significant challenge we have as a nation right now, I believe over the long term, is what will happen to incomes—especially what will happen to middle-class incomes—over time.

I have an amendment today that will address part of the solution or part of the strategy to raising incomes. One of those ideas is an expansion of the child and dependent care tax credit, which is a tax credit that helps families afford childcare, and so I will speak about that for a couple of minutes today. The other issue we are going to deal with is the so-called dual-earner tax credit, which helps families who have young children where both parents work outside the home.

I don't think it is a news bulletin to anyone here or across the country that the cost of childcare has skyrocketed, especially in recent years. A recent study by the Pew Foundation found that average weekly childcare expenses rose 70 percent between 1985 and 2013. So the cost every week that a family is paying for childcare is up basically 70 percent in 30 years or 25 to 30 years.

That is one of the many costs that have gone up in the lives of middle-class families. Their childcare costs have gone way up, the cost of higher education has gone way up in that time period, the cost of health care, the cost of energy, and the cost of food. It seems as though for a middle-class family, every cost or every number we would hope would be going down or leveling off is going up. As a result, childcare is increasingly becoming literally unaffordable for middle-class families.

That is a reality in a context where we know that the cost is going up at a time when all the evidence shows that quality childcare can have a substantially positive impact on a child's life. One of the reasons quality childcare matters so much to a child is because they have opportunities to learn. One thing I have said over and over again is that if our children learn more now—meaning when they are in those early years—when they are in childcare settings, they are going to earn more later. That direct linkage, which all the evidence shows—all the data shows, all the studies show—the linkage between learning and earning is substantial. One of the best ways to make sure kids learn more now and earn more later when they are in the workforce is to make sure they have quality childcare.

To give one example, in Pennsylvania the average cost for full-time daycare for an infant is $10,640. For a 4-year-old, it is $8,072. Those numbers sound almost like approaching college tuition maybe at some public universities. Double-figure, thousand-dollar numbers for childcare is almost hard to comprehend—$10,640 for an infant and $8,072 for a 4-year-old. So what does that mean for, for example, married couples in Pennsylvania? It means that about 12 percent of their annual income is dedicated to childcare. How

about for a single-parent family? For a single mother, those numbers translate into 44 percent of her income. Forty-four percent of that single mom's income is going to childcare. And she has to have it because she has to work. This isn't something extra, something nice to do; she has to have that childcare. She has to be able to pay for it. And in a State such as Pennsylvania, which I think is fairly typical of the country when it comes to these costs, if that single mother is having to pay 44 percent of her income on childcare, that makes it very hard for her to makes ends meet, if not impossible.

That is why the Tax Code has long recognized the need to provide families with tax relief to offset childcare expenses through the child and dependent care tax credit. However, the way this tax credit is currently structured, it means that few families can benefit from it.

Here is what we should do. We should make the full credit available to most working families. More than 85 percent of taxpayers in Pennsylvania, for example, with children would receive the full benefit if our amendment passes. We should increase the maximum amount of the credit for children under 5 from $1,500 to $3,000, thereby reducing the cost of childcare by 35 percent. That would be one of the positive benefits of passing the amendment. Third, we should ensure that lower income families are better able to benefit from the credit by making it fully refundable. We have not done that. We should do that. That is what families would benefit from. Finally, we should retain the value over time by indexing the benefits in income thresholds to inflation.

That is what we do on the child and dependent care tax credit—a substantially positive advancement for families trying to pay for childcare as the cost of everything in their life is going up, for middle-class families especially.

Second, we have the so-called dual-earner tax credit. We want to expand those tax credits for working parents with young children. The amendment includes a provision which would provide up to a $700 tax credit on secondary earners' income for parents with children who are under the age of 12.

We know that as our workforce changes, we must develop policy that ensures that our Tax Code rewards work and expands opportunity for working middle-class families. That should be the goal of everyone here. I think on a lot of days it is, but sometimes the Senate doesn't focus on those priorities. Make the Tax Code reward work and expand opportunity. If we enact these policies we will guarantee that these middle-class families see their incomes go up and we can do it in a fiscally responsible way that pays for these tax cuts by closing the most egregious tax loopholes.

The amendment will say that companies can no longer evade U.S. taxes through so-called corporate inversions, which is when a large company buys another company overseas and then claims their headquarters are abroad. The inversion strategy that some companies have employed has been an abuse of the Tax Code and frankly an insult to working Americans.

We also ask, as a way to pay for these changes, that the very wealthy who have received lots of relief over the last decade—the kind of tax relief we have not seen in my judgment in human history, not just U.S. history—those folks at the very top have gotten a very good deal for the last couple of decades, especially the last decade or so, and this Senator thinks a lot of those folks would like to help their country and would like to help us pay for these commonsense tax relief provisions for middle-class families, especially as it relates to paying for the costs of childcare.

How do we do that? We can enact as part of one of the pay-fors the so-called Buffett rule, named after Warren Buffett—a pretty wealthy guy—but he has supported a measure that would ensure that a secretary or teacher doesn't have a higher tax rate than someone making millions of dollars a year or literally billions a year.

Finally, we would ensure that those who run very large corporations aren't able to use loopholes to avoid paying taxes. So these basic, commonsense steps would make sure our Tax Code works for the middle class and not just those at the very top. In particular, the way the Senate can focus on middle-class incomes is to put in place policies that help families pay for some of the biggest expenses they face, such as childcare.

Finally, Madam President, I will move to the issue of Medicaid. I know my colleague Senator BROWN is on the floor and has worked so hard on this issue over many years. I want to talk about a matter we are working on together, and I appreciate his leadership on Medicaid.

The effort we are undertaking would bolster the work we have done over the last 5 years to expand access to Medicaid. When Medicaid was expanded on the Affordable Care Act, the so-called Federal medical assistance percentage, FMAP, basically is when the Federal Government contributes to help States cover the cost of Medicaid. That was set at 100 percent for 2016. Beginning in 2017 the Federal Government's contribution would decrease until it gets to 90 percent in 2020. The amendment that Senator BROWN, I, and others will put forth will keep the Federal contribution at 100 percent until 2020, instead of letting it drop to 90 percent at 2020.

Pennsylvania has expanded into the Medicaid Program. We are happy about that, but in doing that what Pennsylvania did is they ensured that all individuals with incomes up to 133 percent of poverty were covered. Other States have not done this. This has created a so-called coverage gap that is impacting over 3 million people around the country.

One of the reasons States point to in refusing to expand Medicaid is they cannot afford to pay the costs they will incur, beginning in 2017, when the Federal share goes to 90 percent. The States at that point will have to pay more, and some are using that or citing that as a reason they will not expand Medicaid. This amendment would remove that concern that has been asserted by Governors and others around the country. States would be free to expand Medicaid without having to worry about how they pay the bill.

Wrapping up, let's remember what Medicaid means. Medicaid isn't some far-off program that doesn't affect a lot of Americans. It directly affects tens of millions of Americans and tens of millions more indirectly. For example, Medicaid pays for almost half of all the births in the country. Half of all the babies born in the country are paid for by Medicaid. Every Senator in both parties should remember that. So this isn't some program that you don't have to worry about, that can be cut and slashed without consequence. Half of the babies born in our country are paid for by Medicaid.

How about older citizens? Skilled nursing home payments—that is a shorthand way of saying nursing homes—60 percent of those payments are covered by Medicaid, and 65 percent of almost 23 million publicly paid resident days of care in the State of Pennsylvania are paid for by Medicaid, compared to 13 percent by Medicare. So Medicaid has a huge impact on long-term care for families across the country.

By the way, Medicaid is not just for low-income families. A lot of middle-income families benefit directly from the payments made by Medicaid for long-term care. So if you care about older citizens in your own family getting nursing home placement, if you care about 45 percent of all the babies born in the country, you better care about Medicaid, and you better care about efforts, in a sensible way, to expand Medicaid across the country, which would be better for all of us, especially the children, older citizens, and Americans who have disabilities who are all affected by Medicaid.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I understood that the Senator from Ohio was seeking consent to speak after me.

I would like to take a few minutes this morning to speak about how the Affordable Care Act is harming the people of the State of Alaska. This Senator has come to the floor a lot to talk about the fact that we in the State of Alaska have the highest insurance premiums. Well, again, we have the highest insurance premiums in the country. Believe me, I am hearing from

folks back home all the time about the burden that these costs place on them.

Our State's largest newspaper has been reporting, as we have seen these premium increases coming out over these past several months—they have been detailing the incredible rise of premiums throughout the State. The average monthly premium for a single 40-year-old in the State of Alaska is now over $700 a month—$700 a month for the average single 40-year-old—more than double the national average. People are paying thousands of dollars each month to insure their families. The insurance premium costs have gone up somewhere between 25 percent to 40 percent each year. How do you budget for that?

A family of three in Ketchikan—I got the information from them—are going to be paying almost $2,000 a month next year for one of the cheapest bronze plans available. This is a family of three paying for one of the cheapest plans, and they are going to be paying $2,000 a month. This plan comes with a $10,500 deductible. Heck of a deal. In spite of paying almost $24,000 on insurance, nearly all the medical bills will still be paid out of pocket for this family. They will not see any benefit until they have spent just about $35,000. Contrast the $2,000 per month for health insurance with their mortgage payment. Their monthly mortgage payment is $1,250. Does this seem right to anyone? It should not cost more to provide health care coverage for your family than to own your home.

We have a married couple in Wasilla who were paying $850 a month prior to the ACA, but that plan wasn't acceptable under the new regulations. The promise that you can keep the plan if you like it—well, that didn't hold. They had to find other insurance. Next year this married couple is going to be paying over $2,300 per month. That means they are going to be paying over $17,000 more per year for the same coverage. This is a 268-percent increase in just one calendar year. This is not right. This is unconscionable. It is not that this married couple has somehow increased their income by an additional $17,000 last year. No, this is just the cost to cover their insurance.

A self-employed man down in Homer whose insurance covers him, his wife, and his son has seen his costs increase from $325 per month 2 years ago to $1,325 a month since the ACA was passed. That is an additional $1,000 per month that these folks are now paying for the cheapest bronze plan available with a $12,000 deductible. This is not some Cadillac plan. This is the cheapest plan available. This is a $12,000 deductible. This is what these folks at home are paying.

The ACA repeal bill that we are currently debating addresses the problem by reducing the penalty for not buying insurance to zero. Alaskans could choose to buy insurance or simply save the thousands of dollars they would be paying each month that could be spent on medical bills as needed but would be available for the families to use as they see fit.

On top of the outrageous costs that we are seeing that come with the individual mandate, the Cadillac tax that I just mentioned hits Alaskans harder than anywhere else in the country. Premera is the largest insurer in our State and they tell me that about 62 percent of their customers in Alaska will be forced to pay these tax penalties under the Cadillac tax in 2018, the first year of the tax. The average cost will be $420. That would be the tax on the plan that they would be paying that first year. It is not as if these plans are grand. The problem is with the high cost of health care within our State. The tax penalizes Alaskans because our health care is more expensive in a rural State with a low population.

This tax is going to hit the State, the boroughs, and our school districts. It will take away money from public education and other services that the State provides. I am hearing from school districts. Instead of saying they are concerned about testing or some of the other issues we are dealing with in education, they are saying their No. 1 concern is the implementation of the Cadillac tax. It is the single greatest threat to quality public education. That is how Robert Boyle, the superintendent of the Ketchikan Gateway Borough School District describes the ACA, as the single greatest threat to quality public education. Bob's district faces a tax penalty of over $500,000 due to the Cadillac tax coming up in 2018, the first year of the tax, and the penalties only increase from there. The Ketchikan Gateway Borough School District is looking at a half-million-dollar tax coming due in 2018. They are not getting more money to run their school district. This is money out the door that isn't improving the education of a single child in that district.

We are facing a financial crisis in the State. The State cut the education budget this year, and they are looking hard at cutting it again next year. We are a State that relies on oil revenues, and you see what is going on with the price of oil. That is an impact to us. We are feeling it—desperately feeling it. School districts cannot afford the imposition of hundreds of thousands of dollars of new taxes on top of a budget reduction. The money, as you and I know, would be far better spent paying teachers what they deserve. School districts are now looking to possibly reduce benefits for teachers in order to avoid paying the new tax. With low pay and no benefits, how are our schools going to get ahead? How can we expect to attract and retain quality teachers? The answer is pretty real—we just can't do it. Without quality teachers who suffers? It is going to be the kids.

The bill we are debating solves the problem for 6 years by delaying the Cadillac tax for 6 years until 2024. That gives us time to find a way to address it permanently and in a responsible way. This Senator advocates eliminating the Cadillac tax altogether.

The problems with the ACA don't end with hundreds of thousands of dollars in new taxes on schools or charging individuals outrageous premiums. It also impacts our small businesses. I heard from so many business owners around the State who want to expand but are saying they just can't do it. They can't do it. They cannot afford to both expand their business and then hit the 50-employee threshold at which they are required to provide the insurance. So, at best, these businesses are kind of treading water right now. The ACA requires every business owned by an individual to be grouped together when counting employees.

I have heard from a fellow in my State from Fairbanks. He owns several businesses there. It is a mix of businesses. One is a plumbing distribution company, but he also has a whole handful of little coffee shops. There is quite a difference between plumbing distribution and coffee shops.

For tax purposes, Mr. Vivlamore's businesses are all treated as separate entities, and for legal purposes, they are all treated as separate entities. That makes sense. But for some reason, for purposes of health insurance, they are all lumped into one bucket. He has his employees from the coffee shop, and he has employees from the plumbing distribution business, so he is going to be required to provide health insurance when the mandate kicks in because he employs more than 50 people across all of his companies together, even though he doesn't have 50 employees in every one of his very different businesses. He has talked to me about what he is going to do about the prospect of possibly downsizing because the cost of doing business under the ACA for him is just too high.

This issue is also resolved in the bill by reducing to zero the penalty for noncompliance with the employer mandate. Employers will once again be free to offer workers more hours, hire more staff, or expand operations without facing a large tax penalty for not offering insurance or an equally significant cost increase when they are forced to provide insurance.

I have been on the floor before, and I have asked the question before, but it is worth repeating: For whom is the Affordable Care Act actually affordable? It is certainly not affordable for the average, hard-working Alaskan who is being forced to shell out thousands of dollars for their premiums each month. It is not affordable for the school districts and other State entities that will pay huge taxes. It isn't affordable for the kids whose educations will potentially suffer.

This law is not affordable for us in Alaska. That is why I support the bill that repeals the ACA and wipes out these harmful impacts. We cannot stand by and see these premiums shoot through the roof 30 percent or more each year, see our businesses artificially constrained, and see the quality

of public education decline. It just doesn't work.

I appreciate the time this morning and look forward to the opportunity this afternoon to weigh in on some of these very significant issues that have great and considerable impact on the people of Alaska.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I thank Senator MURKOWSKI for the consent request.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 12 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS BILL AND POLICY RIDERS

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, many in Washington and on Wall Street seem to have collective amnesia. They seem to have forgotten, amazingly enough, about the destructive, devastating impact of the financial crisis even though it took place well less than a decade ago.

For millions of Americans, that crisis is unforgettable; millions haven't recovered. My wife and I live in the city of Cleveland in ZIP Code 44105. That ZIP Code in the first half of 2007 had more foreclosures than any ZIP Code in the United States of America. That was in large part because of Wall Street greed and a number of companies that engaged in predatory lending.

In September of 2008, Lehman Brothers collapsed—the largest bankruptcy in U.S. history—following a decade of unfair lending, Wall Street recklessness, lax supervision, and co-optation in too many cases by regulators and Members of Congress.

I recently interviewed former Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke on C–SPAN about his new book. The book title he was originally writing when he joined the Federal Reserve over a decade ago was going to be called ''The Age of Delusion: How Politicians and Central Bankers Created the Great Depression.'' This was about the Great Depression. I asked him what he would call a similar book or what a historian 20 years from now might call a similar book about the great recession, from which we have emerged over the last decade. He said it would be called ''Asleep at the Switch'' or ''Too Complacent.''

That complacency took a devastating toll on American families. That was the complacency of Congress, of the Bush administration, of regulators, of far too many people at OCC and the Fed who were captured, if you will—cognitive capture, regulatory capture, too close to the banking industry, too close to Wall Street, believing too much in the myths that were woven by Alan Greenspan and that crowd more than a decade ago.

The meltdown triggered a crisis that left America's economy hemorrhaging more than 750,000 jobs a month. Think back to January of 2009, when President Obama took the oath of office. We lost 750,000 jobs that month when Bush left office and Obama took office. The hemorrhaging, of course, didn't stop immediately, although over the last 5½ years, almost 6 years, we have seen job growth every single month.

By the time we hit bottom, we had lost 9 million jobs, the unemployment rate soared to 10 percent, and 5 million Americans lost their homes. The crisis—the worst since the Great Depression—took a shattering financial and psychological toll on a generation of Americans. Thirteen trillion dollars in household wealth was wiped out—again because of complacency and co-optation of the Federal Reserve under Alan Greenspan, of this U.S. Congress, and of the Bush administration.

Congress responded by passing Dodd-Frank. We put in place new rules to bring stability to markets, to ensure strong consumer investor protections, and to crack down on the reckless and irresponsible behavior of Wall Street. Again, to repeat: Since 2010, we have seen 68 months, 69 months, and 70 consecutive months of job growth—I believe the longest in modern economic history.

One of Wall Street reform's most important achievements was the creation of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It has an accountable director to serve as a counterbalance to the Wall Street lobby, and it has an independent funding stream. It was created to ensure that never again would consumers be an afterthought in our Nation's financial system.

Because of Wall Street reform, banks are required to fund themselves using more of their shareholders' money and to hold more cash or assets that can be sold easily—we call that liquidity—when they run into trouble, to undergo strength tests, and to strengthen risk management. That is why this banking system is more stable and safer than it was during the Bush years.

The law also created the Financial Stability Oversight Council to fill gaps in the regulatory framework and establish a forum for agencies to identify risks to preempt, precipitate, and preempt the identifiable risks that could contribute to the next financial crisis.

An overwhelming majority of Americans support regulation of Wall Street. They know that Wall Street did serious damage to our country. But in May the Senate banking committee reported out a sweeping financial deregulation package along party lines. I tried to negotiate with Senator SHELBY during the spring. They broke down once it became clear that the effort wasn't about negotiating; it was really about rolling back the most important parts of Wall Street reform.

Senate Republicans are now working to move this controversial bill—this repeal, this rollback, this slicing of Wall Street, of Dodd-Frank—to roll back these reforms through the appropriations process. This move, unprecedented in its scale, shows the Republicans will try to ram their agenda through Congress any way possible.

Last year, Republicans slipped a repeal of section 716 of Wall Street reform into the end-of-year funding bill. They have tried the same stealth strategy to undermine Wall Street reform, only this time it goes far beyond one provision. Under the guise of so-called regulatory relief for community banks and credit unions, Republicans are trying to undermine consumer protections, sensible regulations for larger bank holding oversight companies, and the Financial Stability Oversight Council. These are a lot of words, perhaps, but what we know is they again want to do Wall Street's bidding—not on the floor of the Senate. We are not debating these issues on the floor; they want to do back-room deals to take care of their Wall Street friends. That is what all of this is about. That is why we introduced our alternative proposal last year.

Now the good news is this: Republicans and Democrats agreed with our approach in the House of moving noncontroversial bipartisan provisions. I wish to give a couple of examples.

Under the Surface Transportation Conference Report, which we will be voting on later today, we included changes in the bank exam cycle for small banks—a major help for community banks. It was sponsored by Senator TOOMEY and Senator DONNELLY, a Republican and a Democrat. It streamlines privacy notices. It is something I had worked on last session as a sponsor. This session Senator MORAN and Senator HEITKAMP introduced it. It allows privately insured credit unions to become members of the Federal Home Loan Bank system, something I have worked on for some time. We have put these in the Transportation bill. We have done what we should do for community banks—not everything we should do, but we have done much of the agenda for the community banks and the small credit unions.

Our goal is to do this right, to debate these issues on the floor, and to help those institutions under $10 billion. They didn't cause the financial crisis; we know that—nor did banks the size of Huntington, $55 billion; of Fifth Third Bank, $130 billion. KeyCorp was $90 billion and is about to do an acquisition that will make them a little larger.

As the ranking member of Senate banking, I have heard time and again the calls for legislation to undermine the new financial rules. Let's help these community banks, but let's not do the bidding of Wall Street. In this bill, we are helping those community banks be more efficient, be able to cut some of their administrative costs, and still protect consumers.

What people want to do in the back room on the omnibus bill is jam all kinds of issues through the Senate that, frankly, are weakening Dodd-Frank. It will challenge and undermine the financial stability of our system.

It is pretty clear to me that far too many Members of this body have forgotten the lessons and forgotten what happened in 2007 to our country and to people in our great country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, the tragic murders that occurred in California yesterday are unthinkable and by all standards horrific. My thoughts and prayers today go out to all of the victims, their families, and the entire community. Today I would also like to take a moment to thank the brave first responders there who selflessly and honorably risked their own lives in order to protect the lives of others.

Following the tragic events of yesterday, President Obama unsurprisingly called to limit the Second Amendment rights of the American people through stricter gun control. I believe this is yet another example of the President using tragic events to push his political agenda.

Infringing on the rights of law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms is not the answer to curbing violent crime in America. Restrictive gun control measures only prevent law-abiding citizens from protecting themselves because criminal criminals, by definition, refuse to follow the law.

In addition to President Obama's misguided calls for gun control, he recently issued an Executive order to remove unarmed military surplus vehicles that were obtained through the section 1033 program from local law enforcement. These vehicles have been valuable to local law enforcement officials in my home State of Alabama, specifically in Calhoun County. They were also used by the local law enforcement people seeking to protect those in harm's way yesterday in California.

I have called on the President to reverse the dangerous decision he made in which he abuses the authority of his office, I believe, by making unilateral decisions through executive fiat. During this time of increased uncertainty at home and abroad, I believe the American people are looking to us for certainty that we will do everything in our power to keep them safe.

Unfortunately, I believe President Obama has once again chosen to attack and weaken law enforcement and law-abiding citizens instead of focusing on fighting against criminals and radical Islamic terrorists.

Let me be clear here today. The President's calls to increase gun control and remove equipment from law enforcement used to keep us safe only undermines the safety and security of the American people. We simply cannot and must not continue to let this administration infringe upon our constitutional rights and put law-abiding Americans in harm's way. I hope we will continue to fight for our constitutional rights here.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, shortly I will be asking consent to advance certain nominations of the President for confirmation by the Senate. I do that in my capacity as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. There are seven that I will bring up today, but there are many more waiting for action. Seven represents some of these nominees. There are others waiting for action.

What these seven all have in common—all seven—is that they are well qualified for the position, they have gone through the process in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—the committee of jurisdiction—they have had hearings, there have been questions asked, the vetting has been done, and they have cleared the committee by unanimous vote. There is no reason to withhold their confirmation when looking at their qualifications for the positions they have been nominated for.

In some cases, these nominees have been waiting as long as 6 months for confirmation on the floor of the Senate. In each of these instances, we are talking about confirming individuals to positions that have importance for our national security and that will be directly involved in protecting our country. Recent events only underscore the importance to have confirmed executive nominees to handle the challenges that are brought before our country.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR NO. 375

Let me start by first mentioning Tom Shannon. Tom Shannon has been nominated to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and is the Department's fourth ranking official, responsible for the management of six regional bureaus of the Department as well as the Bureau of International Organization Affairs. This is a tremendously important leadership position on key national security issues.

Among the many issues with which the Under Secretary will contend, we have the implementation of the Iran nuclear deal. This is the person who is responsible within the State Department as its top management, and I think every Member of the Senate wants to see this implementation done in a way that prevents Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state. This individual also will be monitoring the civil wars raging in Syria, Libya and Yemen, which we know have a major impact on the voids created that allow ISIL to be able to gain footholds. The growing turmoil in Venezuela, the conflict in eastern Ukraine, and the need to ensure the full implementation of the Minsk agreement, as it relates to Ukraine, are all on the plate of the person who holds this position.

Tom Shannon has been nominated and has gone through the process. He has received the full support of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He is a seasoned diplomat. We are fortunate that Ambassador Tom Shannon, a career member of our diplomatic corps who is held in universal respect and esteem by his colleagues, has been nominated to this position. Few diplomats have served our Nation under both Republican and Democratic administrations with as much integrity and ability.

In his current role as Counselor of the Department, he provides the Secretary with his insight and advice on a wide range of issues. He has previously served as Ambassador to Brazil, as Assistant Secretary of State, as Senior Director for Western Hemisphere Affairs at the National Security Council, and in challenging posts in Venezuela and South Africa, among others. He has also served as Acting Secretary for Political Affairs. So he already has the experience and the job training in order to accomplish this.

So as I said, there has been no objection raised as far as his qualifications and the need to confirm this appointment.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 375; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, reserving the right to object, in the hours that have followed the tragic shooting in San Bernardino, when all our prayers are with the families of those who were murdered and those who were injured, more and more of us are becoming concerned that this reflects a manifestation of radical Islamic terrorism here in America. The facts are still not entirely clear, but in the wake of the Paris attack, it is appearing more and more likely that is what this was.

In the wake of these horrific attacks by radical Islamic terrorists, it has become abundantly clear that President Obama's Iranian nuclear deal——

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's comments come off Republican time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRUZ. I didn't hear.

Mr. CARDIN. This is your time, not our time.

Mr. CRUZ. Sure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the time consumed by the Senator from Texas will come off the Republican time.

Mr. CRUZ. In light of these terrorist attacks, President Obama's Iranian nuclear deal looks worse and worse and worse.

The idea that the United States of America would be sending over $100 billion to the Ayatollah Khamenei—the

leading financier of terrorism in the world—is profoundly foolhardy. At the time that deal was being negotiated, I sent a letter to Secretary Kerry informing Secretary Kerry that under no circumstances should the Obama administration attempt to go to the United Nations and circumvent Congress with this foolhardy and catastrophic deal. In that letter to Secretary Kerry I said explicitly: Under no circumstances should the executive branch take such action before the congressional review process is complete. Thus, I ask that you provide written assurances that you will take all necessary steps to block any U.N. Security Council resolution approving the JCPOA until the statutory time line for congressional review has run its course. Until you provide such assurances, I intend to block all nominees for the Department of State and hold any legislation that reauthorizes funds for the Department of State.

This was fair warning, given ahead of time, that the State Department should not try to circumvent the Congress, should not try to undermine U.S. sovereignty, and should not go to the United Nations to try to approve a deal—particularly a deal that profoundly endangers the national security of this country. The Obama administration ignored my warnings and went to the United Nations anyway.

I would note that under the terms of the Congressional Review Act, the congressional review period has not yet run. The Congressional Review Act says that time does not begin to run until the President submits the entire deal to Congress. That statute defines the entire deal to include any and all side agreements. We know of at least two side agreements governing inspections that have not yet been given to this body. So, accordingly, the congressional review period has not yet begun, much less ceased.

When I told Secretary Kerry that if the State Department circumvented Congress and went to the United Nations, I would block State Department nominees, that was not an empty threat. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I certainly understand the right of the Senator to object. I would just hope that this could be resolved. It is not about the State Department being put at a disadvantage by not having these confirmed positions; it is the American people. These are security positions for which we have to have representatives, and not only of the State Department. As I go through these nominations, we will be talking about the Legal Adviser at the Department of State, and we will be talking about ambassadors.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR NO. 204

Next, Madam President, let me mention Brian Egan to be State Department Legal Adviser. The Legal Adviser is the principal adviser to the Department of State on all legal matters, domestic and international, arising in the context of the work of the Secretary of State and the Department as a whole. The Legal Adviser also advises the President and the National Security Council, as well as other Federal agencies, on all legal matters involving the conduct of foreign relations.

I think we are all familiar with the challenges we have that are raised every day in the Senate—issues raised about whether this is legally acceptable or not. We really should have a confirmed Legal Adviser to the State Department in order to respond to the concerns not only of the Congress but of the American people and our international partners.

Like Ambassador Shannon, Mr. Eagan has also served in both Republican and Democratic administrations. He entered public service in 2005 as a civil servant in the Office of Legal Adviser of the State Department, which was headed at the time by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. He has worked in the private sector. He has served as Assistant General Counsel for Enforcement and Intelligence at the Treasury Department. He has served on the National Security Council staff.

His is a nonpartisan, fairminded individual who clearly has the skills and ability to advise our policymakers well and lead the Office of Legal Adviser.

He has been waiting since June for floor action. This is not a matter that just recently came to the floor of the Senate. He has been waiting since June. It has now been 6 months.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 204; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, reserving the right to object, the single greatest national security threat facing the United States today is the threat of a nuclear Iran. The President's catastrophic Iran deal only increases the likelihood the Ayatollah Khamenei will possess nuclear weapons.

There are some in this body who suggest we should trust Iran. Well, I do trust Iran. When the Ayatollah Khamenei, with a cheering crowd, burns Israeli flags and American flags and promises ''Death to America,'' I trust the Ayatollah means what he is saying. Therefore, we should not be giving him over $100 billion and facilitating his getting nuclear weapons. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR NOS. 332 AND 333

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I next would like to address the nomination of David Robinson to the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Conflict and Stabilization Operations.

The Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations has an important role to play in helping the Department of State to address the multiplying violent conflicts around the world and the rise of violent extremist groups. I don't have to tell this body how many challenges we have globally in conflicts dealing with extremists. This is the key person to deal with this issue. Ambassador Robinson clearly has the background and skills to excel in the position for which he has been nominated. He is a career diplomat. This is a career diplomat. This is a person who at an early age went into service for our country—at great risk, as we know. With over 30 years of experience, he currently serves as the Principal Deputy High Representative in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where he oversees the implementation of the peace agreement that ended the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. He has served both Democratic and Republican administrations far and wide under dangerous and demanding circumstances. He was the Assistant Chief of Mission at the U.S. Embassy in Kabul, Afghanistan. Ambassador Robinson has served as the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Populations, Refugees, and Migration, and as U.S. Ambassador to Guyana from 2006 to 2008, and as Deputy Chief of Mission in Guyana and Paraguay.

This is a highly qualified individual, a career diplomat who has shown his commitment and dedication to serving our country. The position he has been nominated for is a critically important position at this time in our history.

Therefore, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 332 and 333; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I have not placed a hold on this nomination, because my hold has been limited to political nominees, not to career foreign service officers serving as ambassadors. That being said, Mr. GRASSLEY, the senior Senator from Iowa, has filed a formal notice of intent to object to this nomination, and, therefore, on behalf of the senior Senator from Iowa, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR NOS. 148 AND 263

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, Azita Raji has been nominated for Ambassador to Sweden and Samuel Heins

as Ambassador to Norway. Having representatives on the ground in Scandinavian countries is urgently needed. Both Sweden and Norway are key strategic allies and members of the Arctic Council. Russia's recent military activities in the Arctic and its disputed territorial claims in vast stretches of waters make the presence of a strong American voice in Sweden and Norway essential.

Moreover, nearly 300 Swedish citizens have left to fight in Syria or Iraq, making it the second largest country of origin per capita for foreign fighters in Europe. Put simply, we need representation in Stockholm and Oslo to protect the U.S. strategic interests abroad.

I particularly want to note the close ties and deep friendship the United States and Norway have, symbolized by the 32-foot Christmas tree at Union Station that is annually gifted to the American people by Norway, their gratitude for U.S. assistance during and after World War II.

Norway is a founding member of NATO alliance and has been more than diligent in attending to its obligations. It has contributed personnel to NATO's operations in Afghanistan, Libya, and the Balkans. Its former Prime Minister currently serves as the 13th Secretary General of NATO. Just this year, Norway assumed leadership responsibilities for NATO's air-policing mission over the Baltic States and is participating in a large-scale NATO anti-submarine exercise.

I am also pleased to note that these nominees for these critical positions have incredible backgrounds. Neither were controversial during the consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Azita Raji is an accomplished businesswoman with impressive international credentials. She was the vice president of J.P. Morgan Securities in New York, Tokyo, and Japan. She speaks five languages and has published in the Journal of the American Medical Association.

Samuel Heins is not only a highly respected lawyer in his home State of Minnesota, but with over 40 years of legal experience he is also a distinguished human rights advocate. He founded Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights. He was a private citizen member of the 2011 U.S. mission to the United Nations Human Rights Council in Geneva and has won human rights awards.

Samuel Heins has been waiting for 200 days. This is not a recent matter. Azita Raji has been waiting almost a year for confirmation. These are people who are ready to serve our country, critical allies.

Mr. President, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 148; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

This is the Azita Raji nomination

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. When Secretary Kerry chose to ignore my request that the State Department not submit this catastrophic Iranian nuclear deal to the United Nations, Secretary Kerry did so with open eyes. He did so knowing the consequences because I had spelled them out explicitly; that the political nominees he would want to put forward at the Department of State would not proceed if Secretary Kerry chose to undermine the authority of the Congress of the United States, to undermine the sovereignty of this country, and to instead treat the United Nations as the relevant decisionmaking body. He did so nonetheless.

As a consequence, the Obama administration is proceeding forward under this Iranian nuclear deal as if it is binding law. The Obama administration is proceeding ultra vires. They are proceeding contrary to law under the explicit terms of the Congressional Review Act. The period of time for congressional review has not begun to commence because the Obama administration has not submitted the entire deal to the U.S. Congress. They have not submitted the side deals. As a consequence, under explicit U.S. law, it is contrary to the law for the Obama administration to lift sanctions on Iran.

I wish to note to any bank at home or abroad that is in possession of Iranian assets, any bank that chooses to release those assets to the Ayatollah Khamenei or to other Iranian interests will be acting directly contrary to Federal statutory law. Even though President Obama and Secretary Kerry are choosing to disregard the law, that does not exonerate the private banks from potential civil liability in the billions or even criminal liability. The stakes are too high. I move to lay that motion on the table.

As we wrestle with the ravages of radical Islamic terrorism, the idea that the President of the United States is trying to send over $100 billion to the Ayatollah Khameini—a theocratic zealot who promises death to America—makes no sense at all. It means that if and when those billions of dollars are used to fund jihadists who murder Americans, the blood of those murders will be on this administration's hands. If you give billions of dollars to jihadists who have pledged to commit murder, you cannot wash your hands of responsibility for their doing exactly what they have told you they would do. Accordingly, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Let me remind our colleagues we are talking about the Ambassador to Sweden.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 263; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

This is the Samuel Heins nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR NO. 127

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to address the nomination of Cassandra Butts to the post to be Ambassador to the Bahamas. Cassandra Butts is currently a senior advisor to the CEO of the Millennium Challenge Corporation in Washington, DC. She is a leading attorney and former Deputy White House Counsel. She is known for her expertise in both domestic and foreign policy, particularly in economic development and migration policy, due to her work on the board of the National Immigration Forum.

I am confident she will apply these essential skills to the task of furthering the bilateral relationships between the Government of the Bahamas, a key U.S. Caribbean partner.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 127; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. Today the single greatest national security threat facing America is the threat of a nuclear Iran. President Obama's catastrophic Iranian nuclear deal dramatically increases the likelihood that the Ayatollah Khamenei will possess nuclear weapons and will use those nuclear weapons to commit horrific acts of terror. Moreover, Secretary Kerry's decision to go to the United Nations and circumvent the Congress of the United States, disregard the authority of the people of the United States was unacceptable and was profoundly damaging to this country. Accordingly, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, the nominees I went through unanimous consent requests—all are important to our national security. We are talking about Ambassadors. We are talking about career people whom we depend upon for advice, for handling conflict areas. It is in our national security interests to get these nominees confirmed. They have been held up for as long as a year in some cases.

I understand the right of individual Senators. I urge my colleagues, we have a responsibility to act on these nominations. I urge my colleagues to work with us. I applaud Senator CORKER. He has moved these nominations through the committee. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to work with us so we can get these individuals serving our country. They are public servants and they deserve our consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

H.R. 1599

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I want to note that right at this moment there are Senators of this esteemed body who are doing something that is not so esteemed. They are working to put into some of the must-pass legislation that we will be considering today and in the days to come something known as the DARK Act. The DARK Act is the Deny Americans the Right to Know Act. It takes away the ability of States to make sure the citizens of their State have the knowledge they would like to have about the food they eat.

We have seen in the toxics discussion in the Senate how important it is to individual States to have the ability to identify for their citizens what is in the everyday household products they have: their spoons, their plates, their bedding, and so forth—but it is much more important. It is an order of magnitude more important to citizens to have the right at the State level to decide how to inform individuals about what is in the food they eat.

This proposal to put the DARK Act—taking away the rights of the States, taking away the rights of citizens to use their democracy to be able to know what is in the food they eat—is being proposed to be put into a bill in the dark of night. The DARK Act should never go into legislation in this Senate. It should never be considered airdropped in, in the dark of night, into must-pass legislation. It should be debated openly in committee, thoroughly vetted, thoroughly considered, because that certainly is the type of consideration merited by an issue so fundamental to citizens as knowledge about the food they eat and the food their children eat.

Let us not, as a Senate, commit such a disgraceful act as taking away the State right and the individual desire to have knowledge about the fundamental food that we consume. Let us not have that airdropped in the dark of night. That would be a huge mistake.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, it has now been over 5 years since President Obama signed into law this so-called Affordable Care Act, a sweeping health care overhaul that had passed this Chamber without a single Republican vote. While legislation as important as this should have been held to the highest standard and included broad bipartisan support, President Obama and then the 60-vote congressional Democrats relied on fuzzy math and false promises to jam through this enormous, unwieldy health care measure that the American people overwhelmingly oppose. Such unilateral action has become President Obama's signature domestic policy legacy, but today all that bullying and brinkmanship comes to a screeching halt.

The legislation we will vote on today takes a critical step forward in lifting the burden that ObamaCare has placed on hard-working citizens across the country who have been saddled by rising premiums, increased health care costs, and reduced access to doctors and hospitals. It continues our long fight to repeal this harmful law and build a bridge to health care solutions that work.

Since ObamaCare's enactment, Americans have been left wondering what happened to all the promises: the promise to remove obstacles to obtaining coverage, the President's promise to reduce yearly premiums by up to $2,500 for a typical family, his promise to maintain existing providers. Remember, if you like your doctor you can keep him, his promise to prevent any form of new tax increases, and a promise to increase competition and provide greater choice.

Despite all of the President's assurances, ObamaCare has been full of empty promises that have made our Nation's health care problems worse. One of the reasons I voted against ObamaCare was because despite being portrayed as affordable, there were numerous predictions that Americans across the country would be faced with increased health care costs. Guess what. Such predictions have become reality. Just as recently as this past summer, the President promised that under ObamaCare health insurance premium increases would be ''modest.'' This is despite the fact that the State insurance regulators and actuaries were predicting the exact opposite outcome.

Let's take a look at how modest these cost increases will be for my home State of Arizona. Data released last month by the Department of Health and Human Services shows that Americans enrolled in the Federal marketplace will see an average premium increase of at least 7.5 percent with the second lowest so-called silver plans known as benchmark plans.

In Arizona, 24 exchange plans will see double-digit rate hikes in 2016. In Phoenix, premium increases are projected to top 19 percent. The highest average premium increase in my home State is projected to reach a whopping 78 percent.

My constituents in Arizona call and write me daily, begging and pleading that something be done to alleviate the financial hardship of ObamaCare.

Thomas from Flagstaff wrote to me and said his monthly premiums jumped from $200 to $600 a month. Jim, a resident of Arizona for over 25 years, will soon pay an additional $160 per week. It goes on and on and on. Stories such as these are unacceptable.

While the President and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to describe ObamaCare as a success, families, patients, doctors, and small businesses across America continue to suffer from the disastrous effects of the President's failed health care law.

Today I am proud to once again stand with my Republican colleagues as we continue the fight to repeal and replace ObamaCare. From the start, I opposed this sweeping scope of the health care law and proudly proposed the first Republican amendment to ObamaCare in 2009 which would have prevented the President from slashing Medicare by half a trillion dollars. Since then, I have continued my efforts by sponsoring numerous other pieces of legislation that would lift the burden that has been placed on individuals and small businesses alike.

Most recently, I introduced the Obamacare Opt-Out Act with Senator BARRASSO in this Congress, which would give Americans the freedom to opt-out of the individual mandate for health insurance coverage required by ObamaCare. It is critical that we eliminate this costly mandate which is estimated to cost Americans who decide not to enroll in ObamaCare roughly $695 per adult and $347 per child in 2016 and even more in the years ahead.

This legislation we will vote on today takes an even bigger step forward in freeing Americans from the harmful effects of this law. It provides relief to individuals and employers alike by eliminating costly penalties for those who fail to comply with ObamaCare's mandate. It repeals draconian tax increases—such as the medical device tax and the Cadillac tax—that have made health care more expensive and driven innovative companies to move critical operations and research and development overseas. It ensures that Americans will not experience any disruption in their health care coverage by delaying the implementation date by 2 years. Most importantly, it gets the government out of the way and puts patients in charge of their health care decisions and needs.

The fact is, we can repeal and replace ObamaCare with health care policies that work. For years I have underscored commonsense policy alternatives, such as providing Americans with a direct, refundable tax credit to help them pay for private health care, expanding the benefits of health savings accounts, passing medical liability reform, or ''tort reform,'' and extending the freedom to purchase health care across State lines. These are proposals that would provide immediate relief to Americans and my fellow Arizonans who have been left to choose between buying groceries or paying for health insurance under ObamaCare.

Perhaps the greatest flaw in President Obama's health care law is that it has severely limited consumers' access to quality care. Today, limited access is now commonplace, costs are increasing, and government bureaucrats remain at the center of an individual's health care decisions.

It is clear that any serious attempt to improve our health care system must begin with full repeal and replacement of ObamaCare—a mission I remain fully committed to fighting on behalf of the people of Arizona.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this critically important bill today. It will build a bridge from the President's broken promises to a better health care system for hard-working families in Arizona and across the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the vote series related to H.R. 3762, there be 2 minutes equally divided between each vote and that the first votes in the series be in relation to the Murray amendment No. 2876 and the Johnson amendment No. 2875, with a 60-vote affirmative threshold required for adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, we are on the verge of a series of votes, and we are also just a few days away from the third anniversary of the hideous and horrific shootings at Sandy Hook.

Once again, the unspeakable has happened in America. The mass murders in San Bernardino reminds us of the inaction by this body. Congress has become complicit by its inaction in this mass slaughter which continues in America. Yet, listening to the debate on the floor, one would think it is business as usual.

We are debating whether to repeal the Affordable Care Act again. How many times have we voted on that issue? How many times have we voted to defund Planned Parenthood? Yet what we see on the floor of the Senate and throughout Congress is a shrug of the shoulders. It can't be done or won't be done.

Now is the time for action. We are past the point of platitudes and prayers. We need them. San Bernardino deserves them. But prayers, thoughts, and hearts need to be matched by action. The time for action is now. We need to pass sensible, commonsense measures that will make America safer and better.

There is no single solution or panacea to stop gun violence, but inaction is not an option. A shrug of the shoulders is not acceptable. That is not what we were elected to do. We were elected to act and provide solutions. Strong laws, such as what we have in Connecticut, are a good start, but State laws will not prevent guns from crossing borders from States without strong laws. The States with the strongest laws are at the mercy of States with the weakest protection because borders are porous.

The question in America today is, What will it take—30,000 deaths a year, a mass shooting every day? A mass shooting is four or more individuals shot. What will it take for this body to act?

We are not going away. We are not giving up. We are not abandoning this fight. We are on the right side of history, and we will prevail. Today will be an opportunity to show which side we are on.

I urge my colleagues to support these sensible, commonsense amendments which will at least take a step—by no means a complete or even a fully adequate step—in the right direction.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, this week we have been debating the future of ObamaCare, which still remains unworkable, unaffordable, and more unpopular than ever. For millions of Americans, the law today represents nothing more than broken promises, higher costs, and fewer choices. Recent polling shows that most Americans still oppose this unprecedented expansion of government intrusion into health care decisions for hard-working families and small businesses.

That is why Leader MCCONNELL promised that we would send a bill to the President's desk repealing ObamaCare using budget reconciliation, and that is exactly what we are doing. There is a special provision under the budget that allows us to send a bill to the desk with a majority of votes in the House and a majority of votes in the Senate. The majority of votes in the House has occurred, and now we are debating changes to that bill.

The amendment's repeal of ObamaCare allowed under the rules of reconciliation—including its taxes, regulations and mandates—sets the stage for real health care reforms that strengthen the doctor-patient relationship, expands choices, lowers health care cost, and improves access to quality, affordable, innovative health care for each and every American.

As I noted at the start of this debate, ObamaCare will crush American households with more than $1 trillion in new taxes over the next 10 years. This means ObamaCare will cost taxpayers more than $116 billion every year and result in smaller paychecks for families while holding back small businesses from expanding and hiring new workers. For hardworking taxpayers, ObamaCare has meant more government, more bureaucracy, and more rules and regulations, along with soaring health care costs and less access to care.

By the time we are done, the Senate-passed ObamaCare repeal will eliminate more than $1 trillion in tax increases placed on the American people, while saving more than $500 billion in spending. Lifting the burdens and higher costs the President's law has placed on all Americans will help the Nation move forward from ObamaCare's broken promises to a better health care system for hardworking families across the country.

ObamaCare contained more than $1 trillion in tax hikes from over 20 different tax increases. These tax increases included a new excise tax on employer-sponsored insurance plans, the so-called ''Cadillac tax,'' taxes on insurance providers, prescription drugs, medical devices, a new tax on investment income, and additional taxes and other restrictions on Health Savings Accounts, among others. Eliminating these taxes can help boost economic growth.

The Senate bill repeals $1 trillion in tax increases included in ObamaCare: Cadillac tax, which would force companies to shift costs to employees or to reduce the value of the health care benefits they provide; medical device tax, which would harm healthcare innovation, stifle job creation, and increase the difficulty of delivering high quality patient care; health insurance tax, which would increase health insurance premiums; individual and employer mandates, which forced people to purchase a government defined level of health insurance; prescription drugs taxes, which would make critical medication more expensive; and health savings accounts tax, which would essentially make over-the-counter medicines more expensive by making them ineligible as qualified medical expenses.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, repealing ObamaCare would raise economic output, mainly by boosting the supply of labor. The resulting increase in public and private sector growth, GDP is projected to average .7 percent over the 2021 through 2025 period. Alone, those effects would reduce Federal overspending by $216 billion over the 2016 to 2025 period according to the CBO and Joint Committee on Taxation, JCT, estimate.

ObamaCare included over $800 billion in Medicare cuts. Instead of using those savings to strengthen and secure Medicare, the President, along with Congressional Democrats, took those funds and used them to create new entitlement programs. This bill ends the raid on Medicare to pay for ObamaCare and puts those funds back into Medicare, where they belong.

State exchanges were almost exclusively financed through $5.4 billion in grant money from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS. While costing billions of taxpayer dollars from hardworking families, most State exchanges have dramatically underperformed or failed. Some exchanges have received hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal grants, yet

are or were unable to accomplish their stated goal. In fact, recent news reports highlight more than $474 million of taxpayer funds were spent on failed exchanges for Massachusetts, Oregon, Nevada, and Maryland. Our measure ends this waste of taxpayer dollars.

Medicaid spending currently consumes nearly a quarter of every State dollar, passing education as the largest state budgetary commitment. This expansion under ObamaCare includes an unsustainable and costly guarantee of 90 to 100 percent Federal funds that will likely be shifted back to the States as the Federal Government begins looking for ways to cut spending and addressing its almost $19 trillion national debt. Most importantly, the bill provides for a transition to a more sustainable State partnership.

As I noted earlier, our Nation has made great strides in improving the quality of life for all Americans, but these transformative changes were always forged in the spirit of bipartisan compromise and cooperation. We still need health care reform, but it has to be done the right way. The bill the Senate will approve can help build a bridge from these broken promises to better care for each and every American.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

FARM BILL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the 2014 farm bill and attempts to change it by Members of this Congress. The farm bill process was a long, hard, and frustrating exercise. Nobody got everything they wanted, but in the end we got a new bill for farmers across the country.

I believe our country needs good farm policy, which means an adequate, yet limited safety net for farmers.

Our farmers face real, uncontrollable risks every year. The farm bill provides farmers with a number of programs that help mitigate those risks. That is why I was very concerned when I learned the budget deal was cutting $3 billion from the Federal crop insurance program.

That cut would have forced the Risk Management Agency at the Department of Agriculture to renegotiate the Standard Reinsurance Agreement next year and save $300 million per year. These cuts were almost universally opposed by rural America. Lenders, commodity groups, input suppliers, and many others opposed the cuts to the crop insurance program.

Beyond being bad policy, I opposed the crop insurance cuts because—like many of my colleagues on both the House and Senate Agriculture committees—I do not support reopening the 2014 farm bill. I am very glad the highway bill is going to reverse these cuts to the crop insurance program.

I also want to speak to the importance of not reopening the farm bill in the omnibus.

Section 739 of the House Agriculture Appropriations bill reauthorized commodity certificates. For those who don't remember what commodity certificates are, they are a way around payment limits. The language in the House bill specifically directs the USDA to administer commodity certificates as they were in 2008 when they were not subject to any payment limits at all.

I want to be very clear so there is no misunderstanding by those in this body or the agriculture lobby. Section 739 of the House Agriculture Appropriations bill brings back commodity certificates, which reopens the 2014 Farm Bill. If the agriculture community wants to be taken seriously, we should heed our own advice and not reopen the Farm Bill by reauthorizing commodity certificates.

I am opposing cuts to the crop insurance program today because that would reopen the farm bill. I hope tomorrow I don't have to oppose commodity certificates in the Omnibus because a few people want to reinstate unlimited farm subsidies.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2876

There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 2876, offered by the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am well aware that there are serious disagreements between Republicans and Democrats when it comes to women's health, but I would hope that despite our disagreements, they would at least allow us to vote on the important amendment I have offered to strike the harmful language defunding Planned Parenthood in this legislation and replace it with a new fund to support women's health care and clinic safety for staff and patients. Unfortunately, apparently my Republican colleagues are going to choose instead to just simply push this amendment aside and everything with it that we are doing for women and families.

Well, Planned Parenthood doctors and staff are not going to be pushed aside, even by the terrible violence we have seen all too often at women's health clinics. They are keeping their doors open. And the women and families who rely on these centers for their care and who believe women should be able to make their own choices aren't letting the political attacks we have seen today get in their way. They are standing up for what they believe.

While Republicans may want to avoid taking this tough vote, Democrats are going to keep making it very clear exactly where we stand: with Planned Parenthood and with women across the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the tabling amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Senator MURRAY proposes to establish a new women's health care and clinic safety and security fund to ensure that, among other goals, all women and men have access to health care services without threat of violence. No one disagrees with the goal of making sure all Americans have access to health care without fearing threats or violence. We certainly don't condone any of the violence anywhere in the United States.

The best way to ensure that women and men have affordable health care is to pass this repeal bill and repeal ObamaCare. For every American, ObamaCare has meant more government, more bureaucracy, and more rules and regulations, along with soaring health care costs and less access to care.

The most effective solution to improving the quality of and access to women's health care is to lower the cost and provide access to health care, not to create another fund with another new tax. ObamaCare already contains more than $1 trillion in new taxes, funding new and duplicative programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ENZI. I yield back any time, although evidently there is none.

Mr. President, I move to table the Murray amendment No. 2876 and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 311 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Wicker

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Booker	Cantwell
Bennet	Boxer	Cardin
Blumenthal	Brown	Carper

Casey	Klobuchar	Sanders
Coons	Leahy	Schatz
Donnelly	Markey	Schumer
Durbin	McCaskill	Shaheen
Feinstein	Menendez	Stabenow
Franken	Merkley	Tester
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Udall
Heinrich	Murphy	Warner
Heitkamp	Murray	Warren
Hirono	Nelson	Whitehouse
Kaine	Peters	Wyden
King	Reed	
Kirk	Reid	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes be 10 minutes in length and that the following amendments be in order following disposition of the Johnson amendment: the Brown-Wyden amendment No. 2883 and the Collins amendment No. 2885.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2875

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 2875, offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, on June 15, 2009, President Obama went to the American Medical Association to sell his health care plan to the doctors and to the American people. President Obama addressed the doctors, and he said:

> I know that there are millions of Americans who are content with their health care coverage—they like their plan and, most importantly, they value their relationship with their doctor. They trust you. And that means no matter how we reform health care, we will keep this promise to the American people: If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period. If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take that away, no matter what.

Now, Mr. President, we all know, unfortunately, that promise has been broken. So many people who supported the bill made that similar promise. But PolitiFact called it something else; they called it 2013's ''Lie of the Year.''

My amendment would restore that promise. My amendment would keep that promise to the American people.

I urge my colleagues, particularly those who made that promise—you have the opportunity to restore and convert that lie into a promise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the amendment that has just been described. Our colleague from Wisconsin is seeking to bring back the so-called grandfathered health plans that existed between 2010 and the end of 2013. My view is that this is something of a health care Frankenstein. All the plans that were grandfathered on December 31, 2013, and disappeared on that date would somehow be magically brought back to life by the Senator from Wisconsin. That is not the way the private health insurance market works in America. Many of the plans that were in existence on December 31, 2013, don't exist anymore. In the private market, which I support, plans change continually. Plans changed in 2014 and they changed again at the beginning of 2015.

It seems to me that what this amendment does is it distorts the private marketplace. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2875.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 312 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Enzi	Murkowski
Ayotte	Ernst	Paul
Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Bennet	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Graham	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Donnelly	Moran	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Reid
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Manchin	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McCaskill	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Heinrich	Nelson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have the floor for Senator ENZI and myself.

AMENDMENT NO. 2883 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

(Purpose: To maintain the 100 percent FMAP for the Medicaid expansion population)

I call up amendment No. 2883.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 2883 to amendment No. 2874.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be despensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of December 2, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate on the amendment.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the Brown-Casey-Wyden-Stabenow-Hirono amendment would permanently extend the Medicaid expansion matching rate at 100 percent. It would help strengthen Medicaid for 71 million Americans who rely on this program for quality, affordable health insurance.

Because of the ACA, more Americans can access comprehensive affordable care. Because of the Affordable Care Act, people in my State—600,000 Ohioans—now have Medicaid and affordable health insurance, in addition to other provisions of ACA. The best way to support States that have expanded Medicaid is by making the enhanced FMAP permanent.

Mr. President, that means States will now bear none of the cost of Medicaid expansion. We would pay for this amendment by closing corporate tax loopholes. It would provide States with fiscal security and free up State Medicaid budgets, as I have heard Senator ALEXANDER talk about so often. It would free up State Medicaid budgets for higher education and other kinds of State expenditures.

I encourage my colleagues to do the right thing and provide health care and to do smart budgeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I refuse to ask more American taxpayers, who have sacrificed so much already, to satiate the boundless Washington appetite for spending. Spending on Medicaid has experienced a 137 percent increase from $200 billion in 2000 to $476 billion in 2014, and many expect those figures to increase.

We all want individuals to have access to high quality health insurance. However, a 2011 study found that 31 percent of doctors are unwilling to accept new Medicaid patients. How can Americans access quality health care if doctors will not treat them?

Most importantly, adding more people to Medicaid will lead to a loss of jobs. A 2013 study concluded that for every 21 million adults who joined Medicaid, the economy will employ 511,000 to 2.2 million fewer people. The Obama recovery is a jobless recovery, and I refuse to exacerbate the unemployment. Instead of adding more and more people to the rolls of a failing Medicaid program——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, the pending amendment No. 2883 offered by the Senator from Ohio would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the authorizing committee's 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays. Therefore, I raise a point of order against this amendment pursuant to section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 313 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Reid
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Manchin	Shaheen
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	McCaskill	Tester
Donnelly	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—55

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Ayotte	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Graham	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Carper	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Sullivan
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	
Enzi	Murkowski	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 45, the nays are 55.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next amendments in order be the following: Casey, No. 2893; and Heller, No. 2882.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maine.

AMENDMENT NO. 2885 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2885.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS] proposes an amendment numbered 2885 to amendment No. 2874.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike section 101.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this amendment, which I offer with my colleagues Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator KIRK, would strike the provisions that would eliminate Federal funding, including Medicaid reimbursements, for Planned Parenthood. Otherwise, the likely result would be the closure of several hundred clinics across the country, depriving millions of women of the health care provider of their choice.

I want to make clear that our amendment does not include any new spending, it does not increase taxes, and it retains the current Hyde amendment language, which prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortions except in cases of rape, incest or where the life of the mother is at risk.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, Senator COLLINS, who is my friend and colleague from Maine, would strike a provision in this bill defunding Planned Parenthood and would continue directing Federal funds to that organization.

Earlier this year, I joined Senator ERNST, Senator PAUL, and other colleagues, and we introduced legislation that prohibits taxpayer dollars from funding Planned Parenthood and reasserts Congress's support for directing those funds to current providers of women's health care.

We absolutely should support health care choices for women. But Planned Parenthood is the single largest provider of abortions in the country. Directing increased taxpayer dollars to community health centers provides quality health care options to women without supporting the largest provider of abortions in the country. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 314 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Reid
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Kirk	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	McCaskill	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—52

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Ayotte	Flake	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rounds
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Capito	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	
Ernst	Paul	

The amendment (No. 2885) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENT NO. 2893 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a credit for married couples who are both employed and have young children, and for other purposes)

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2893.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASEY] proposes an amendment numbered 2893 to amendment No. 2874.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an amendment that deals with a fundamental issue for working families, and that is the cost childcare. By way of example, the weekly cost of childcare in Pennsylvania, roughly over the last 30 years, has gone up by 70 percent. In a State like ours that can mean over $10,600 per infant per family. We want to make sure this credit is fully available to working families. We want to increase the maximum amount to $3,000. Finally, we want to make sure it is fully refundable.

This amendment is paid for by offsets.

I thank Senator BALDWIN for the great work she did with us on this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that Senators MURRAY and REED of Rhode Island be added as cosponsors of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Senators CASEY and BALDWIN have proposed an amendment to further shift the tax burden onto high-income taxpayers. It would pay for new tax credits with the Buffett tax through taxing foreign inversion corporations as domestic and by expanding limitations on executive compensation deductibility.

This legislation is not the place to add one-sided cuts that have not been included in regular order negotiations going on between Congress and the administration and in the Finance Committee.

Further, passing this reconciliation legislation will repeal a dozen new taxes used to offset the cost of ObamaCare.

Comprehensive tax reform is needed to examine our system of credits and deductions to create a pro-growth tax policy across income spectrums, but not in this bill.

Washington already takes over $3 trillion per year from the American public, which is more than enough to fund necessary government functions. Increasing the tax burden on the most successful Americans discourages the work and jobs and investment necessary to grow America's economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ENZI. I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. President, the pending amendment No. 2893 offered by Senator CASEY would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the authorizing committees's 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays. Therefore, I raise a point of order against this amendment pursuant to section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 46, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 315 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Baldwin	Booker	Cantwell
Bennet	Boxer	Cardin
Blumenthal	Brown	Carper
Casey	Leahy	Sanders
Coons	Manchin	Schatz
Donnelly	Markey	Schumer
Durbin	McCaskill	Shaheen
Feinstein	Menendez	Stabenow
Franken	Merkley	Tester
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Udall
Heinrich	Murphy	Warner
Heitkamp	Murray	Warren
Hirono	Nelson	Whitehouse
Kaine	Peters	Wyden
King	Reed	
Klobuchar	Reid	

NAYS—54

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). On this vote, the yeas are 46, the nays are 54.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, continuing this advanced notice of what is coming up, I ask unanimous consent that the next amendment in order be the following: Shaheen amendment No. 2892.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 2882 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2882.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. HELLER] proposes an amendment numbered 2882 to amendment No. 2874.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the reinstatement of the tax on employee health insurance premiums and health plan benefits)

On page 5, beginning with line 24, strike through page 6, line 3.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, my amendment postpones the implementation of the Cadillac tax for the next 10 years. I think that is a good start on the legislation we have in front of us today. In fact, I think it is a great start, but I think we ought to take the next step. The next step is to repeal it altogether, and that is exactly what this amendment does. It is the only bipartisan piece of legislation that does just that.

To that end, I thank the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. HEINRICH, for his help and support in moving this legislation forward to where we are today.

Mr. President, there is no opposition to this legislation. There is no opposition in America to this legislation. I have 83 groups and organizations around this country. Unions support this amendment. The Chamber supports this amendment. Seniors support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mrs. MURRAY. We yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HELLER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 316 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Franken	Nelson
Ayotte	Gardner	Paul
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Reid
Booker	Heitkamp	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Brown	Hirono	Rounds
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sanders
Capito	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson	Schumer
Casey	King	Scott
Cassidy	Kirk	Sessions
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Collins	Lankford	Shelby
Coons	Leahy	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Markey	Tester
Crapo	McCain	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	Menendez	Toomey
Donnelly	Merkley	Udall
Enzi	Mikulski	Vitter
Ernst	Moran	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Fischer	Murphy	Wicker
Flake	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—10

Boxer	Durbin	Sasse
Carper	Kaine	Warner
Coats	Manchin	
Corker	McCaskill	

The amendment (No. 2882) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next amendments in order be the following: Cornyn amendment No. 2912 and Feinstein amendment No. 2910.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues, I expect the amendments next in order after those will be Grassley amendment No. 2914, followed by Manchin amendment No. 2908, but that is not locked in yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 2892 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

(Purpose: To improve mental health and substance use prevention and treatment)

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2892.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mrs. SHAHEEN] proposes an amendment numbered 2892 to amendment No. 2874.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, we are facing a public health emergency in New Hampshire and States across the country. Heroin and opioid abuse are at epidemic levels. This is important because it affects every State that is represented on the Senate floor. Each day, 120 Americans die of drug overdose; that is 2 deaths every hour. In New Hampshire we are losing one person every day from drug overdose. Drug overdose deaths have exceeded car crashes as the No. 1 cause of fatalities in this country.

This amendment recognizes that this is a public health emergency and that we need to provide additional resources to address it.

It does three things. First, it ensures that all health plans bought on the exchange cover mental health and addiction-related benefits. Second, it eliminates the Medicaid coverage exclusion that currently prohibits reimbursement for critically important inpatient facilities that treat mental illness. That is the 16-bed limit on those inpatient treatment facilities. Finally, it provides much needed funding to help States, municipalities, and their implementing partners prevent and treat mental illness and substance use disorders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. This is a public health emergency. This amendment is fully paid for. I urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I share my colleague's concern with the current state of mental health and substance abuse policies in the United States. Our health care system in many ways has failed to treat those who need care most desperately. However, as deeply as I believe we must strengthen mental health, I believe we have to do it right.

Consideration of mental health legislation should be thoughtful and should examine the real barriers to appropriate treatment. Simply throwing more money at the problem has proven time and again to be ineffective. That is why I am proud of the work being done by the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee. Chairman ALEXANDER, Ranking Member MURRAY, and 26 other Senators, including me, support the Mental Health Awareness and Improvement Act. That bill takes important steps to increase mental health awareness, prevention, and education; encourages the sharing of relevant mental health information; and assesses the barriers to integrating mental and behavioral health into primary care. It is a good step and should be done through the committee process.

I thank Senator SHAHEEN for offering this amendment and support the intent, but it has to be done right. And this increases taxes.

Mr. President, the pending amendment No. 2892 offered by Senator SHAHEEN would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the authorizing committee's 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays. Therefore, I raise a point of order against this amendment pursuant to section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 317 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Collins	McCaskill	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	

NAYS—52

Alexander	Cornyn	Graham
Barrasso	Cotton	Grassley
Blunt	Crapo	Hatch
Boozman	Cruz	Heller
Burr	Daines	Hoeven
Capito	Enzi	Inhofe
Cassidy	Ernst	Isakson
Coats	Fischer	Johnson
Cochran	Flake	Kirk
Corker	Gardner	Lankford
Lee	Risch	Sullivan
McCain	Roberts	Thune
McConnell	Rounds	Tillis
Moran	Rubio	Toomey
Murkowski	Sasse	Vitter
Paul	Scott	Wicker
Perdue	Sessions	
Portman	Shelby	

NOT VOTING—1

Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 52.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The majority whip.

AMENDMENT NO. 2912 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2912.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN] proposes an amendment numbered 2912 to amendment No. 2874.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this is an alternative to the Feinstein amendment we will be voting on next. Under the Feinstein amendment, the government without due process can take away from you valuable constitutional rights. They happen to be Second Amendment rights without notice and the opportunity to be heard. If you believe that the Federal Government is omniscient and all competent, vote for the Feinstein amendment, but I wish to point out that even our former colleague Teddy Kennedy was on this terror watch list at one point. Despite numerous efforts to try to get off of it, he never could—as well as our friend Catherine Stevens, former Ted Stevens' spouse.

My amendment would provide that due process, notice, and an opportunity to be heard, and provide new tools and increased authorities to prevent terrorism and prevent violence by blocking the transfer of firearms following that notice and opportunity to be heard, which would also give the judicial authority an opportunity to grant an emergency terrorism order which would actually detain the person who is identified and proven to be a terrorist.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, to give law enforcement the ability to take terrorists off the streets and prevent them from obtaining firearms while preserving important constitutional rights of law-abiding Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have great respect for the senior Senator from Texas, a former member of the Texas Supreme Court. How he could

make an argument like this is beyond my ability to comprehend.

This Republican amendment ties the hands of law enforcement. This amendment doesn't keep terrorists from getting guns. It simply delays their efforts for up to 72 hours. This amendment means that all a lawyer needs to do is gum up the works for a short time and an FBI terrorist suspect can walk away with a firearm—a legal firearm. That would be relatively easy to do. There are a lot of lawyers in this Chamber. Courts can't do virtually anything in 72 hours. How long does it take to shoot up a school, a mall, someone's home? Fifteen minutes? Five minutes? You could be on the terrorist watch list, go buy a gun, and let the time go by.

This is outrageous that people would try to run from this amendment. If you are on a terrorist watch list, you shouldn't be able to buy a gun. This would allow a terrorist to not only buy a gun but keep it for up to 72 hours.

The second aspect of this amendment is equally alarming. It takes money away from law enforcement. Here again, we are voting on something again and again. We already voted down this Vitter amendment, sanctuary cities bill, last month, which strips all local law enforcement from vital Federal community policing grants.

I am using a little bit of my leader time right now.

This strips local law enforcement from vital Federal community policing grants, targeted public safety and to build community trust. It cuts community development block grants, and the purpose of this is to ensure affordable housing and provide services to the most vulnerable in our communities.

Very quickly, this amendment takes the FBI out of the equation when it comes to keeping guns away from terrorists, and it takes away from local law enforcement agencies, threatening public safety. Is it any wonder that this is an anti-law enforcement amendment?

The legislation is opposed by the Fraternal Order of Police, Major Cities Chiefs Association, United States Conference of Mayors, and many others. This is a dangerous amendment. First of all, to use Senator Kennedy, let him be on the watch list. He is not going to go buy a gun and hurt anybody. These ridiculous assertions are just that—ridiculous. We are trying to say if you are on a watch list as being a terrorist, you shouldn't be able to buy a gun. It is as simple as that. My friend the Senator from California will lay this out. She has been the leader on guns in this Chamber for two decades.

Mr. CORNYN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No time for debate remains.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 10 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, to accept the argument of the Democratic leader, you would have to believe that the Federal Government is always right and is all-knowing and can deprive you of valuable constitutional rights without giving notice and an opportunity to be heard in front of an impartial tribunal—a judge. That is what the Democratic leader is suggesting. I think it is wrong and it is un-American. It violates the very core constitutional protections afforded to all Americans.

I urge Senators to vote for my alternative to the Feinstein amendment and against the Feinstein amendment, which would deprive people of their due process rights under the Constitution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is nothing unconstitutional about keeping a terrorist from buying a gun. That is what this is all about. Do we want people on a terrorist watch list to go buy a gun? The answer is no. That is what this amendment is all about. The Senator from California will explain it.

I raise a point of order against this ridiculous amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of the applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of amendment No. 2912, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 318 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Ayotte	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Graham	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Donnelly	Moran	
Enzi	Murkowski	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Booker	Cantwell
Bennet	Boxer	Cardin
Blumenthal	Brown	Carper
Casey	Klobuchar	Reid
Coons	Leahy	Sanders
Durbin	Markey	Schatz
Feinstein	McCaskill	Schumer
Franken	Menendez	Shaheen
Gillibrand	Merkley	Stabenow
Heinrich	Mikulski	Tester
Heitkamp	Murphy	Udall
Hirono	Murray	Warren
Kaine	Nelson	Whitehouse
King	Peters	Wyden
Kirk	Reed	

NOT VOTING—1

Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 44.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, continuing to march through the amendments, I ask unanimous consent that the next amendments in order be the following: Grassley amendment No. 2914 Manchin amendment No. 2908.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 2910 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

(Purpose: To increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of firearms or the issuance of firearms and explosives licenses to known or suspected dangerous terrorists)

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2910.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] proposes an amendment numbered 2910 to amendment No. 2874.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on an amendment which is identical to a bill I have introduced with Republican Congressman PETER KING. This amendment was proposed by the Bush administration's Department of Justice in 2007. It would allow the Attorney General to prevent a person from buying a gun or explosive if, one, the recipient is a known or suspected terrorist; and, two, the Attorney General has a reasonable belief that the recipient would use the firearm in connection with a terrorist act.

The bill has very broad law enforcement support, including the Major Cities Chiefs Association and the International Association of Chiefs of Police. New York Police Commissioner Bill Bratton, who was also chief of the Los Angeles Police Department, recently said on Meet the Press:

> If Congress really wants to do something instead of just talking about something, help us out with that Terrorist Watch List, those thousands of people that can purchase firearms in this country. I'm more worried about them than I am about Syrian refugees, to be quite frank with you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if you believe the Federal Government should be able to deprive an American citizen of one of their core constitutional rights without notice and an opportunity to be heard, then you should vote for the Senator's amendment. This is not the way we are supposed to do things in this country. If you think that the Federal Government never makes a mistake and that presumptively the decisions the Federal Government makes about putting you on a list because of some suspicions, then you should vote for the Senator's amendment. But we all know better than that. I have used the example of Teddy Kennedy, Captain Stevens, and others who were placed on these lists.

At the very least we ought to provide those individuals with an opportunity to be notified, and they should have a right to be heard by an impartial judicial tribunal to make those decisions.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Senator's amendment.

I have one other reason. The whole purpose of this amendment is to destroy the privileged status of this reconciliation bill. If this bill passes, it will destroy our ability to pass this reconciliation bill with 51 votes.

Again, I urge all of my colleagues to vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, the pending amendment No. 2910, offered by Senator FEINSTEIN, contains matter that is not within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee or the HELP Committee, and it is extraneous to H.R. 3762, a reconciliation bill. Therefore, I raise a point of order against the amendment pursuant to section 313(b)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act for the purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 319 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hirono	Peters
Booker	Kaine	Reed
Boxer	King	Reid
Brown	Kirk	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Leahy	Schumer
Carper	Manchin	Shaheen
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	McCaskill	Tester
Donnelly	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—54

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rubio
Coats	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeven	Scott
Collins	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 45, the nays are 54.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, after we finish the Grassley amendment and the Manchin amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the next amendments in order be the following: Bennet No. 2907 and Paul No. 2899.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 2914 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

(Purpose: To address gun violence, improve the availability of records to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, address mental illness in the criminal justice system, and end straw purchases and trafficking of illegal firearms, and for other purposes)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2914.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 2914 to amendment No. 2874.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. GRASSLEY. The Manchin-Toomey amendment that is going to be up next, I am told, won't prevent the next shooting or reduce crime or fix our mental health system. We need to also be worried about protecting the Second Amendment.

My amendment addresses the Obama administration's reduction in gun prosecutions by providing money to expand Project Exile and funding for prosecuting felons and fugitives who fail background checks, targeted to the highest crime jurisdictions. It criminalizes straw purchasing and gun trafficking, provides more resources for Secure Our Schools grants, and increases funding for mental health initiatives. It incentivizes States to provide mental health records to the background check database, clarifies what records should be submitted to the NCIS system, and it provides that military members can buy firearms in their State of residence or where they are stationed, so that what happened in Chattanooga doesn't happen again. Finally, this amendment also reduces funding to those municipalities that continue to defy the law with regard to the enforcement of immigration offenses, otherwise known as sanctuary cities.

I ask for adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the victims of gun violence and their families deserve more than a moment of silence; they deserve a moment of sanity.

We have coming before us a proposal by a Republican Senator and a Democratic Senator, Senator TOOMEY and Senator MANCHIN, a proposal to close the loopholes so that people who are convicted felons and people who are mentally unstable cannot buy firearms. Unfortunately, in the 100-page amendment being offered by the Senator from Iowa, exactly the opposite occurs. The loopholes are opened. When it comes to background checks, unfortunately, this doesn't do anything.

It does do one thing: It reduces the amount of money available to police departments and COP grants all across the United States if the Senator disagrees with their immigration policy. That is why the Fraternal Order of Police opposes it.

Let's have a moment of sanity. Let's please vote no on the Grassley amendment.

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment violates section 313(b)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for the purposes of amendment No. 2914, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 320 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Enzi	Paul
Ayotte	Ernst	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Gardner	Roberts
Burr	Graham	Rounds
Capito	Grassley	Rubio
Cassidy	Hatch	Sasse
Coats	Heller	Scott
Cochran	Hoeven	Sessions
Collins	Inhofe	Shelby
Corker	Isakson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Johnson	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Donnelly	Murkowski	

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Nelson
Bennet	Hirono	Peters
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reed
Booker	King	Reid
Boxer	Kirk	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Lee	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	McCaskill	Udall
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	
Heinrich	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 46.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The Senator from West Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 2908 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

(Purpose: 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)

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2908.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. MANCHIN] proposes an amendment numbered 2908 to Amendment No. 2874.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise again today to offer this important piece of legislation with my good friend PAT TOOMEY. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation. It makes all the sense in the world. Most of America supports the background checks that we are talking about.

As a law-abiding gun owner, I can assure you that basically I have been taught not to sell my gun to a stranger, not to sell my gun to a criminal, and not to sell my gun to someone who is severely mentally ill. That is how we were trained, and that is how most American law-abiding gun owners are trained. All this bill does is not infringe upon the rights of a personal transaction.

The only thing this piece of legislation does is to close a loophole in commercial transactions such as gun shows and Internet sales. I don't know if that person is a criminal. I don't know if that person is severely mentally ill. I just don't know that person. I was taught not to sell to that person or to give to that person unless I knew him.

This is the most commonsense idea supported by an overwhelming majority of Americans and an overwhelming majority of law-abiding gun owners in America.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in this bipartisan legislation to please support this. It is basically something that is long, long overdue, and these tragedies continue to happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on this side, we yield back all of our time.

Mr. President, the pending amendment No. 2908 contains matter that is not within the jurisdiction of the Finance or HELP Committees and is extraneous to H.R. 3762, a reconciliation bill. Therefore, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment violates section 313(b)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 321 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Boxer
Bennet	Booker	Brown
Cantwell	King	Peters
Cardin	Kirk	Reed
Carper	Klobuchar	Reid
Casey	Leahy	Sanders
Collins	Manchin	Schatz
Coons	Markey	Schumer
Donnelly	McCain	Shaheen
Durbin	McCaskill	Stabenow
Feinstein	Menendez	Tester
Franken	Merkley	Toomey
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Udall
Heinrich	Murphy	Warren
Hirono	Murray	Whitehouse
Kaine	Nelson	Wyden

NAYS—50

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Ayotte	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Graham	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Sasse
Coats	Heller	Scott
Cochran	Hoeven	Sessions
Corker	Inhofe	Shelby
Cornyn	Isakson	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—2

Johnson Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 50.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 2907 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2907.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BENNET] proposes an amendment numbered 2907 to amendment No. 2874.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide additional amounts to the Department of Veterans Affairs to increase the access of veterans to care and improve the physical infrastructure of the Department of Veterans Affairs and to impose a fair share tax on high-income taxpayers)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ADDITIONAL FUNDING TO INCREASE ACCESS OF VETERANS TO CARE AND IMPROVE PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to any increase in revenues received in the Treasury as the result of the enactment of section 59A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(1) $20,000,000,000 shall be made available, without further appropriation, to carry out the purposes described in section 801(b) of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note); and

(2) any remaining amounts shall be used for Federal budget deficit reduction or, if there is no Federal budget deficit, for reducing the Federal debt in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate.

SEC. _____. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

"PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

''Sec. 59A. Fair share tax.

"SEC. 59A. FAIR SHARE TAX.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—

''(1) IMPOSITITION OF TAX.—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

''(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

''(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

''(I) the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, over

''(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

''(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

''(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

''(B) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year, determined without regard to any tax liability determined under this section,

''(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

''(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

''(b) TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

''(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

''(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

''(2) MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

''(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

''(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

''(B) TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

''(c) HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'high-income taxpayer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of $1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

''(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2016, the $1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $10,000.

''(d) PAYROLL TAX.—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

''(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such tax is attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year or wages or compensation received during such taxable year, over

''(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

''(f) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, this amendment will help improve access to care for veterans all across the country and fill a huge unmet need. It provides funding to hire more doctors, nurses, social workers, and mental health professionals to serve our veterans. It will also help improve VA medical facilities by supporting upgrades and minor construction improvements.

In Colorado, our VA system has been plagued by long waiting times and a lack of access. Across the State, we have shortages of physicians, nurses, and mental health professionals, particularly in rural areas such as Alamosa and the San Luis Valley. We also know all too well in Colorado that much more accountability is needed within the VA, and we will continue to work to improve a bureaucracy that has plagued access to quality care.

The 400,000 veterans in Colorado and across the Nation deserve the best care we can offer. They deserve what they have been promised. This amendment is fully paid for, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I commend my colleague from Colorado for working to advance the needs of veterans. However, Senator BENNET proposes a $20-billion increase in spending paid for by a tax increase.

I believe the problem with Washington's finances is that our government spends too much and lives outside its means. I am continually working to put our country's finances on a sustainable path so that more Americans can keep more of their hard-earned money. What we don't need are higher taxes, and we do need bills that go through the proper committees.

Congress has continually rejected this one-sided tax policy. Comprehensive tax reform is needed to examine our system of credits. Washington already takes $3 trillion per year from the American public, which is more than enough to fund necessary government functions, provided we get through the regular process. So I urge my colleagues to oppose this.

Mr. President, the pending amendment No. 2907 would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the authorizing committee's 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays. Therefore, I raise a point of order against this amendment pursuant to section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, first, through the Chair, I say thank you to my colleague from Wyoming for his kind words about our efforts with respect to veterans.

Pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable provisions of that act for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 322 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Collins	McCaskill	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	

NAYS—52

Alexander	Cochran	Ernst
Barrasso	Corker	Fischer
Blunt	Cornyn	Flake
Boozman	Cotton	Gardner
Burr	Crapo	Graham
Capito	Cruz	Grassley
Cassidy	Daines	Hatch
Coats	Enzi	Heller

Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kirk
Lankford
Lee
McCain
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Perdue
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott
Sessions
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 52.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, next up of course will be the Paul amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that following the vote on that amendment, the next amendments in order be the following: Cardin amendment No. 2913 and Coats amendment No. 2888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 2899 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

(Purpose: To prevent the entry of extremists into the United States under the refugee program, and for other purposes)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2899.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 2899 to amendment No. 2874.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes evenly divided.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, we spend hundreds of billions of dollars defending our country, and yet we cannot truly defend our country unless we defend our border. My bill would place pause on issuing visas to countries that are at high risk for exporting terrorists to us. My bill would also say to visa waiver countries that in order to come and visit, you would have to go through global entry, which would require a background check.

I urge Senators who truly do want to defend our country and have increased border security to vote for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I hate to say this to my good friend from Kentucky, but this is a bumper sticker kind of amendment. It says it would keep us secure, but it would even stop tourists from visiting this country for at least 30 days.

Let's say you have a relative who is dying in this country, you will have to call them up and say: Don't die for at least 30 days so I can come over and say goodbye to you. It stops some of our closest allies in the Middle East. Jordan is probably our closest ally, and this legislation would stop us from issuing visas there.

It doesn't make us safer. It kills our tourist industry, it damages our economy, but most importantly it makes it look to the rest of the world like we are cowering in our shoes. I don't want to do that.

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment violates section 313(b)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of the applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of amendment No. 2899, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand that there is going to be a request for a 60-vote margin on this vote. If my understanding of that is correct, I withdraw my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a 60-vote threshold for adoption of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 89, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 323 Leg.]

YEAS—10

Barrasso
Cruz
Enzi
Kirk
Lee
Moran
Paul
Sessions
Shelby
Vitter

NAYS—89

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt
Booker
Boozman
Boxer
Brown
Burr
Cantwell
Capito
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Cassidy
Coats
Cochran
Collins
Coons
Corker
Cornyn
Cotton
Crapo
Daines
Donnelly
Durbin
Ernst
Feinstein
Fischer
Flake
Franken
Gardner
Gillibrand
Graham
Grassley
Hatch
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Heller
Hirono
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Lankford
Leahy
Manchin
Markey
McCain
McCaskill
McConnell
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Perdue
Peters
Portman
Reed
Reid
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Rubio
Sanders
Sasse
Schatz
Schumer
Scott
Shaheen
Stabenow
Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Udall
Warren
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCAIN be recognized to offer amendment No. 2884.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 2884 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2884.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 2884 to amendment No. 2874.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the personal importation of safe and affordable drugs from approved pharmacies in Canada)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SAFE AND AFFORDABLE DRUGS FROM CANADA.

Chapter VIII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 381 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 810. IMPORTATION BY INDIVIDUALS OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS FROM CANADA.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations permitting individuals to safely import into the United States a prescription drug described in subsection (b).

''(b) PRESCRIPTION DRUG.—A prescription drug described in this subsection—

''(1) is a prescription drug that—

''(A) is purchased from an approved Canadian pharmacy;

''(B) is dispensed by a pharmacist licensed to practice pharmacy and dispense prescription drugs in Canada;

''(C) is purchased for personal use by the individual, not for resale, in quantities that do not exceed a 90-day supply;

''(D) is filled using a valid prescription issued by a physician licensed to practice in a State in the United States; and

''(E) has the same active ingredient or ingredients, route of administration, dosage form, and strength as a prescription drug approved by the Secretary under chapter V; and

''(2) does not include—

''(A) a controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802));

''(B) a biological product (as defined in section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262));

''(C) an infused drug (including a peritoneal dialysis solution);

''(D) an intravenously injected drug;

''(E) a drug that is inhaled during surgery;

''(F) a parenteral drug;

''(G) a drug manufactured through 1 or more biotechnology processes, including—

''(i) a therapeutic DNA plasmid product;

''(ii) a therapeutic synthetic peptide product of not more than 40 amino acids;

''(iii) a monoclonal antibody product for in vivo use; and

''(iv) a therapeutic recombinant DNA-derived product;

''(H) a drug required to be refrigerated at any time during manufacturing, packing, processing, or holding; or

''(I) a photoreactive drug.

''(c) APPROVED CANADIAN PHARMACY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, an approved Canadian pharmacy is a pharmacy that—

''(A) is located in Canada; and

''(B) that the Secretary certifies—

''(i) is licensed to operate and dispense prescription drugs to individuals in Canada; and

''(ii) meets the criteria under paragraph (3).

''(2) PUBLICATION OF APPROVED CANADIAN PHARMACIES.—The Secretary shall publish on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration a list of approved Canadian pharmacies, including the Internet Web site address of each such approved Canadian pharmacy, from which individuals may purchase prescription drugs in accordance with subsection (a).

''(3) ADDITIONAL CRITERIA.—To be an approved Canadian pharmacy, the Secretary shall certify that the pharmacy—

''(A) has been in existence for a period of at least 5 years preceding the date of such certification and has a purpose other than to participate in the program established under this section;

''(B) operates in accordance with pharmacy standards set forth by the provincial pharmacy rules and regulations enacted in Canada;

''(C) has processes established by the pharmacy, or participates in another established process, to certify that the physical premises and data reporting procedures and licenses are in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, and has implemented policies designed to monitor ongoing compliance with such laws and regulations;

''(D) conducts or commits to participate in ongoing and comprehensive quality assurance programs and implements such quality assurance measures, including blind testing, to ensure the veracity and reliability of the findings of the quality assurance program;

''(E) agrees that laboratories approved by the Secretary shall be used to conduct product testing to determine the safety and efficacy of sample pharmaceutical products;

''(F) has established, or will establish or participate in, a process for resolving grievances and will be held accountable for violations of established guidelines and rules;

''(G) does not resell products from online pharmacies located outside Canada to customers in the United States; and

''(H) meets any other criteria established by the Secretary.''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. For how long?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For 1 minute.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to pay attention to the following: For a drug called Glumetza, the price in Canada is $157 for 90 tablets; the price in the United States is $4,643 for 90 tablets. Edecrin in Canada costs $607 per vial; in the United States, it costs $4,600 per vial. Biltricide costs $10.50 per tablet in Canada and $81 in the United States.

The list goes on and on.

My dear friends, let our citizens go to Canada and buy their prescription drugs. What is wrong with that? What is wrong with allowing them to be able to spend $157 for 90 tablets in Canada instead of $4,643 for 90 tablets? I will tell my colleagues what it is. It is the power of the pharmaceutical companies that will prevent us from letting Americans go to Canada and get those pharmaceuticals at a reasonable price.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McCAIN. Tragically, because this will be subject to a 60-vote threshold——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. McCAIN. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Tragically, some stooge of the pharmaceutical company will object on a budget point of order, so I will withdraw the amendment. But, my friends, you have not heard the last of this wonderful issue that I am having so much fun with but which is important to all of our constituents who are paying outrageous prices to the pharmaceutical companies.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona be given an additional half hour to explain his views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARRASSO. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT NO. 2884 WITHDRAWN

Mr. McCAIN. I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 2913 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2913.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] proposes an amendment numbered 2913 to amendment No. 2874.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the special rule for seniors relating to the income level for deduction of medical care expenses and to require high-income taxpayers to pay a fair share of taxes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. EXTENSION OF SPECIAL RULE FOR SENIORS RELATING TO INCOME LEVEL FOR DEDUCTION OF MEDICAL CARE EXPENSES.

Subsection (f) of section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(f) SPECIAL RULE.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2012, and ending before January 1, 2024, subsection (a) shall be applied with respect to a taxpayer by substituting '7.5 percent' for '10 percent' if such taxpayer or such taxpayer's spouse has attained age 65 before the close of such taxable year.''.

SEC. _____. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

''Sec. 59A. Fair share tax.

''SEC. 59A. FAIR SHARE TAX.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—

''(1) IMPOSITITION OF TAX.—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

''(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

''(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

''(I) the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, over

''(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

''(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

''(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

''(B) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year, determined without regard to any tax liability determined under this section,

''(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

''(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

''(b) TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

''(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

''(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

''(2) MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

''(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

''(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

''(B) TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

''(c) HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'high-income taxpayer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of $1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

''(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2016, the $1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $10,000.

''(d) PAYROLL TAX.—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

''(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such tax is attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year or wages or compensation received during such taxable year, over

''(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

''(f) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am not going to ask for a record vote on this amendment, and I hope that will help others try to move the process along.

This amendment is very similar to the next amendment, the Coats amendment, in that it is a clear indication that the Democrats understand that we want to extend the medical expense deduction of 7.5 percent threshold to seniors, which expires at the end of 2016. The difference is that we don't believe it should be paid for on the backs of our seniors, and that is why this amendment would have it paid for by a minimum tax of 30 percent on those who earn over $1 million dollars, the so-called Buffett rule.

The Coats amendment that is coming up next is on the backs of seniors by denying the indexing of the $85,000 threshold for seniors to pay the additional Medicare premiums. I will have a chance to talk about that in a moment, but this amendment allows us to extend the medical expense deduction of 7.5 percent threshold but does it without attacking our seniors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Maryland for being willing to take a voice vote, knowing that would be in the minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2913.

The amendment (No. 2913) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 2888 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] proposes an amendment numbered 2888 to amendment No. 2874.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the special rule for seniors relating to the income level for deduction of medical care expenses, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. EXTENSION OF SPECIAL RULE FOR SENIORS RELATING TO INCOME LEVEL FOR DEDUCTION OF MEDICAL CARE EXPENSES.

Subsection (f) of section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(f) SPECIAL RULE.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2012, and ending before January 1, 2024, subsection (a) shall be applied with respect to a taxpayer by substituting '7.5 percent' for '10 percent' if such taxpayer or such taxpayer's spouse has attained age 65 before the close of such taxable year.''.

SEC. ____. TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF THE INFLATION ADJUSTMENT IN THE CALCULATION OF MEDICARE PART B AND PART D PREMIUMS.

Section 1839(i)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395r(i)(5)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''2018 and 2019'' and inserting ''in 2018 through 2025''; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking ''2020, August 2018'' and inserting ''2026, August 2024''.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, similarly, as Mr. CARDIN has said, what this does is to continue something that was put into the Affordable Care Act, a rise between 7.5 percent of adjusted gross income before you can begin deducting to 10 percent of adjusted gross income before you can deduct. For seniors, an exemption was provided so that seniors could stay at the 7.5 percent level. This expires next year. My amendment essentially extends this for 7 years. It is to the benefit of seniors to do this. For those seniors who find excessive medical expenses facing them, this is something that was supported, obviously, by everyone across the aisle in the Affordable Care Act, and I am extending this for an additional 7 years with this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support for low-income and middle-income seniors the excessive medical cost by adopting the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment because of how it is paid for. Seniors who have $85,000 of income have to pay a higher Part B premium today. We have indexed that because, as I think Members on both sides of the aisle agree, we believe that brackets should have that type of index so that our seniors are protected from inflationary growth.

The problem with the Coats amendment is that he removes that index through 2025. This is an attack on our seniors. There is no way that we should be paying for this worthwhile extender. I don't disagree with the extender, but I do take exception with paying for it on the backs of our seniors, and I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, if I could just respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2888.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 324 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Alexander	Crapo	Isakson
Ayotte	Cruz	Johnson
Barrasso	Daines	Kaine
Blunt	Enzi	King
Boozman	Ernst	Kirk
Burr	Fischer	Lankford
Capito	Flake	Lee
Cassidy	Gardner	Manchin
Coats	Graham	McCain
Cochran	Grassley	McCaskill
Collins	Hatch	McConnell
Corker	Heller	Moran
Cornyn	Hoeven	Murkowski
Cotton	Inhofe	Paul

Perdue	Sasse	Thune
Portman	Scott	Tillis
Risch	Sessions	Toomey
Roberts	Shelby	Vitter
Rounds	Sullivan	Warner
Rubio	Tester	Wicker

NAYS—39

Baldwin	Feinstein	Murray
Bennet	Franken	Nelson
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reid
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	Menendez	Udall
Coons	Merkley	Warren
Donnelly	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Sanders

The amendment (No. 2888) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following disposition of the Paul amendment, Senator MCCONNELL or his designee be recognized to offer amendment No. 2916; further, that Senator REID or his designee be recognized to offer Byrd points of order against amendment No. 2916 and that Senator MCCONNELL or his designee be recognized to make the relevant motion to waive; and that following the disposition of the motion to waive, the only three amendments remaining in order be the following: Reid amendment No. 2917, Baldwin amendment No. 2919, and Murphy amendment No. 2918.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 22

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of H.R. 3762, the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 22; further, that it be in order for the majority leader or his designee to offer a cloture motion on the conference report; and that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees on the cloture motion; I further ask that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture; finally, if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate vote on adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

I am so not going to object. I just wanted to thank you and thank everybody. I think this is a moment all of us have waited for, for a long time, so I am not objecting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to announce to everybody there will be up to five votes, and on those five votes we will have 10-minute rollcall votes. We intend to enforce the 10 minutes, so it would be a good idea for everybody to stay close to the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the direction we are going, but I would hope that we would have, really, 10-minute votes. One way to enforce that is to have people miss a couple of these votes, OK? Because people come strolling in thinking they are going to be protected, so I would hope it would be 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next amendment be Paul amendment No. 2915 and that it be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 2915 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

(Purpose: To restore Second Amendment rights in the District of Columbia)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2915.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 2915 to amendment No. 2874.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes equally divided on the amendment.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, last week the District of Columbia police chief said that if you see an active shooter, take them down. The problem is it is very difficult to own a gun in DC, and it is nearly impossible to have a gun with you if you were to see an active shooter.

So my amendment would create a District of Columbia concealed carry permit program. It would also allow national reciprocity for concealed carry. It would also allow Active-Duty Forces to carry concealed carry-on Department of Defense properties.

I ask the Senate and those Senators who believe in self-defense to vote for this amendment.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am rather shocked at this amendment by my friend—and he is my friend. If I stood here and said: I don't like the laws in Lexington, KY, and I think that Big Brother ought to decide we should repeal their laws because I don't like it—that is ridiculous. The fact is, I am shocked that a Libertarian would stand here and offer this.

I thought that Libertarians believe in freedom of localities over Big Government. So why would you wipe out duly enacted local laws? DC has its own unique needs. We know how many diplomats come here. We know the rest. It is quite different. We are a definite target, but the fact is, I urge my colleagues to stand and be counted here on behalf of local control.

I started off as a county supervisor. I didn't want other entities telling me what to do. I think we ought to vote no on this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to Paul amendment No. 2915.

Mr. PAUL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 325 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Enzi	Murkowski
Ayotte	Ernst	Paul
Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Blunt	Flake	Portman
Boozman	Gardner	Risch
Burr	Graham	Roberts
Capito	Grassley	Rounds
Cassidy	Hatch	Rubio
Coats	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeven	Scott
Collins	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Donnelly	Moran	Wicker

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Heinrich	Murray
Bennet	Heitkamp	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hirono	Peters
Booker	Kaine	Reed
Boxer	King	Reid
Brown	Kirk	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	McCaskill	Udall
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENT NO. 2916 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2874

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2916.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for Mr. MCCONNELL, proposes an amendment numbered 2916 to amendment No. 2874.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, over the last several years our country has taken some important steps forward when it comes to health care. More than 16 million people have gained the peace of mind and security that comes with having health care coverage. Tens of millions of people with preexisting conditions no longer have to worry about insurance companies turning them away. Young adults in our country are able to stay covered under their parents' insurance as they start out in life. And there is so much more. But, as I have said many times, the work did not end when the Affordable Care Act passed—far from it. I am ready to continue working with anyone who has good ideas about how to continue making health care more affordable, expand coverage, and improve quality of care.

Unfortunately, with this latest tired political effort to dismantle critical health care reforms, my Republican colleagues are once again making it clear that they want to take our health care system back to the bad old days. This is a major substitute amendment that my Republican colleagues just offered. It is yet another effort to pander to the extreme political base rather than working with us to strengthen health care for our families.

Even the Parliamentarian agreed with us today that repealing these important premium stabilization programs does not have a sufficient budget impact and is subject to the Byrd rule.

So I am raising a point of order today to strike section 105(b) from the amendment, which repeals the risk corridor program. It is a vital program to make sure premiums are affordable and stable for our working families. Repealing it would result in increased premiums, more uninsured, and less competition in the market.

This amendment represents a step forward for our health care system, not backward. I hope Republicans will drop the politics and join us in supporting it.

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that section 105(b) of the pending amendment violates section 313(b)(1)(D) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, ''premium stabilization'' is a fancy term for bailout. What this basically seeks to strike out is a provision that takes out the money for a bailout fund, for taxpayer money that would be used to bail out insurance companies that participate in ObamaCare. Why should the American taxpayer have to bail out private insurance companies that are losing money on ObamaCare?

Last year, because we passed this provision, we saved the American taxpayers $2.5 billion. But now, because these companies have lobbyists who come up here and lobby to get their money, we are supposed to leave in this fund to bail out private insurance companies. This is outrageous.

If you want to be involved in the exchanges—and of course I want us to repeal the whole lot, but if you want to be involved in these exchanges and you lose money, the American taxpayer should not have to bail you out to the tune of over $2 billion, and that is what they are asking for.

Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of amendment No. 2916, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 326 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Ayotte	Flake	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rounds
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Capito	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Durbin	Markey
Bennet	Feinstein	McCaskill
Blumenthal	Franken	Menendez
Booker	Gillibrand	Merkley
Boxer	Heinrich	Mikulski
Brown	Heitkamp	Murphy
Cantwell	Hirono	Murray
Cardin	Kaine	Nelson
Carper	King	Peters
Casey	Kirk	Reed
Coons	Klobuchar	Reid
Corker	Leahy	Schatz
Donnelly	Manchin	Schumer
Shaheen	Udall	Whitehouse
Stabenow	Warner	Wyden
Tester	Warren	

NOT VOTING—1

Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 47.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained, and section 105(b) is stricken.

The Democratic leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 2917 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2916

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the clerk to report amendment No. 2917.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2917 to amendment No. 2916.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the reinstatement of the tax on employee health insurance premiums and health plan benefits)

In section 209, strike subsection (c).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. There is no shortage of contradictions today from my Republican friends. The first amendment was called, ''If you like what you have, you can keep it.'' A couple of hours later, the same Republicans came back and voted to strip the health care for 22 million Americans.

In one of the few bipartisan moments today, 90 Senators voted to remove the provision that would restart the Cadillac tax in 2025. Yet minutes later, the Republican leader offered the pending substitute amendment to put that provision back in.

Do they really believe those who oppose the Cadillac tax will not recognize that they voted with them and then immediately reversed themselves and voted against them? I am offering them a chance to correct the record.

My amendment will again remove the provision that restarts the Cadillac tax in 2025. I urge all Senators, particularly the 90 who just voted yes, to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I appreciate the senior Senator from Nevada protecting the bipartisan amendment that was put forward by the junior Senator from Nevada to make sure that stays in the bill. I suggest that we have a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2917) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT NO. 2919 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2916

(Purpose: To ensure that individuals can keep their health insurance coverage)

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2919.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Ms. BALDWIN] proposes an amendment numbered 2919 to amendment No. 2916.

Ms. BALDWIN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of my amendment to allow families in Wisconsin and across the country to keep their high-quality affordable health insurance under the Affordable Care Act.

My Republican friends want to repeal the Affordable Care Act and turn back the clock to the days when only the healthy and wealthy could afford the luxury of quality health insurance. The plan before us would strip millions of Americans of their premium tax credits and take away new Medicaid coverage for thousands of people across this country.

My amendment is simple. It would prevent Republicans from taking away these tax credits and Medicaid for millions of low-income Americans. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, over 183,000 Wisconsinites—hard-working Wisconsinites—have obtained quality, affordable private health insurance coverage through the marketplace. Almost 90 percent of these Wisconsinites are receiving support to make their coverage more affordable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. BALDWIN. I ask unanimous consent for 10 more seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. BALDWIN. Americans deserve to know their coverage will be there when they need it the most. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment because in the United States of America, health care should be a right guaranteed to all, not a privilege reserved for the few.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. This amendment would exempt individuals eligible for advanced premium tax credits from the larger tax credit repeal in the bill. As a matter of policy and fairness, I do not believe that just because an individual is eligible for an advanceable tax credit, they should be exempt from the larger repeal.

I also object to the repeated attempt to pay for this amendment by increasing taxes on hard-working Americans. I urge my colleagues to oppose this message.

The pending amendment No. 2919 would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the authorizing committee's 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays. Therefore, I raise a point of order against this amendment pursuant to section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 327 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Reid
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—54

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 45, the nays are 54.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Connecticut.

AMENDMENT NO. 2918 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2916

(Purpose: To protect victims of violence or disease, veterans, workers who have lost their health insurance and their jobs, and other vulnerable populations from the repeal of the advanced premium tax credit)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2918.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MURPHY] proposes an amendment numbered 2918 to amendment No. 2916.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, when President Clinton proposed his health care bill in 1993, Republicans were so upset that they came up with a radical idea. This radical idea was to give tax credits to poor people to buy private insurance, to set up an insurance exchange where they could do that, to ban preexisting conditions, and to include an individual mandate—in short, the Affordable Care Act, built by Republicans, many of them still in this Chamber today.

At the heart of that proposal was the idea that people should get a tax cut in order to be able to buy private insurance. At the heart of the underlying Republican amendment is a gutting of that ability of individuals to go out and buy private insurance for themselves.

This amendment is pretty simple. It says that at the very least we can come together on the idea that we should preserve those tax credits for the most vulnerable—for pregnant women, for victims of domestic violence, for people suffering from heart disease, cancer, and Alzheimer's. At the very least, we can come together and decide to protect those tax credits—a Republican idea at the genesis for those vulnerable individuals.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Under ObamaCare, health insurance plans are decreasing, they are narrower, and they are giving sick individuals fewer choices and fewer options over their health care.

Repealing ObamaCare is the first step in moving toward health care that is better for all Americans, including those who Senators MURPHY and STABENOW intend to help.

This amendment also again proposes the Buffett tax, taxing foreign inversion corporations as domestic, and expanding limitations on executive compensation deductibility.

I believe the problem with Washington's finances is that our government spends too much and lives outside its means. I am continually working to put our country's finances on a sustainable path so that more Americans can keep more of their hard-earned money. We don't need higher taxes.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the upcoming motion to waive.

Mr. President, the pending amendment No. 2918 would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the authorizing committee's 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays. Therefore, I raise a point of order against this amendment pursuant to section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) 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 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 328 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Collins	McCaskill	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—1

Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 46, the nays are 53.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 2916, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on amendment No. 2916, as amended, offered by the majority leader.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are about to have a voice vote on the substitute amendment, and I would not object to a voice vote, since I know we have all been here a long time, but I would just like to point out to everyone that the substitute amendment is a major bill that has just been introduced that we are now voting on. I assume everyone has read every word of it.

We have been debating 20 hours and just got a major amendment a few hours ago that doubles down on all of the deep and harmful bill that is in front of us, and it is really objectionable to those on our side that after 20 hours of debate on a number of amendments we get a major substitute amendment that we are voting on.

I would not object to it being a voice vote, but I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield back the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2916, as amended.

The amendment (No. 2916), as amended, was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2874, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on amendment No. 2874, as amended, offered by the majority leader.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield back our time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yeld back all time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2874, as amended.

The amendment (No. 2874), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for years the American people have been calling on Washington to build a bridge away from ObamaCare. For years Democrats prevented the Senate from passing legislation to do just that, but in just a moment that will change.

It will be a victory for the middle-class families who have endured this law's pain far too long on their medical choices, on the affordability of their care, on the availability of their doctors and hospitals, and on the insurance they liked and wanted to keep. A new Senate that is back on the side of the American people will vote to move beyond all the broken promises, all the higher costs, and all the failures. We will vote to build a bridge away from ObamaCare and toward better care. We will vote for a new beginning.

We hope the House will again do the same, and then President Obama will have a choice. He can defend the status quo that has failed the middle class by vetoing the bill or he can work toward a new beginning and better care by signing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as I have said before, I am very proud of the progress we have made over the last few years toward a health care system that actually works for our families and puts their needs first.

Today more than 16 million people have gained the peace of mind and security that comes with health care coverage. Tens of millions of people with preexisting conditions no longer have to worry about insurance companies turning them away, and young adults in this country are able to stay covered as they start out their lives, but the work didn't end when the Affordable Care Act was passed—far from it.

So I am ready, and I know our colleagues on this side of the aisle are also, to work with anyone who has good ideas about how we continue making health care more affordable, expanding coverage, and improving the quality of care.

The legislation we have now spent the last few days debating, which has no chance for becoming law, will do the exact opposite. This will undo the progress we have made. It is not what our families and communities want.

I hope that once this partisan bill reaches the dead-end it has always been headed for, Republicans will finally drop the politics and work with us to deliver results for the families and communities we serve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having read the third time, the question is, shall the bill pass?

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 329 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Ayotte	Flake	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rounds
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Capito	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Casey	Heitkamp
Bennet	Collins	Hirono
Blumenthal	Coons	Kaine
Booker	Donnelly	King
Boxer	Durbin	Kirk
Brown	Feinstein	Klobuchar
Cantwell	Franken	Leahy
Cardin	Gillibrand	Manchin
Carper	Heinrich	Markey

McCaskill	Peters	Tester
Menendez	Reed	Udall
Merkley	Reid	Warner
Mikulski	Schatz	Warren
Murphy	Schumer	Whitehouse
Murray	Shaheen	Wyden
Nelson	Stabenow	

NOT VOTING—1

Sanders

The bill (H.R. 3762), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a 60-affirmative vote be required for adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all of our colleagues, there will be only two votes in relation to the highway bill, and those will be the last votes of the week.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2015—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 22, which will be stated by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 22), to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, having met, have agreed that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment and the House agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of December 1, 2015.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 30 minutes of debate equally divided.

Who yields time?

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I wish to clarify today a provision included in the FAST Act conference report.

In order to build and restore the Nation's highway infrastructure without breaking the bank to do so, we are going to need the best and latest in cost-saving construction technologies to help us attain that goal.

I supported a provision in the Senate bill that would do just that with regard to construction for key highway components, such as bridge abutments, erosion control on highway waterways, and sound walls. My language specifically identified ''innovative segmental wall technology for soil bank stabilization and roadway sound attenuation, and articulated technology for hydraulic sheer-resistant erosion control'' as technologies for research and deployment action by the Federal Highway Administration, FHWA.

A core value shared by all three technologies is that they can save taxpayer dollars. And we should certainly encourage FHWA to engage in research and deployment on them.

For example, one of the practical and expensive problems with highway construction is moving and dispensing with excavated dirt. Segmental retaining wall, or SRW, technology can reduce transportation construction costs to the taxpayers by allowing the use of in situ soils in building segmental retaining walls rather than treating the excavated dirt as waste and hauling it away. Using the native soils for bank reinforcement can save the hauling costs and time for dirt removal, also reducing construction time. Similar segmental unit technology can be used to provide additional choices that are also aesthetically appealing for transportation designers to consider for sound attenuation.

And articulated segmented unit technology for erosion control, known as ACB for the concrete blocks usually used for this purpose linked together in a durable matrix, is especially durable and resistant to overtopping in high-water events. Overtopping is a major problem in high-water events that can degrade or ruin the existing erosion control measures. Rebuilding and replacing is always a huge cost that we should seek to avoid.

While the conference report does not retain my provision, we still have options to save the taxpayers money. I would like to point out that provisions appear elsewhere in the conference report that can give FHWA essentially the same mission, albeit articulated in a different way.

Section 1428 of the conference report states that ''the Secretary shall encourage the use of durable, resilient and sustainable materials and practices, including the use of geosynthetic materials and other innovative technologies, in carrying out the activities of the Federal Highway Administration.''

Section 1428 might be an alternate means of articulating the same concepts I supported with regard to the innovative segmental wall, or SRW, technology. SRW walls use concrete block facing materials that are obviously highly durable, resilient, and sustainable. These facing units are anchored into the soils using geosynthetic ties that are also highly tough and durable and described in Section 1428.

In passing the conference report, I would like to clarify for FHWA staff to consider SRW technology, using the durable, resilient, sustainable materials anchored with geosynthetics as one of the technologies envisioned in Section 1428. ACBs and segmental block sound walls also fit the definition of durable, resilient, and sustainable materials and techniques set forth in this section and should enjoy a similar favorable view under the umbrella of Section 1428.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the highway trust fund, HTF, and the conference report we will be considering shortly to accompany the surface transportation reauthorization bill, which is called the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, FAST Act.

First, I am pleased to see that this bill provides 5 years of funding for our Nation's transportation infrastructure. That is the kind of long-range certainty our State and local officials and the private sector need to plan transportation infrastructure projects in a thoughtful and responsible way.

While there are many excellent provisions in the bill, I do have significant concerns about the way our Nation's surface transportation infrastructure is being funded.

First, I will speak about the policy within the bill. I am pleased that the conference committee has retained this Nation's commitment to transportation alternatives. This bill includes more than $4 billion for bike and pedestrian infrastructure, making our roads safer for everyone who uses them. My bill creating a dedicated program for nonmotorized safety is also included in the reauthorization, which will support things like bike safety training programs for both bicyclists and drivers, again making our streets safer for all who use them.

Furthermore, the section 5340 bus program has been kept intact. This program is for high-density areas like Baltimore and Washington, DC, which cannot simply widen a road to accommodate extra travelers. The FAST Act provides more than $2.7 billion to high-density areas. This is significant for Maryland in particular. Over the life of this bill, Maryland should receive more than $4.4 billion in Federal Highway Administration, FHWA, and Federal Transit Administration, FTA, funding combined. That is an extraordinary amount of funding for a State that sorely needs it.

I am concerned, however, that the FAST Act undermines the public input, environmental analysis, and judicial review guaranteed under the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA. If Congress wants Federal agencies to approve more permits faster, then we should appropriate the requisite funds for sufficient staff and other necessary resources. We should not undermine the integrity of important project reviews. Moreover, the argument that the permitting process takes too long is a red herring. More than 95 percent of all FHWA-approved projects involve no significant impacts and therefore have limited NEPA requirements. If we really want to speed project development, we should recognize the known causes of delay and not use this bill as a Trojan horse to dismantle our Nation's foundational environmental

laws. So while I support many of the policies in the bill, I am still very concerned about the impact it will have on our environment.

While I have mixed feelings about the policies in this bill, I am not conflicted with regard to how it is funded. I am extremely disappointed in the hodgepodge of questionable pay-fors that we are using in this bill. We certainly needed to address the problem of funding our Nation's highway and transit systems beyond the myriad short-term extensions that Congress has approved in the past. But instead of opting for a reliable and permanent future revenue stream to pay for this critical government function, the FAST Act falls back on provisions completely unrelated to highways and mass transit. It relies on one-time pay-fors that are simply digging a deeper hole for the next reauthorization. That is a troublesome precedent.

I think we have missed an opportunity here to stick to the ''user pays'' principle with regard to the Federal gasoline excise tax, which hasn't been raised since 1993. According to the Congressional Budget Office, a 10-cent-per-gallon increase in the tax would fully fund the bill for 5 years.

Gasoline prices are plunging around the country, with the national average falling in 24 out of the past 30 days, according to the American Automobile Association, AAA, earlier this week. The price of a gallon of regular gasoline now stands at $2.04 nationally, down 14 cents compared to 1 month ago and 74 cents lower than this time last year. AAA officials and others anticipate that the national average price will dip below the $2.00 threshold within a matter of days.

So, as I said, I think we may be missing an opportunity here to put surface transportation infrastructure funding back on a solid foundation, appropriately based on the ''user pays'' principle.

It is also important from a policy perspective that we price carbon more appropriately to reflect its total costs, promote fuel efficiency, and accelerate the absolutely essential shift from fossil fuels to cleaner, more sustainable sources of energy. Lower gasoline prices let motorists keep more money in their pockets in the short term. But we have to think about the long term, too, and if we needlessly delay making that inevitable shift, the long-term costs to human health and the environment will dwarf any perceived short-term gains.

There is one so-called offset in the bill that I adamantly oppose: the use of private collection agencies, PCAs, to collect tax debt. I oppose this provision not only because it simply will not raise revenue but also because it is terrible tax policy that puts a target on the back of low-income and middle-class families. The Treasury Department, the Internal Revenue Service, IRS, and the National Taxpayer Advocate all join me in opposing this provision.

The Joint Committee on Taxation, JCT, scores this provision at over $2.0 billion over 10 years, but since JCT only takes into account incoming and outgoing tax revenue, its score doesn't take into account the IRS's implementation and oversight costs and the opportunity costs of farming collections out to private collectors.

Twice before, from 1996 to 1997 and from 2006 to 2009, Congress required Treasury to turn over some tax collection efforts to PCAs with miserable results. The first attempt resulted in the loss of $17 million and contractors participating were found to have violated the Fair Debt Collections Practice Act. Under legislation enacted in 2004, the IRS again attempted to use PCAs to collect Federal taxes in 2006. In September of that year, the IRS began turning over delinquent taxpayer accounts to three PCAs who were permitted to keep between 21–24 percent of the money they collected. While the program was supposed to bring in up to $2.2 billion in unpaid taxes, data from the IRS showed that the program actually resulted in a net loss of almost $4.5 million to the Federal Government after subtracting $86.2 million in administration costs and more than $16 million in commissions to the PCAs.

In analyzing the PCA offset last year, the IRS prepared a preliminary estimate of the percentage of individual taxpayers who have ''inactive tax receivables'' that would be subject to private debt collection and who are low-income. After reviewing collection data for fiscal year 2013, the IRS found that 79 percent of the cases that fell into the ''inactive tax receivables'' category involved taxpayers with incomes below 250 percent of the Federal poverty level. So nearly four-fifths of delinquent taxpayers were almost surely in the ''can't pay'' category and would be unlikely to make payments when contacted by a PCA instead of the IRS.

Not only are low-income taxpayers more vulnerable to begin with, PCAs actually provide fewer options for them to meet their tax obligations. IRS employees, unlike the PCAs, have a variety of tools at their disposal they can use to help delinquent taxpayers meet their tax obligations, especially those facing financial difficulties. These tools include the ability to postpone, extend, or suspend collection activities for limited periods of time; making available flexible payment schedules that provide for skipped or reduced monthly payments under certain circumstances; the possibility of waiving late penalties or postponing asset seizures; and offers in compromise, OIC, which are agreements between struggling taxpayers and the IRS that settle tax debts for less than the full amount owed.

In contrast, the PCAs' sole interest is to collect from a taxpayer the balance due amount they have been provided. They have no interest in whether the taxpayer owes other taxes or may not have filed required returns. They cannot provide any advice or use any of the tools IRS employees have, such as extensions or offers in compromise.

In October, I joined 15 other Senators—including several of my Finance Committee colleagues and Ranking Member WYDEN—in signing a letter the senior Senator from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, sent to leadership on the dangers and shortcomings of this provision. Unfortunately, our message was not heard. So, because we refuse to turn to obvious and commonsense financing solutions for our transportation infrastructure problems, we have decided instead to use an offset that has historically lost money, all on the backs of low-income taxpayers.

Mr. President, the FAST Act conference report is a bipartisan, bicameral achievement. I congratulate the House and Senate conferees for reaching an agreement; I know it has been an arduous process. The reauthorization contains many good provisions and provides 5 years of desperately needed funding for our Nation's crumbling transportation infrastructure. I will vote for the conference report, but I will do so with serious reservations about how this bill is funded. Our surface transportation infrastructure is a crucial component of our national security and economic competitiveness. Reauthorizing our surface transportation programs used to be a relatively routine matter; now it is becoming harder and harder to do and we are relying more and more on gimmicky funding mechanisms. These are worrisome precedents.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, over the past few years, the public has grown increasingly skeptical of Congress being able to function.

When Republicans took the majority in January, we promised the American people we would get the Senate working again, and we have been delivering on that promise.

This Transportation bill conference report is another major legislative achievement and the result of hard work by several committees in the House and Senate who put together key provisions to spur long overdue infrastructure investment and safety improvements.

This bill will give States and local governments the certainty they need to plan for and commit to key infrastructure projects. It will also help strengthen our Nation's transportation system by increasing transparency in the allocation of transportation dollars, streamlining the permitting and environmental review processes, and cutting red tape.

Republicans and Democrats alike got to make their voices heard during this process, and the final conference report is stronger because of it.

As chairman of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, I had the opportunity to work on various sections of the bill with Ranking Member BILL NELSON. The

provisions under our committee's jurisdiction comprise roughly half of the 1,300 pages of legislative text.

One particular focus was on enhancing the safety of our Nation's cars, trucks, and railroads, and the final bill we produced makes key reforms that will enhance transportation safety around the country.

Over the past year, the Commerce Committee has spent a lot of time focused on motor vehicle safety efforts. Last year was a record year for auto problems, with more than 63 million vehicles recalled.

Two of the defects that have spurred recent auto recalls—the faulty General Motors ignition switch and the defective airbag inflators from Takata—are responsible for numerous unnecessary deaths and injuries—at least 8 reported deaths in the case of Takata and more than 100 deaths in the case of General Motors. Indications point to the Takata recalls as being among the largest and most complex set of auto-related recalls in our Nation's history, with more than 30 million cars affected.

Given the seriousness of these recalls, when it came time to draft the highway bill, one of our priorities at the Commerce Committee was addressing auto safety issues and promoting greater consumer awareness and corporate responsibility.

The conference report includes our committee's work to triple the civil penalties that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration can impose on automakers for a series of related safety violations—from a cap of $35 million to a cap of $105 million—which should provide a much stronger deterrent against auto safety violations like those that occurred in the case of the faulty ignition switches at General Motors.

I am also pleased that the conference report includes the Motor Vehicle Whistleblower Safety Act, which I introduced with Ranking Member NELSON and others to incentivize auto companies to adopt internal reporting systems and establish a system to reward employees who ''blow the whistle'' when manufacturers sit on important safety information. The conference report also improves notification methods to ensure that consumers are made aware of open recalls.

The new notification requirements include a provision incentivizing dealers to inform consumers of open recalls when they bring in their cars for routine maintenance, as well as a grant program to allow States to notify consumers of recalls when they register their vehicles.

Our committee also worked with the House Energy and Commerce Committee during the conference process to incorporate a modified provision from my Democrat colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri, which will prevent rental car companies from renting unrepaired cars that are subject to a recall.

In the wake of the recall over the GM ignition switch defect, the inspector general at the Department of Transportation published a scathing report identifying serious lapses at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration—or NHTSA—the government agency responsible for overseeing safety in our Nation's cars and trucks.

The concerns raised included questions about the agency's ability to properly identify and investigate safety problems—a concern that is further underscored by the circumstances surrounding the Takata recalls.

In addition to targeting violations by automakers, our portion of the highway bill also addresses the lapses at NHTSA identified in the inspector general's report. While the conference report does increase funding for NHTSA's Office of Defects Investigation, that will only happen contingent on the agency's implementation of reforms called for by the inspector general, ensuring that this agency will be in a better position to address vehicle safety problems in the future.

Combating impaired driving is also a priority. I am pleased to announce that the conference report creates a grant for States that provide 24/7 sobriety programs. I have been a long-time champion of these programs, which have been very effective in States, like my home State of South Dakota, where it originated.

This provision is intended to allow States to certify the general practice on minimum penalties which can meet the definition under the repeat offender law, and we expect that NHTSA should reasonably defer to a State's analysis underpinning such a certification.

Another significant portion of the final conference report is made up of a bipartisan rail safety bill put together by the Republican junior Senator from Mississippi and the Democrat junior Senator from New Jersey that we merged in conference with the passenger rail bill that the House passed earlier this year.

The resulting passenger rail title includes a 5-year reauthorization of Amtrak that includes a host of safety provisions that our committee adopted following the tragic train derailment in Philadelphia. I know a number of my colleagues are very pleased with various provisions that will strengthen our Nation's rail infrastructure and smooth the way for the implementation of new safety technologies.

Our transportation infrastructure keeps our economy—and our Nation—going. Our Nation's farmers depend on our rail system to move their crops to market. Manufacturers rely on our Interstate Highway System to distribute their goods to stores across the United States.

And all of us depend on our Nation's roads and bridges to get around every day.

For too long, transportation has been the subject of short-term legislation that leaves those responsible for building and maintaining our Nation's transportation system without the certainty and predictability they need to keep our roads and highways thriving.

I am proud of the final conference report that passed the House earlier today by a strong vote of 359–65. I urge my colleagues to join in passing this long-overdue bill so it can be signed into law by the President without further delay.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the Commerce Committee's related provision be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMERCE COMMITTEE PROVISIONS IN FIVE-YEAR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BILL

Below is an extended summary of key provisions in the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee's titles in the five-year surface transportation bill:

IMPROVED PROJECT DELIVERY AND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (DOT) MANAGEMENT

Project Streamlining—Provides additional authority to streamline project delivery and consolidate burdensome permitting regulations (similar to the administration's GROW AMERICA proposal).

IMPROVING HIGHWAY SAFETY

Keeps Drug Users Off the Roads—Allows for more effective drug testing for commercial truck drivers. Also increases federal cooperation with state efforts to combat drug impaired driving and directs a study on the feasibility of an impairment standard for driving under the influence of marijuana.

Prohibits Rental of Vehicles Under Recall—Prohibits covered rental companies from renting or selling an unrepaired vehicle under recall. Based upon the Raechel and Jacqueline Houck Safe Rental Car Act of 2015 (S. 1173).

Incentivizes Crash Avoidance Technology—Adds that crash avoidance information be indicated on new car stickers to inform vehicle purchasing decisions and foster competition in the marketplace.

Tire Pressure Monitoring—Requires the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to update the rule governing tire pressure monitoring technologies; modified in conference to avoid unintended consequences and clarify that the rule should not be technology specific.

Improves Information on Safety of Child Restraint Systems—Improves crash data collection to include child restraint systems.

IMPROVES VEHICLE RECALL NOTIFICATION

Improves Consumer Awareness of Recalls—Requires NHTSA to improve the safercar.gov website and the consumer complaint filing process. Provides a study on the technological feasibility of direct vehicle notification of recalls. Also requires manufacturers to identify and include applicable part numbers when notifying NHTSA of safety defects, making this information publicly available.

Incentivizes Dealers to Notify Consumers of Open Recalls—Incentivizes auto dealers to inform consumers of open recalls at service appointments.

Creates Program for States to Notify Consumers of Recalls—Creates a state pilot grant to inform consumers of open recalls at the time of vehicle registration.

Improves Tire Recall Efforts—Increases the time tire owners and purchasers have to seek a remedy for tire recalls at no cost to consumers. Creates a publicly available database of tire recall information. Also includes

a provision adopted in conference to direct NHTSA to study the feasibility of requiring electronic identification on tires in order to facilitate registration and ease the burden on small businesses.

FREIGHT

Develops a National Freight Strategy and Strategic Plan—Sets goals to enhance U.S. economic competitiveness by improving freight transportation networks that serve our agriculture, retail, manufacturing, and energy sectors. Focuses freight planning efforts in the Office of the Secretary with the Undersecretary for Policy to provide multimodal coordination.

Requires Additional Freight Data—Establishes a working group and an annual reporting requirement to collect additional freight data to help improve the movement of freight throughout the country.

Improves Freight Planning—Improves freight planning efforts to ensure that freight planning is multimodal and addresses the links between highways, railroads, ports, airports, and pipelines.

FLEXIBILITY FOR STATES

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) Grant Consolidation—Consolidates state trucking enforcement grants to provide additional flexibility to states to administer enforcement programs.

NHTSA Grant Flexibility—Increases emphasis on ''Section 402'' highway safety grants to address each state's unique highway safety challenges. Also increases opportunities for states to obtain grants for implementing graduated drivers licensing, distracted driving laws and impaired driving. Creates a new non-motorized grant to create programs to enhance safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.

REGULATORY REFORM & TRANSPARENCY

Petitions—Requires FMCSA to respond to stakeholder petitions for review of regulations or new rulemakings.

Transparency—Requires FMCSA to maintain updated records relating to regulatory guidance, and provides for regular review to ensure consistency and enforceability.

NHTSA OVERSIGHT & VEHICLE SAFETY ENFORCEMENT

Vehicle Safety Enforcement—Triples penalties for auto safety violations per incident and triples the overall penalty cap to $105 million, provided that NHTSA conducts a previously-required rulemaking on penalty assessment factors.

Whistleblower Incentives—Incentivizes auto employees to come forward with information about safety violations by authorizing the Secretary to award a percentage of certain collected sanctions to whistleblowers. Based upon the bipartisan Motor Vehicle Safety Whistleblower Act, which passed the Senate by voice vote in April (S. 304).

Increases Funding for Vehicle Safety—Following the record number of auto recalls in 2014, the bill authorizes additional funding increases to GROW AMERICA levels for vehicle safety efforts, but only if the DOT Secretary certifies that certain reforms have been implemented following the scathing inspector general (IG) audit of NHTSA following the GM ignition switch defect.

Increases Corporate Responsibility—Requires rules on corporate responsibility for reports to NHTSA and updates recall obligations under bankruptcy; increases the retention period during which manufacturers must maintain safety records and expands the time frame for remedying defects at no cost to consumers.

Provides Increased Oversight of NHTSA—Requires DOT IG and NHTSA to provide updates on progress to implement IG recommendations to improve defect identification, requires an annual agenda, clarifies the limits of agency guidelines, and directs IG and Government Accountability Office GAO audits of NHTSA's management of vehicle safety recalls, public awareness of recall information, and NHTSA's research efforts.

CONSUMER PRIVACY

Driver Privacy—Makes clear that the owner of a vehicle is the owner of any information collected by an event data recorder. Based on the bipartisan Driver Privacy Act, which the Committee approved in March (S. 766).

TRUCKING REFORMS & IMPROVEMENTS

CSA Reform—Addresses shortcomings in the Compliance, Safety, and Accountability (CSA) program following concerns raised by the DOT IG, the GAO, and a DOT internal review team about the reliance on flawed analysis in the scores used to evaluate freight companies, while maintaining public information on enforcement data and consumer information on the scores of intercity buses.

Beyond Compliance—Establishes new incentives for trucking companies to adopt innovative safety technology and practices.

Commercial Driver Opportunities for Veterans—Establishes a pilot program to address the driver shortage by allowing qualified current or former members of the armed forces, who are between 18 and 21 years old, to operate a commercial motor vehicle in interstate commerce. Currently, 48 states allow 18–21 year olds to drive intrastate on county, state, and Interstate highways.

RAIL

Passenger Rail Reform—Reauthorizes Amtrak services through 2020, empowers states, improves planning, and better leverages private sector resources. It also creates a working group and rail restoration program to explore options for resuming service discontinued after Hurricane Katrina. Many of these provisions are based on the bipartisan Railroad Reform, Enhancement, and Efficiency Act (S. 1626), which passed the Commerce Committee by voice vote in June.

Railroad Loan Financing Reform—Reforms the existing $35 billion Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Program to increase transparency and flexibility, expand access for limited option freight rail shippers, and provide tools to reduce taxpayer risks.

Rail Infrastructure Improvements—Improves rail infrastructure and safety by consolidating rail grant programs, cutting red tape and dedicating resources for best use. It also establishes a Federal-State partnership to bring passenger rail assets into a state of good repair.

Expedites Rail Projects—Accelerates the delivery of rail projects by significantly reforming environmental and historic preservation review processes, applying existing exemptions already used for highways to make critical rail investments go further.

Dedicated Funding for Positive Train Control (PTC)—Establishes a new limited authorization with guaranteed funding for the Secretary of Transportation to provide commuter railroads and States with grants and/or loans that can leverage approximately $2+ billion in financing for PTC implementation.

Testing of Electronically-Controlled Pneumatic (ECP) Brakes—Preserves the DOT's final rule requiring ECP brakes on certain trains by 2021 and 2023, while requiring an independent evaluation and real-world derailment test. It requires DOT to re-evaluate its final rule within the next two years using the results of the evaluation and testing.

Liability Cap—Increases the passenger rail liability cap to $295 million (adjusting the current $200 million cap for inflation), applies the increase to the Amtrak accident in Philadelphia on May 12, 2015, and adjusts the cap for inflation every five years going forward.

Cameras on Passenger Trains—Requires all passenger railroads to install inward-facing cameras to better monitor train crews and assist in accident investigations, and outward-facing cameras to better monitor track conditions, fulfilling a long-standing recommendation from the National Transportation Safety Board.

Thermal Blankets on Tank Cars Carrying Flammable Liquids—Closes a potential loophole in Department of Transportation regulations and reduces the risk of thermal tears, which is when a pool fire causes a tank car to rupture and potentially result in greater damage.

Real-Time Emergency Response Information—Improves emergency response by requiring railroads to provide accurate, real-time, and electronic train consist information (e.g., the location of hazardous materials on a train) to first responders on the scene of an accident.

Grade Crossing Safety—Increases safety at highway-rail crossings by requiring action plans to improve engineering, education, and enforcement, evaluating the use of locomotive horns and quiet zones, and examining methods to address blocked crossings.

Passenger Rail Safety—Enhances passenger rail safety by requiring speed limit action plans, redundant signal protection, alerters, and other measures to reduce the risk of overspeed derailments and worker fatalities.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would also like to conclude by underscoring my appreciation regarding the collaborative work with my friend from Florida, Senator BILL NELSON, ranking member of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, and his Committee staff.

I would also like to thank the following Senate colleagues and staff: Leader MCCONNELL; Senator INHOFE; Senator BOXER; Senator HATCH; Senator CORNYN; Senator FISCHER, who chairs the Surface Transportation subcommittee and who also served on the conference committee; Neil Chatterjee, Hazen Marshall, Scott Raab, Sharon Soderstrom, and Jonathan Burks in Leader MCCONNELL's office for helping to guide this bill through the Senate and ultimately through conference with the House; Dave Schwietert; Nick Rossi; Rebecca Seidel; Adrian Arnakis; Allison Cullen; Patrick Fuchs; Cheri Pascoe; Peter Feldman; Katherine White; Robert Donnell; Andrew Timm; Ross Dietrich; Jessica McBride; Paul Poteet; Jane Lucas; Frederick Hill; and Lauren Hammond.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermonters take great pride in our historic downtowns and small communities. In our cities and towns, we have a culture of getting things done—and finding a way to accomplish our shared goals. That is why, like many Vermonters, I have been frustrated with the back-to-back short-term patches to keep our highway trust fund afloat. I have consistently advocated for a long-term solution that will give States the ability to move forward with building and repairing roads, bridges, and byways; to promote rail safety and transit and to invest in the critical infrastructure that supports our cities and towns; to enable interstate and intrastate commerce; and to

create jobs for American workers. The time to pass a plan for long-term transportation funding has finally come.

The FAST Act will bring stability where, for too long, there has been uncertainty. This bill ensures that Vermont will receive the funding it needs, more than $1.1 billion over the next 5 years, to allow Vermonters to move forward on infrastructure projects that have been waiting in the wings. In Vermont, the construction season is short and the need is great, and a series of stopgap measures to kick the can down the road was never the right answer. I am pleased there will finally be the stability needed for Vermont and all States to move forward to bolster our country's infrastructure.

This legislation also reverses changes made to the Federal Crop Insurance program, which was a careful balance first struck in the farm bill, sending a clear message that we should not thoughtlessly tamper with the farm bill until its next expiration in 2018. And while I am glad that the harmful Freedom of Information Act exemptions that we eliminated in the Senate bill remain out of this conference report, I am concerned that a new exemption was added. Nowhere is the free flow of information more important than when the safety of every Vermonter and every American is at stake.

We Vermonters know that, in a democracy, demanding 100 percent of what you want and refusing to negotiate effective compromise is a formula for stalemate and paralysis. As a result, Vermonters know that to actually get something done, compromise is a must, and we have advanced the ball a long way down the field. This legislation provides stability to move our infrastructure forward to support our economy. It supports safety provisions to protect the well-being of those traveling America's highways and rails.

Frankly, to facilitate the thriving communities, commerce, and economic growth that we want and need, we should be doing far more to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. This process should not be reduced to ''searching under sofa cushions''—as some have described it—to scrape together the budget to pay for the vital roads and bridges that are so important to us in so many ways. But with this bill, we finally are providing our States and communities with longer lead times to plan and accomplish this work on our infrastructure, and that signals at least a flicker of progress. We have had enough kicking the can down the road and generating year after year of uncertainty. It is time to bring stability and certainty back to our infrastructure and transportation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I intend to support the surface transportation bill before us. It has been more than a decade since we have had a true multiyear transportation bill. And while this bill gives State transportation and transit agencies funding certainty for the next 5 years, it is not all that it could or should have been.

I worked hard to retain the transit density formula, which the House had tried to eliminate. If the House had prevailed, the Rhode Island Public Transit Authority, RIPTA, would have lost upwards of $8.5 million of its Federal allocation each year—about one-third of its yearly Federal funding. The loss of funding would have been devastating to RIPTA and to the thousands of Rhode Islanders who rely on bus service to get to work, to the store, and to medical appointments. Nonetheless, the funding increase provided under this part of the formula is disappointingly low in comparison to the increase provided to rural and growing States, as well as to States that have established fixed guideway systems.

I am also pleased that the bill addresses some key priorities for transit workers, including mandating new rules to protect drivers from violent assaults, as well as dedicating funding to frontline workforce training. And overall, the bill continues critical worker protections, particularly under the Davis-Bacon Act.

On the highway side of the ledger, the bill includes a vital increase in formula funding that will give the Rhode Island Department of Transportation a baseline from which it can begin to address the high percentage of structurally deficient and functionally obsolete bridges in the State, as well as the high percentage of roads with unacceptable pavement conditions.

In addition, both the transit and highway titles of the bill each have new competitive programs, including the restoration of a competitive bus and bus facility program for transit agencies and the establishment of a grant program for nationally significant freight and highway projects, those that typically exceed $100 million.

The bill also includes other important matters, including a long overdue reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, which has essentially been shuttered since July due to opposition to an extension by some on the other side of the aisle.

On the other hand, there are provisions in the bill that are concerning, beginning with how it is paid for. Rather than relying on the gas tax or another predicable and related funding source, the bill is built on a hodgepodge of offsets like outsourcing tax collection to private debt collectors, which has been tried before and wound up costing revenue rather than generating it. It also calls for selling off portions of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve under the assumption that oil prices will increase, and it taps into funds held by the Federal Reserve—something current and former Fed officials have cautioned against.

In addition, the bill has a number of extraneous provisions, including a measure that preempts a State's ability to regulate Small Business Investment Companies, SBICs, and allows certain fund advisers with significant assets under management to escape Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, registration altogether. In the wake of the financial crisis, it remains unclear to me why we would be so hasty to weaken investor protections. The bill also restores a wasteful agricultural subsidy that I have long fought against and that was just cut under the bipartisan budget agreement last month.

That leads me to a larger point concerning the double standard that is being applied to important legislation that invests in our people, our economy, and our national defense on the one side and to special interest benefits, primarily offered under the Tax Code, on the other. For years, Congress has tied itself in knots to develop offsets to buy down the sequester, to reduce student loan interest rates, to cover emergency unemployment assistance, and to pay for infrastructure investments like this surface transportation bill; yet without a second thought, deficit ''hawks'' in the majority shrug off billions of dollars in tax cuts and tax extenders with little regard for the cost. Both types of expenditures have an impact on the debt and deficit. We should be honest about it and account for both in the same way.

Despite these concerns, I believe that after years of work and waiting, we should adopt this bill so that transportation agencies can move forward with their plans with the confidence that Federal funding will be there.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, America's infrastructure was once the envy of the world. But for decades, we haven't maintained these public works.

The quality of U.S. infrastructure now ranks just 16th in the world, according to the World Economic Forum.

The dismal state of our outdated roads, bridges, and railways is costing Ohioans valuable time, money, and energy.

To create jobs and keep America on top of the global economy, Congress must pass a long-term bill that invests in a world-class infrastructure.

The bill that the Senate will soon consider does not contain the robust investment that the President and most experts think we need, but it does make progress over the next 5 years.

In Ohio, a quarter of our bridges are ''structurally deficient'' or ''functionally obsolete.'' Forty-five percent of our State's major urban highways are congested, costing our drivers $3.6 billion a year in additional repairs and operating costs.

During the negotiations on this legislation, I fought to include provisions important to Ohio, and we have made progress on my State's top priorities.

The bill would create a new competitive grant program to fund job-creating projects of regional and national significance, like the replacement of the Brent Spence Bridge between Cincinnati and Kentucky.

Each year, 4 percent of America's GDP crosses the Brent Spence, which was built more than half a century ago.

Replacing this bridge isn't just a top priority for the region's business community—it is a safety issue for the hundreds of thousands of cars that drive over it every week.

The bridge would be eligible for funds from the $800 million per year pot of funding, which would grow to $1 billion annually in fiscal year 2020. It is a big win for the Brent Spence project and Ohio jobs.

The legislation would also boost funding for Ohio's highway and transit programs.

Nationwide, overall highway spending would increase by 15 percent compared to current law, and annual transit spending would grow 18 percent.

By 2020, that growth will deliver more than $200 million of new highway investment to Ohio each year.

In addition to repairing roads, the bill will help Ohio's many transit agencies, providing up to $20 million of new funds each year. In Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Columbus, our transit systems carry more than 250,000 passengers every day.

The bill also provides up to $340 million annually for a new competitive bus program I championed. This was a top priority for Ohio's transit providers, and I am pleased they will have a much-needed source of funding for bus replacement.

And as a long-time supporter of Buy America, I am pleased that the legislation would increase the amount of American-made steel and other components that will go into buses and subway cars.

The bill also would finally reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, which is critical to helping Ohio companies create jobs and sell their products around the world.

After some on the far right allowed the Ex-Im Bank to expire in June—for the first time in the Bank's history—we heard stories of lost contracts, risks to future export business, and manufacturing jobs moving out of the United States to Canada and Europe.

This is about ensuring that U.S. manufacturers can be competitive in a global marketplace.

While we argued about funding U.S. infrastructure and allowed the Ex-Im Bank to expire, China announced that its export-import bank will provide a $78 billion credit line to China Railway Corp to support its infrastructure projects at home and abroad.

With countries like Brazil and China investing in 21st century transportation systems, we cannot let the U.S. fall behind.

This is no way to run a global economic power.

In addition to renewing Ex-Im, the Transportation bill also contains important provisions for community banks and credit unions.

It includes changes to the bank exam cycle for small banks, a bill that Senators DONNELLY and TOOMEY introduced.

It streamlines privacy notices for financial institutions—a bill that Senator MORAN and I introduced last Congress and that had the support of 97 other senators and which Senators HEITKAMP and MORAN reintroduced this year.

The bill also allows privately insured credit unions to become members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, a proposal I introduced last Congress and Senators DONNELLY and PORTMAN spearheaded this Congress.

Since May, Senate Democrats have been pushing for a package of modest, bipartisan proposals like these to help community banks and credit unions. We have resisted efforts to rollback important Wall Street reforms.

The House agreed with this approach, and that is why these provisions were added to the Transportation bill.

So when you hear that we need to attach ''community bank regulatory relief'' to must-pass appropriations legislation, don't believe it.

Relief for small banks and credit unions is already in the Transportation bill.

Let me be clear: I will not support riders to undermine Wall Street reforms in legislation to fund the government.

Like any bill of this significance, the long-term transportation measure isn't perfect. I have strong concerns with the process that led to this agreement and with some of the proposals used to pay for it.

I think it was a mistake to tap Federal resources that have nothing to do with transportation to cover the bill's cost.

Under this bill, we are funding highways in part by taking money from banks and the Federal Reserve. It is a bad precedent.

We made real improvements to the bill's language on the use of the Federal Reserve Banks surplus fund and to the rate of the dividend paid to banks over $10 billion. But these pay-fors are not a sustainable way to fund transportation projects.

Instead of this shortsighted approach that just delays the problem, Congress should be looking for a long-term solution to replenish the highway trust fund.

I will support this bill because it is the best option we have right now to keep America on top of the global economy and provide the investment that Ohio needs. But I hope that Congress won't lose sight of the need to identify long-term, robust investment in world-class infrastructure.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, Senator BOXER deserves tremendous credit for negotiating a long-term funding bill for our crumbling roads and bridges. The Fixing America's Surface Transportation, FAST, Act is an important turning point in addressing our Nation's infrastructure needs, and the bill will create quality jobs and stimulate economic growth. The FAST Act ends years of short-term congressional extensions and legislative gridlock that prevented our country from making critical investments in our roads, bridges, and mass transit.

The bill reauthorizes Amtrak and provides vital funding for positive train control technology and hazmat training programs. This 5-year reauthorization will allow our States and communities to finally plan for the future and address long-overdue maintenance backlogs. Additionally, the FAST Act takes important steps towards addressing the growing problem of violence against our transit operators. These hard-working men and women deserve a safe working environment, and I will continue to work with my colleagues to make sure we do everything we can to achieve that.

However, I must oppose the bill because Republicans have used this strong bill as a vehicle to roll back rules that protect consumers and our financial system.

This is the third time in the last year that Republicans have used this hostage-taking approach. Last December, Republicans used the government funding bill as a vehicle for a provision written by Citigroup lobbyists that would repeal a critical anti-bailout rule in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. Weeks later, Republicans used a broadly popular, bipartisan bill extending the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act to jam through another provision that weakened Dodd-Frank's rules on risky derivatives trading. And now, in the FAST Act, Republicans have handed out more than a dozen goodies to financial institutions, including a requirement that does little but bog down the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau with needless paperwork and administrative tasks.

If Democrats continue to support bills that include these kinds of rollbacks, it will simply encourage Republicans to use other must-pass bills to repeal or weaken even larger portions of Dodd-Frank and our other financial rules. That is why I must oppose this bill—and why I hope the American people weigh in with their representatives against this kind of cynical hostage-taking.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a joint statement by the chair and ranking member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Representative SHUSTER and Representative DEFAZIO, and the chair and ranking member of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, myself and Senator BOXER, to clarify an issue with the Joint Explanatory Statement of the committee on conference for H.R. 22.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE BILL SHUSTER, THE HONORABLE PETER A. DEFAZIO, AND THE HONORABLE JAMES INHOFE, THE HONORABLE BARBARA BOXER ON THE JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCE H.R. 22, FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

December 3, 2015

Title XLIII of the Joint Explanatory Statement provides a summary of section 43001 concerning requirements in agency rulemakings pursuant to this Act. Section 43001 of the House amendments to H.R. 22 was not agreed to in conference and does not appear in the conference report to accompany H.R. 22. The summary of section 43001 in the Joint Explanatory statement therefore appears in error. Accordingly, title XLIII of the Joint Explanatory Statement has no effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I raise a point of order under rule XXVIII that section 32205 exceeds the scope of conference for the conference report to accompany H.R. 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I move to waive the point of order raised under rule XXVIII that section 32205 of the conference report to accompany H.R. 22 exceeds the scope of conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The waiver is debatable.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if I could just be heard for 30 seconds or less. Please, please don't alter this, because if this passes and we don't waive the point of order, this bill is gone. The House bill didn't even have an extension. So if this bill goes down, we have no highway system.

Please vote with Senator INHOFE and myself. It is urgent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, both sides have agreed to have 5 minutes equally divided.

How much time did the Senator from California take?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California used 30 seconds.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I recognize Senator ROBERTS for 45 seconds.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise to address the point of order raised against the highway bill.

Among the many provisions of the bill, the legislation realizes a commitment made by House and Senate leadership to restore egregious, harmful, counterproductive, contract-breaking cuts to the Federal Crop Insurance Program. The commitment we reached with the House was to reverse these damaging cuts and policy changes in order to protect our producers. That is their No. 1 priority for risk management.

The message from farm country couldn't be more clear: Do not target crop insurance. The point of order would not only strip out much of the needed crop insurance fix, but it could also prevent the timely passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I recognize the junior Senator from Arizona, Mr. FLAKE, for such time as he wants to use of his 2½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, what we are doing is targeting a specific provision that was air dropped into the highway bill. This isn't an attack on the highway bill. It is an attack on a provision that increases crop subsidies $3 billion over what is in the budget deal.

We are often accused in this body of reversing cuts that we make before the ink is dry. In this case, we actually made a deal to reverse the cuts before the ink was even put to paper.

Now, if we are ever going to get serious about controlling our deficit and addressing our debt, then we actually have to stick to some of the cuts that we have made. That is what this point of order is all about.

I urge support of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I recognize the Senator from Michigan, Senator STABENOW, for 15 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise to support the transportation bill and crop insurance. We made a deal with farmers when we gave up direct subsidies that, instead, we would ask them to have skin in the game and to have crop insurance to manage their risk.

They have a 5-year bill that gives them certainty. We should not pull the rug out from under them at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I recognize the Senator from Kansas, Mr. MORAN, for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the point of order and ask my colleagues to support the crop insurance program. In Kansas the weather is not always our friend. The most important farm program that farmers benefit from is the crop insurance program.

We have eliminated other farm programs over a long period of time in the name of reform but have replaced them by crop insurance. Now crop insurance becomes the target.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I recognize the Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN, for such time as she needs to use for her side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Thank you, Senator INHOFE. I will be brief.

Mr. President, I think it is important to challenge the provision in this legislation.

I support the highway bill. I think the negotiators did a great job to get us a 5-year bill, but the fact is this provision was not included in either the House transportation or the Senate transportation bill. It is an indefensible reversal of the bipartisan budget bill that became law less than a month ago. It is a $3 billion giveaway to the insurance companies, and I think we need to challenge this kind of move when it gets dropped into a bill.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would ask the Chair the time remaining for the proponents and opponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 1 minute remaining, and the Senator from Oklahoma has 15 seconds.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I wish to end by saying this is not an attack on the highway bill. It has its own issues, but this provision simply attacks the subsidy—the $3 billion subsidy—that was added back in after we had agreed in a bipartisan way to these cuts. We cannot continue to go back on the cuts that we have made. In this case we didn't even wait 1 month or 2 months. The agreement was made on this floor before the bill was even passed. We have to get away from that kind of practice.

So I urge support for this point of order, and I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me make sure everyone understands what we are doing here. The budget act of 2015 had major cuts in the Federal Crop Insurance Program. Some of those were restored in the highway bill. Now, if the highway bill is changed—if this should pass—it has to go back to the House, which means we could not have it this year. In other words, the issue here is not how you feel about crop insurance; it is whether or not you want this bill.

I would suggest to the 65 Members who are here today and who voted for the bill that it would be very difficult to explain how you could vote for the bill and then turn around and vote for the very order against it that would kill the bill for this year in 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Is all time yielded back?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 77, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 330 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Alexander
Baldwin
Barrasso
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt
Boozman
Boxer
Brown
Burr
Cantwell
Capito
Cardin
Casey
Cassidy
Coats
Cochran
Collins
Cornyn
Cotton
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Donnelly
Enzi
Ernst
Feinstein
Fischer
Franken
Gardner
Graham
Grassley
Hatch
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Heller
Hirono
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kaine
King
Kirk
Klobuchar
Lankford
Leahy
Markey
McConnell
Merkley
Mikulski
Moran
Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Paul
Peters
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Schatz
Scott
Shelby
Stabenow
Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Udall
Vitter
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden

NAYS—22

Ayotte
Booker
Carper
Coons
Corker
Durbin
Flake
Gillibrand
Lee
Manchin
McCain
McCaskill
Menendez
Perdue
Reed
Reid
Schumer
Sessions
Shaheen
Toomey
Warner
Warren

NOT VOTING—1

Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 77, the nays are 22.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The question occurs on the adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 22.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, everybody. I love everyone tonight. We are going to have a great vote. But go. Go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 331 Leg.]

YEAS—83

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Barrasso
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt
Booker
Boozman
Boxer
Brown
Burr
Cantwell
Capito
Cardin
Casey
Cassidy
Coats
Cochran
Collins
Coons
Cornyn
Daines
Donnelly
Durbin
Enzi
Ernst
Feinstein
Fischer
Franken
Gardner
Gillibrand
Graham
Grassley
Hatch
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Heller
Hirono
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kaine
King
Kirk
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin
Markey
McCain
McCaskill
McConnell
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Moran
Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Peters
Portman
Reed
Reid
Roberts
Rounds
Schatz
Schumer
Sessions
Shaheen
Stabenow
Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Udall
Vitter
Warner
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden

NAYS—16

Carper
Corker
Cotton
Crapo
Cruz
Flake
Lankford
Lee
Paul
Perdue
Risch
Rubio
Sasse
Scott
Shelby
Warren

NOT VOTING—1

Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the conference report to accompany H.R. 22 is agreed to.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments to congratulate the chairman of our environment committee, Senator INHOFE, and his ranking member, Senator BOXER, for an extraordinary job. This has been a fascinating experience, particularly for Senator BOXER and me. To say that our relationship got off to a rather rocky start is to put it mildly. We found ourselves 20-some odd years ago on the opposite side of a very contentious issue with a lot of—shall I say—rather feisty exchanges on the floor of the Senate. It is also pretty obvious that we are not exactly philosophical soulmates. But I had heard Senator INHOFE say over the years how much he had enjoyed working with Senator BOXER and that there were actually things they agreed upon.

I made a mental note of that and wondered whether there might be some opportunity at some point down the way to team up with Senator BOXER. That finally happened this year. As Senator INHOFE and Senator BOXER would certainly underscore, we had challenges. We had the complexity on our side of the Ex-Im Bank issue, which created some serious internal Republican problems. We had a flirtation among some Members on the other side that we could shoehorn a major territorial tax bill into this bill. Senator BOXER and I were skeptical about that from the beginning because it is an article of faith on our side that tax reform is not for the purpose of taking the money and spending it, but of taking the money and buying down the rates.

We had all kinds of odd potential allowances that led to the floor debate last summer, for which we had an administration that was less than enthusiastic with what Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE and I were trying to do. Senate Democratic leadership hadn't exactly bought in on it either. In the meantime, our good friends in the House on my side of the aisle were calling it the Boxer bill, which of course was really great for me to hear.

We had all kinds of tripwires on the path to getting what we thought was important for the country, which was a multiyear highway bill, which—I believe I am correct, Senator BOXER—we haven't done since 1998.

Mrs. BOXER. Actually, 10 years.

I am told it was 17 years since we had a bill of this size.

Mr. MCCONNELL. It has been 17 years since we had a bill of this duration, which we all thought was important for the States and localities, for people who build and repair the roads to have some certainty. In the end, there wasn't really a philosophical problem here. The question was, How can we pull together these disparate pieces into one mosaic that actually had a chance to get somewhere?

I want to say to Senator BOXER, in particular, that this has been one of the most exhilarating and satisfying experiences I have had in the time that I have been in the Senate. I never would have predicted 20-some-odd years ago that I would be having it with BARBARA BOXER. But this shows, in my opinion—I know Senator INHOFE agrees—the Senate is at its best when people can identify common interests and work together to get a positive result for the country.

I want to say to both of these great colleagues how much I appreciate their extraordinary work, particularly Senator BOXER because we were such opposites in almost every way. What actual fun it was to get to know her better and to work on this together. She has a year left. Maybe we can find something else. Congratulations to both of you on an extraordinary accomplishment for the American people.

Mr. INHOFE. That is great, Mr. Leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. We have a lot of requests for speakers to be heard. I am going to put myself at the end of the line so that everyone else can get in there first. The order is going to be Senator BOXER, and I understand she might want to share a little time with the Senator from Florida. Then Senator LEE from Utah, Senator ENZI after that, and then whoever else wants to talk. If nobody else wants to talk, then I will wind it up.

Before I turn it over to Senator BOXER, I am going to tell a story because I want to make sure that Senator SULLIVAN doesn't have to wait for 2 hours to hear it. Ten years ago, in 2005, we had the last bill of this nature. It was a bill that we passed. I was an author of it, and I was very proud. That was 10 years ago. That was the last time we did a bill like this. I remember standing here, as I am standing today. The chairman of that committee wanted to talk about what a great bill that

was—the Transportation reauthorization bill—and all of a sudden the alarms went off. They said: The bombs are coming. Everybody run. Evacuate, evacuate.

I wasn't through talking. I talked for about 15 minutes. It is very eerie when you are standing here and are the only one in the U.S. Capitol making a speech with the TV going but no other people are around. I made my speech. Afterward I started going down, and I saw a great big guy walking down the steps very slowly. I went up to Ted Kennedy. I said: Ted, you better get out of here; this place is going to blow up.

He said: Well, these old legs don't work like they used to.

I said: Let me help you.

I put my arm around his waist. Some guy had a camera. The front page of the cover of that magazine said: Who says that conservatives are not compassionate?

That is my story. We will go on to Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I completely neglected to mention an extraordinarily important player in all of this, and that is Neil Chatterjee of my staff, who befriended Senator BOXER and Bettina before I realized that there might be a possibility that we could do something together. Neil has done an extraordinary job. I think I can safely say he enjoyed the confidence of both sides and allowed us to work together in a positive and constructive way. I want to thank Neil Chatterjee for the great job that he did as well.

Mr. INHOFE. We certainly agree with that.

Senator BOXER.

Mrs. BOXER. I am hardly ever at a loss for words, as you all know. I was so touched tonight. A terrible tragedy happened in my State yesterday. You all know about the emotions of that and then the emotions of this. I am going to set aside the emotions of the tragedy and talk to my friends here.

What we did was the impossible dream. It was, in many ways, a very long and winding road to get to this night. People worked together who never thought they would find that common ground. We found it. The reason we found it is we were willing to set aside the misperceptions I think we had on so many fronts and recognized that our people needed this badly.

As I often say, if you want to buy a house and you go to the bank and the bank says ''Oh, you have great credit, but I can only give you a mortgage for 6 months,'' you are not going to buy the house. You are not going to build a major road if you are worried about the funding. What we have done is extraordinary. For the first time in 17 years, we have a long bill. We have a bill that lasts 5 years.

I have to say—and I did not think of it—I think the pay-for was brilliant, the major pay-for. There are others who don't like it. Many people on my side said we should look at the gas tax. I looked at the gas tax. I agreed with the chamber of commerce on the gas tax, but I am only one of six people here who probably voted for it.

When you come up against these barriers, you need to be very creative. The international tax reform—Leader MCCONNELL was never going to allow that. I got that message. I still encouraged my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work on it, but it didn't work out. What are we going to do? Just fold up our tent and say the general fund is going to pay for this? We don't have enough in the general fund. We have deficits. We all know that.

What I want to say is that with 60,000 bridges in disrepair—falling down, structurally deficient—and 50 percent of our roads in disrepair, we have a lot of work to do. This gives our States the certainty.

The relationships that developed between the staffs—I am going to withhold my comments on that until later. When everybody finishes, I am going to be here because I am going to mention every single name on both sides. I can't thank you enough. They didn't sleep during the Thanksgiving break. They worked constantly.

Let's face it, this bill was the ''Perils of Pauline.'' Even last night my senior leader asked me to do something I could never do in a million years on this bill. I must have turned so pale that I almost fainted. Bettina almost had a heart attack on the spot because we thought that maybe we would not have this bill. But he knows me well enough to know what I can do, and that makes for a great working relationship.

I will talk about the details of the bill later. Basically, it is a 5-year bill. Over the period, it is a 20-percent increase, which is huge for our States. It is roads. It is transit. There are new programs, freight programs that Senator INHOFE and MARIA CANTWELL worked on. Ex-Im is in there. I know it is controversial for some, but for our small businesses it is great.

I predict that this bill is going to give the economy a real boost—I really mean it—because of the certainty it is bringing and because of the fact that millions of jobs will be created. That always boosts us. It helps with our deficits.

I will yield the remainder of my time—just 2 minutes—to Senator NELSON, with the deepest thanks to Senator MCCONNELL; Senator INHOFE; Senator THUNE; Senator NELSON, who is just a hero; Senator BROWN; all of the members of the conference committee who signed the conference report.

I yield this time to Senator NELSON, and then we will go back to Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding, Mr. President. I am going to say two short paragraphs, but first, my commendations to the leadership that has already been mentioned by the esteemed majority leader; my commendations to my colleague, our chairman on the commerce committee, Senator THUNE, who has been a pleasure to work with; and my thanks to the staff, including Kim Lipsky, the staff director for our minority staff on the commerce committee.

I want to echo what you have said. Because of this bill, we are going to provide States and communities with over $300 billion over 5 years to repair the roads and bridges of this country and greatly improve rail and port projects, and as a result, we are going to create jobs. In my State of Florida, this translates to $12 million that can be used for improvements on Interstate 95, Interstate 75, and projects, such as SunRail, Tri-rail, and the streetcars in Fort Lauderdale. This is just a small example, and I am so grateful to everyone. I thank everyone very much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we will go forward with the previous agreement and hear from the Senator from Utah, Mr. LEE, followed by Senator ENZI from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the highway spending bill before us today—and not just the failed substance of the legislation. I rise to oppose the bill's irresponsible and unsustainable funding mechanisms and the cynical process that produced it.

We are told this bill fully funds Federal highway spending for the next 5 years and that it won't add a single dime to the Federal deficit. The math may add up on paper, but does anyone really think the pay-fors in this bill are honest, responsible ways to fund a government program?

Let's look at a few examples. Of the $70 billion this bill uses to bailout the highway trust fund over the next 5 years, more than $50 billion comes from an accounting gimmick that steals money from the rest of the Treasury's general fund.

Here is how the shell game works. Normally, the Federal Reserve sends the profits from its portfolio assets directly to the U.S. Treasury. These surplus profits are actually one of the major reasons our Federal budget deficits have fallen in recent years below where they were a short time ago. However, this bill would siphon off that money and redirect it into the highway trust fund.

Just today, Federal Reserve Chair Janet Yellen testified before the Joint Economic Committee, where she commented on this particular provision—on this particular aspect of this bill.

She said:

This concerns me, I think financing federal fiscal spending by tapping resources at the Federal Reserve sets bad precedent and impinges on the independence of the central

bank; it weakens fiscal discipline, and I would point out that repurposing the Federal Reserve's capital surplus doesn't actually create any new money for the federal government.

That is not the only funding gimmick found in this legislation. It also purports to raise $6.2 billion in revenue for transportation and infrastructure projects by selling oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Let's leave aside for a second that the Strategic Petroleum Reserve was never intended to be a piggy bank for congressional appropriators. What makes this pay-for particularly objectionable is that its authors assume they can get $93 for a barrel of oil when it is currently selling for less than $40 per barrel. Only in Washington could we come to love a provision like this. Only in Washington could we come to accept a provision like this as somehow acceptable. If we are going to start selling Federal assets at fantasy prices—prices that do not exist and will not exist in any universe for the foreseeable future—there is absolutely no limit whatsoever to the number of things that we can pretend to pay for. But that is what we will be doing—pretending to pay.

As bad as this bill's funding schemes are, the cynical process used to secure votes in its favor might well be far more troubling. For instance, this bill adds back $3.5 billion in crop subsidy spending that we just cut last month in the budget deal.

Is this really how we do business in the Senate? We reduce spending one month in order to appear fiscally responsible only to reverse course the very next month when we think no one is looking? You don't need to oppose crop subsidies to see the dishonesty and cynicism of this particular maneuver.

Even worse, this bill would never have had a chance of passing the Senate were it not for a deal to include the renewal of the Export-Import Bank as part of this legislation. I have spoken out against the Export-Import Bank many times before, so there is little need to revisit the mountain of evidence proving that it is one of the most egregious, indefensible cases of crony capitalism in Washington, DC. But it is worth highlighting some of the so-called reforms that Ex-Im supporters included in the bill.

First, there is the new Office of Ethics created within the Export-Import Bank. Presumably, this is supposed to help the Bank's management reduce the rate at which Ex-Im employees and beneficiaries are indicted for fraud, bribery, and other wrongdoing. Since 2009, there have been 85 such indictments, or about 14 per year.

The bill also creates a new position called the Chief Risk Officer and requires the Bank to go through an independent audit of its portfolio. Only in Washington will you find people who believe that an organization's systemic ethical failings can somehow be overcome by creating a new ethics bureaucracy or that hiring a new risk management bureaucrat is a suitable replacement for market discipline or that giving another multimillion-dollar contract to a well-connected accounting firm will somehow substitute for real, actual political accountability.

None of these bogus reforms will make an ounce of difference. None of them will change the essential purpose of the Export-Import Bank, which is to use taxpayer money to subsidize wealthy, politically connected businesses.

Finally, it must be stressed that this bill does nothing to fix our fundamentally broken highway financing system. After this legislation is enacted, the highway trust fund will spend more money than the Federal gasoline tax brings in. And after this series of fraudulent pay-fors are exhausted in just 5 years, we will be right back to where we have been for the last decade, and that is trying to find enough money for another bailout without attracting too much attention from the American people.

Let's not forget that the States are big losers under the status quo system too—under the current system that we have. Federal bureaucrats divert at least 25 percent of State gasoline dollars to nonhighway projects, including mass transit, bike paths, and other boondoggles such as vegetation management, whatever that is.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield? I have a favor to ask. I will give the Senator from Utah all the time in the world, but he originally asked to speak for 5 minutes. I plan to respond to the issues he is talking about, which I don't happen to agree with, but I wonder if the Senator from Utah will allow his colleagues to speak in the order we agreed to and then come back and allow the Senator from Utah to finish his remarks.

I ask the Senator through the Chair if that will work?

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have less than a page of my remarks that I prepared left.

I ask unanimous consent for permission to have an additional 2 minutes to complete my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. As I was saying, Federal bureaucrats divert at least 25 percent of State gas tax dollars to nonhighway projects, including mass transit, bike paths, and other boondoggles such as vegetation management. Federal Davis-Bacon price-fixing regulations then artificially inflate construction costs by at least 10 percent, and Federal environmental regulations, such as those issued under the National Environmental Policy Act, add an average of 6.1 years in planning delays to any federally funded project.

I understand that Washington is not ready for a more conservative approach to infrastructure funding—at least not yet—one where States get to keep their transportation dollars and decide how and on what they will spend those dollars, free from interference by Federal regulators.

We can have honest disagreements from policy, and I know there is more work to do in making the case for conservative transportation reform, but what I refuse to accept is the toxic process that produced this bill—the backroom deals, the about-face on crop subsidies, and the Export-Import Bank. The American people deserve better than this, and I won't stop fighting to ensure that we do better than this in the future.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for letting me interrupt at this time. We passed a bill earlier, and normally I would have spoken after final passage, but I didn't want to hold people up who had transportation plans, so I reserved my comments until later. I appreciate this opportunity to speak at this time.

I congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from California for the significant highway bill they passed tonight. I know there was a lot of work that went into that and a lot of good things will come out of it. It will make a difference for the economy in the United States.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I know if we can get the private sector to increase by just 1 percent, we bring in $400 billion more in revenue without raising taxes, and raising the economy by 1 percent in the private sector is significant.

RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTHCARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION BILL

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, today we also passed the most comprehensive and far-reaching repeal of ObamaCare that is possible under the reconciliation rules. We expect the House to pass this version shortly and soon this repeal will head to the President's desk for the first time in his tenure.

Our bill will eliminate more than $1.2 trillion in ObamaCare tax hikes and save nearly $400 billion over 10 years. Lifting the burdens this law has placed on hard-working families will help move the Nation forward from ObamaCare's broken promises to better access to patient-centered health care for each and every American.

As I noted earlier, our Nation has made great strides in improving the quality of life for all Americans, but these changes were always forged in the spirit of bipartisan compromise and cooperation. We still need health care reform, but it has to be done the right way. To have good health care, we will have to have ideas from both parties, not just one party.

Tonight we made significant progress to pointing out a bunch of the flaws,

and there were a lot of people who were involved in that and I wish to take this opportunity to thank them.

We gave instructions to the Finance Committee and the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee that they were each to save $1 billion. So Senator HATCH and his staff went to work on it, and Senator ALEXANDER and his staff went to work on it, and they accomplished that task in conjunction with the House. So I thank them for their effort.

I thank the Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee, and especially my staff director, Eric Ueland; as well as my deputy staff director, Dan Kowalski; the parliamentarian, Tori Gorman; the senior budget analyst, Steve Robinson; the budget analysts, Greg D'Angelo and Tom Borck; the junior budget analyst, Kaitlin Vogt; the chief counsel, George Everly; the assistant counsel, Clint Brown; the director of regulatory review, Susan Eckerly; and the editor, Elizabeth Keys.

I also wish to thank the people on my personal staff who had to put some of their projects kind of secondary at times and then had to pitch in and help with the budget as well.

I also want to express my appreciation to the staff from Leader MCCONNELL's office. Leader MCCONNELL is a tremendous strategist and has opened the process for the Senate so that great things like the highway bill can be done, and that is done by allowing committees to do amendments, and then allowing the committee bill to come to the floor and have amendments from both sides of the aisle in an open process, and then to go to conference committee and have the conference committee do their work to make sure that the House and the Senate are together. Some of the chief people who worked on that are the chief of staff, Sharon Soderstrom; his policy advisor, Scott Raab; his budget and appropriations policy advisor, Jon Burks; and his policy director, Hazen Marshall. In addition, our floor and cloakroom staff has been very helpful, led by Laura Dove and Robert Duncan.

Senator CORNYN and his staff did a marvelous job of helping to find out what difficulties there were and what things needed to be corrected. Senator THUNE did a great job of lining up speakers, and Senator BARRASSO did a great job with his staff in lining up some of the messaging.

Thanks are due to the Senate Finance Committee, including the staff director, Chris Campbell; the chief health counsel and policy director, Jay Khosla; and the health policy advisor, Katie Simeon; the tax counsel, Preston Rutledge; and the health policy advisor, Becky Shipp.

I extend my gratitude to the staff of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, as well as Senator ALEXANDER, who has done a marvelous job there. I thank his staff director, David Cleary, his deputy staff director, Lindsey Seidman, his senior policy adviser and health council, Liz Wroe, and his health policy director, Mary Sumpter Lapinski.

I also need to thank the former budget staff people who lent their expertise on this, particularly Bill Hoagland.

We are in a process that may help with some of the future accounting for projects and things and that is to do some budget reform. A lot of people have talked about budgeting reform and we have been doing some hearings on budget reform. We will be putting together a bill, and to make it a bipartisan bill it will have to go into effect in 2017. At that point nobody will know who will be in the majority, so we will all work to have a process that will be fair to both sides just in case we happen to be in the minority or the other side happens to be in the minority.

So we have a lot of people on both sides who have been working on that issue, and we will hold a number of hearings yet and hopefully come up with a process where we can get rid of old programs, eliminate duplication, and make the programs that we have be far better. Some of the people who have worked on that in the past have been Senator Domenici, who was the chairman of the committee; Senator Gregg, who was the chairman of the committee; and Senator PATTY MURRAY, who was the chairman of the Budget Committee. One of the early ones, Senator Phil Gramm, has donated some of his time to come and work with both sides to take a look at what some of the future economic problems are, and he is also one of the foremost economic predictors, so we can make sure all of those things will come together as we work on future budgets.

Of course, I would be grossly in error if I didn't mention the House chairman of the Budget Committee, TOM PRICE. He and I have been meeting at least once a week with our staffs and coordinating what is being done on both sides, both from a process standpoint, from a policy standpoint, from a bill standpoint, and from a budget standpoint. I think that paid off in what we are seeing tonight.

Last and particularly not least, I need to think the Parliamentarians. I need to thank Elizabeth MacDonough, Leigh Hildebrand, Michael Beaver, Thomas Cuffie. These are some unsung heroes of the U.S. Senate who do a bipartisan—a nonpartisan job for us of kind of refereeing when asked, and when you are doing a reconciliation bill, you are forced to ask. I had no idea what the process was and the difficulty and the time that is involved, but all of that was spent by the Parliamentarians.

We are all familiar with the rule book that is in every one of these desks and about this thick. That is a small part of it. In their office, they have file cabinets full of precedents. If you are drafting a bill that has to meet the kind of rules and the tight constraints that a reconciliation bill has, they have to meet with you on a regular basis and give their opinion and review all of these precedents to see if it can be put together the way we think it ought to be put together to be sure that when it comes to the floor, it can be voted on and when it is done, it actually is a bill that will be possible to send to the President's desk.

So I thank the Parliamentarians for presiding. I know the tremendous job they do of advising whoever sits in the Presiding Officer's chair, but this was a whole new level of instruction as I found out all of the things that they have to have as a part of their knowledge, and I really appreciate the effort they go to, the knowledge they already have, and the important role they play in this process.

I know I left out a lot of people, but to anybody who participated, I want to thank them for their efforts and hope that out of all of these budget processes, what we come up with is a better America.

I yield the floor, and I thank the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me first of all thank the Senator from Wyoming. It is interesting that every time we are involved in something—it could be reconciliation, the budget or the highway bill—he is always in the center and he has always been the anchor that holds us all together, and we appreciate that so much.

I will recognize the Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL.

TRANSPORTATION BILL

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise tonight to thank my colleagues who worked so hard on this transportation package that we have just voted on. I thank Chairman INHOFE and Senator BOXER for their hard work, as well as Chairman THUNE and Senator NELSON from the commerce committee for their hard work.

The last thing I would have predicted at the beginning of this year is that Senator BOXER would have joined forces with Senator MCCONNELL to force through a transportation package that many of us probably thought wasn't even a reality. I would like to thank the Senator from California because I think there are times in everybody's career where you have to decide that you are going to stand up and push forward no matter how many arrows are shot in your back or no matter how many questions people ask. You have a vision of a path that you see and you realize that at the end, you think you can produce a package that will really be good for America.

That is what Senator BOXER has done. She has produced a package that will not only be a great legacy for an already great career but will be the very anecdote we need right now to an economy that is greatly challenged by a lack of infrastructure investment.

I say that because the Senator from California and I both represent West Coast States that see Asia as a great economic opportunity and that represent ports up and down the West Coast. We probably have the top one and two and three and four ports on the west coast as far as volume. The key thing that we know is that our own quadrennial review of energy products told us that we can't even move product because we compete so much for room on our rails, and battle congestion on our highways. So for the first time, because of this legislation, the United States of America will have a national multimodal freight policy, along with a national freight strategic plan to say that we have to identify the freight network that is most critical to moving product to the United States of America and through our ports, and that we should have a program to direct funding to those multimodal projects that are going to help get U.S.-made products outside of the United States and to the markets where they need to be delivered.

So again, I thank Senator THUNE and Senator NELSON for fighting for these provisions in the commerce committee bill that got merged into this package and all of the staff on both sides of the aisle in the commerce committee who helped on this and Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE for including this.

I know that many times I ran into staff in the hall and they said: Yes, we know, freight can't wait. Which is kind of a moniker that we had come to talk about because freight really can't wait. If we are not shipping it in a timely fashion from North America, from the United States, I guarantee to my colleagues that products will be delivered to Asia or to Europe from someplace else and we will lose business.

So I think the U.S. Congress and the Senate tonight has understood that our infrastructure needs a shot in the arm to move freight and to establish this policy I know is going to pay dividends for us. So thank you very much for making sure that provision was in this legislation. It is a very key moment for us looking at the fact that we are an exporter and that we want our products to reach markets in a timely fashion.

I also want to thank the Secretary of Transportation because he gets this policy, and the national advisory committee that his predecessor established on freight will be very helpful for us in identifying the projects and using the resources that are in this legislation to move forward.

I also want to say how happy and grateful I am that the resolution of the Export-Import Bank debate is finally over tonight, and finally we have resolved the fact that the Bank will be reauthorized for 4 years. There are hundreds of millions of dollars of projects that need to be approved and they can hopefully start moving through the process.

I will point out that the Board needs nominees to fill the vacancies, and we should get that done so we can finish this process. But the fact that we are making a commitment for 4 years to the strategy that, yes, we want to manufacture products and, yes, we want to build things and ship them to overseas markets—whether they are grain silos, whether they are airplanes, whether they are music stands, whether they are tractors—whatever they are, we want to build them and we want to reach developing countries and international markets, and we are going to make sure the credit agencies that assist bankers in finalizing those deals exist, and we are making that commitment for 4 years.

So if there is anybody who has arrows in their back over that, I also thank them for continuing to fight to make sure we got through this process. My colleagues know that both a majority of people in the House—a majority of Republicans—supported this idea and finally got their voices heard through a discharge petition, and the majority of the U.S. Senate supported this position.

So I hope people who have allowed this process to finally take place will understand how valuable the freight provision and the export bank provision is for us as a country to continue our export strategy.

Our strategy is to build great products and to sell them to a developing world. Ninety-five percent of consumers are outside of the United States, so let's sell products, but we have to fix our infrastructure to do it. We have to make sure that credit is available to do it, and we have to make sure we continue to move forward with the other policies that are going to help us with this strategy.

So, again, I want to say how grateful I am. I will tell my colleagues I don't think it is a perfect bill, but everybody here understands it is not a perfect bill. Again, I want to thank the Senator from California for her decision to take what is a challenging process and persevere on an investment strategy that—each and every one of us would have written a different one, but at least it got us to this goal of making needed investment in critical infrastructure at a time that our country needs to be able to move products and get things to customers around the globe, and this will very much help in that process.

Again, I thank the staff on both committees, on both sides of the aisle, and everybody who was involved in making these policies a reality.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to address very briefly the comments made by one of the Senators earlier about how bad this bill is.

I think it is important for us to understand that it shows us how difficult a bill like this is because we are facing accusations, and it is the kind of thing that people would want to believe, but it is just not true. We don't have the things that sound good. The Export-Import Bank, that is something I had to swallow. I have opposed the Export-Import Bank every opportunity I have had for the last 20 years.

Yet this is a huge bill. This is the largest bill in 17 years. The most important part of this to me is those who criticize it fail to realize that when we take an oath of office, we hold up our hand—every Senator does—to uphold the Constitution of the United States. It says in the Constitution, the only two things that we are mandated to do in article I section 8 is to defend America and roads and bridges.

Ever since 1956, when Eisenhower came and did the national bill, the National Highway System, it has been successful, but where we have dropped the ball is we have been failing to have the Transportation reauthorization bill. We take into consideration all of the things that we are supposed to do, and these are things that we are supposed to do in accordance with the Constitution.

It is easy for me to say this because I have been ranked the most conservative Member many times and probably more than anyone else, but I recognize that we do have this responsibility.

Having said that, let me just say that I agree with the comments that were made by the majority leader and by Senator BOXER. She and I have disagreed more than we have agreed on things, but we have gone through a couple of these bills together and people look at us and think, If both of them want to do this, there must be something good about them.

So I have enjoyed working with Senator BOXER. It has been my honor to do it. We have actually shocked a lot of people with how well we get along. That is not going to happen after this bill, but it did before.

So let me just say this. I wish to thank some people. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Wyoming recognizes his staff. I look around here and I see these two guys. They were up more nights all night long than they were sleeping all night long, and this is for a long period of time. We have been working on this for a long period of time. It is the result of months and months of really hard work.

In particular I want to thank our EPW team of Alex Herrgott, who was trying to drive this thing, and Shant Boyajian, one who does maybe the hardest part, the actual road part; he is the expert that pulled that through. We also had Chaya Koffman, Susan Bodine, Jennie Wright, Andrew Neely, Donelle Harder, Daisy Letendre, and Kristina Baum.

And Senator BOXER's team: David Napoliello, whom I really enjoyed working with. This is funny. I could talk to David just as I talk to one of our people here. We all have the same concerns, and so it makes it easier. I

also thank Andrew Dohrman and Jason Albritton. I would include so many others, but I see that Senator BOXER is still here, and I would like to just conclude right now. I know Senator BOXER wants to recognize some of the people that worked so hard in her shop, and we worked with a lot of people.

I will yield to Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am so relieved we voted on a 5-year, fully-funded surface transportation bill that increases funding for our highway and transit programs. This is a monumental accomplishment for us all. The Environment and Public Works Committee has led the way to achieving the longest surface transportation bill that this country has seen in 17 years, which is essential for jobs, for our safety, and for our economic standing in the world.

This bill, which passed the House by a vote of 359 to 65, will provide the certainty that our States and local governments need to plan and construct improvements to the Nation's surface transportation system. It will support millions of jobs and thousands of businesses. Our bill has the support of a broad coalition of labor, business, and government organizations, including the AFL–CIO, Transportation Trades Department of the AFL–CIO, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Americans for Transportation Mobility Coalition, Teamsters, Transportation Construction Coalition, American Road and Transportation Builders Association, National Association of Counties, U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Governors Association, National Association of Manufacturers, American Trucking Associations, Highway Materials Group, Associated General Contractors, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Traffic Safety Services Association, Transport Workers Union, American Society of Civil Engineers, International Union of Operating Engineers, Amalgamated Transit Union, United Steelworkers, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, Coalition for America's Gateways and Trade Corridors, and American Association of Port Authorities.

The FAST Act is a comprehensive bill that, among other things, modernizes federal highway and transit programs, motor carrier and vehicle safety programs, and includes a passenger rail authorization. We should also not forget that it reauthorizes the Export-Import Bank, which is so important for jobs and our economic competitiveness.

It was a mammoth task to put this bill together and it has been a roller coaster ride from day one. I am pleased that this entire process was jump-started when my dear friend JIM INHOFE, who has been my partner on many infrastructure issues, worked with me to pass a highway bill out of the EPW Committee on June 24 by a unanimous 20–0 vote. I truly believe that it was our overwhelming bipartisan vote that set the stage and built momentum for this bill to begin moving through the Senate.

I also want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Congressman DEFAZIO in the House. They led a strong bipartisan effort in the House of Representatives which allowed us to go to conference with the wind at our back, and while it was never an easy negotiation and neither side got everything that they wanted, I think we are all pleased with the outcome. I want to thank all the members of the conference committee, with a special thanks to Senators DURBIN and NELSON, who are strong supporters of the conference report.

Let me highlight a few things in this bill that I am so proud of:

The bill creates and significantly funds two new programs: No. 1, the National Highway Freight Program, which will improve goods movement; and No. 2, the Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects Program, a competitive grants program to support major projects.

It provides $199 million to help commuter railroads install positive train control. It includes the Raechel and Jaqueline Houck Safe Rental Car Act, to protect consumers from leasing unsafe recalled rental vehicles. This cause has been incredibly important to me. I have worked tirelessly to get this safety provision into law. It will save lives in the future and is an example of the positive things we can do to prevent families from suffering from tragedies resulting from defective rental cars in the future.

I have been working for years to pass a long-term transportation bill, because our Nation's aging infrastructure needs robust investment to keep us competitive in the global marketplace. Our country has over 61,000 structurally deficient bridges and 50 percent of our Nation's roads are in less than good condition. More than 30,000 people die from traffic accidents each year.

The passage of MAP–21, for which I chaired the conference committee in 2012, provided 2 years of certainty and made key innovations for transportation.

Now, the FAST Act, which increases highway and transit funding, will enable our State and local governments to make new investments to improve our roads, bridges, and transit systems, which will improve safety, increase mobility, and keep goods moving efficiently. Improving our transportation infrastructure should not be a partisan issue, and I thank Leader MCCONNELL and Senator INHOFE for working closely with me to do the right thing for our country.

This entire process has been about trust, teamwork, and persistence, and I couldn't be more proud of what we have accomplished.

I would like to thank all of the staff that played an important role in this bill. As I have said, getting to this point has been a process that would make the workings of a sausage factory look appealing in comparison.

Mr. President, I know it is late, and I know we are all exhausted, but you have to mark a moment. I think this bill was such a monumental effort and the staffs that we are mentioning—Senator INHOFE is right—they were working constantly. The reason I know is that I called them constantly.

Senator INHOFE is right again. I called my staff; I called his staff; I called Senator THUNE's staff. I called everybody's staff. Right? I drove them crazy.

One time my little granddaughter was there, and I was getting into a bit of an altercation with a Member from the House, and I whispered to my granddaughter: Tell him to help your grandmother.

She got on the phone and said: Please help my grandmother. She had no idea.

The gentleman on the other end said: Oh, boy, you are tough. OK. We got through that night all right.

I am going to also thank the House family who helped us write the Safe Rental Car Act.

In closing, I am going to read these names on my team: Bettina Poirier, David Napoliello, Andrew Dohrmann, Tyler Rushforth, Jason Albritton, Ted Illston, Mary Kerr, Kate Gilman, Colin MacCarthy, and Kathryn Bacher.

From Senator INHOFE's team, I have to mention them again: Alex Hergott, Ryan Jackson, Shant Boyajian, Susan Bodine, Andrew Neely, and Chaya Koffman.

For Leader MCCONNELL: Neil Chatterjee, Hazen Marshall, and many others.

For the Banking Committee staff, I want to thank Mark Powden, Shannon Hines, Jennifer Deci, and Homer Carlisle.

For Senator NELSON: Kim Lipsky, Devon Barnhart, Matt Kelly, and Brandon Kaufman.

For Senator THUNE: Dave Schweitert, Adrian Arnakis, Allison Cullen, and Patrick Fuchs.

We built trust, we worked together, and we forged real friendships. I will never forget this as long as I live. I am grateful to everyone.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

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.

REMEMBERING GOVERNOR OLENE WALKER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute today to Governor Olene Walker, a woman beloved in my home State of Utah and regarded across the

Nation as a model of civility and selfless service. Governor Walker passed away last Saturday from causes incident to age. In her 85 years of life, she led with compassion and humility, earning the respect and admiration of everyone she served.

Governor Walker's life was one of humble service, and her modest background made her rise in politics all the more impressive. Raised in rural Utah, she developed her trademark work ethic on the family farm and spent much of her childhood milking cows, hauling hay, and harvesting sugar beets. Both as a young woman working in her family's fields and as a Governor serving the people of Utah, no task was ever below Olene—she was always willing to do whatever was necessary to get the job done and to help those in need.

As a State legislator, a Lieutenant Governor, and a Governor, Olene was steadfast in her commitment to help society's most vulnerable, especially small children. Her work in the area of health care reform precipitated the establishment of our State's Children Health Insurance Program, which helps provide medical insurance for Utah's underprivileged youth. After becoming Utah's first female Governor, she continued her advocacy for children by championing education reform.

Governor Walker's Read With a Child Early Literacy Initiative was essential to her reform efforts. This program sought to improve childhood literacy by encouraging parents to read with their kids for at least 20 minutes every day. The initiative's focus on the family speaks to a simple truth: meaningful societal change doesn't begin in the bustling chambers of Congress but in the quiet solitude of the home, through the daily interactions between parent and child. As a former homemaker and as a mother of seven, Olene understood that healthy homes lead to a healthy society. This belief influenced many of her pro-family policies as Governor.

Perhaps more than anyone I know, Governor Walker exemplified the teaching that the greatest among us is the servant of all. She often eschewed the trappings of public office and even refused to use a driver. After leaving the Governorship, Olene volunteered to serve as the primary president for her local church congregation. This humble position was a significant departure from her role as Utah's chief executive. Instead of negotiating with legislators and managing State agencies, Olene led dozens of little children in song and prayer, teaching them about the words of Christ and his early apostles. Anyone preoccupied with prestige or positions of power would surely consider this new responsibility a demotion, but Olene wasn't one of those people. She never concerned herself with titles, standing, or prominence; she cared only about serving others in whatever capacity she could.

And she served until the very end. Even after retiring from office, Olene remained in the public sphere and continued to advocate for education reform. She was also active in ecclesiastical service and would eventually serve a 2-year mission in New York City for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. She was equally engaged in academia and was instrumental in establishing the Olene S. Walker Institute of Politics and Public Service at Weber State University. In addition to hosting public forums, the institute helps students find jobs and internships in government and encourages women to become involved in politics.

Through her trailblazing example, Governor Walker leaves a legacy of leadership that is sure to inspire generations of young Americans. With her passing, we have lost not only an exemplary stateswoman but also a loving mother and a friend. I am deeply grateful for my association with Olene Walker. I consider myself lucky to have known Olene and even luckier to have served alongside her. Elaine and I send our deepest condolences to the Walker family. May God comfort them, and may He comfort all of us as we mourn the loss of an exceptional woman.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT STIVERS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to recognize a good friend of mine and the Kentucky Senate president, Robert Stivers, for the honor he recently received of being named one of the country's top nine public officials of the year by Governing magazine. Senator Stivers certainly deserves this recognition, as he has led the Kentucky Senate admirably since his elevation to the president's post in 2013.

Senator Stivers has served in the Kentucky Senate since 1997. He represents the 25th District in eastern Kentucky, which includes parts of Clay, Knox, Lee, Owsley, Whitley, and Wolfe Counties. Like myself, Robert is a proud graduate of both the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville. Before becoming senate president in 2013, he served as the senate's majority floor leader from 2009 to 2012.

Senator Stivers is perfectly suited for his leadership role, as he is a man who naturally knows how to build consensus and coalitions. He remains a practicing attorney in his hometown of Manchester and is finely tuned in to the needs of his constituents. The Clay County Chamber of Commerce honored Senator Stivers with its Man of the Year award in 2000. In 2002 he received both the AARP Appreciation Award and the Kentucky River Lincoln Club Outstanding Service Award.

Senator Stivers was recognized as one of the top public officials in the country because he has led the Kentucky Senate to pass some very important measures, including a bill to address the growing scourge of heroin and prescription pain pill abuse in our State. That is an issue I have followed closely over the years, and I can attest firsthand that Senator Stivers has been a real champion in working to find a solution.

Senator Stivers also led the senate to pass a measure providing funding for a new cancer research center at the University of Kentucky. This new facility will prove to be of immeasurable benefit to the people of Kentucky and also helps establish the University of Kentucky as one of the region's top research universities, which will attract more talent and funding to the Commonwealth.

I would ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kentucky Senate President Robert Stivers on this honor, and I thank him for his service to the people of our State. Those of us in Kentucky who have watched him at work have known for a long time that he is a talented and energetic legislator. And he is a great public servant on behalf of the people of Kentucky.

The Lexington Herald-Leader recently published an article detailing Senator Stivers' recognition by Governing magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lexington Herald-Leader, Nov. 17, 2015]

MAGAZINE NAMES KENTUCKY SENATE PRESIDENT ROBERT STIVERS A TOP PUBLIC OFFICIAL IN NATION

(By Jack Brammer)

FRANKFORT—Kentucky Senate President Robert Stivers has been named one of the country's nine public officials of the year by Governing magazine.

Stivers, R–Manchester, was nominated for the award by the magazine's editors. The magazine has honored individual state and local government officials for their accomplishments every year since 1994.

The publication commends Stivers for his bipartisan work since assuming the role of Senate president in 2013.

Landmark legislation that has passed during Stivers' presidency include bills to address abuse of prescription drugs and heroin, and providing funding for a new cancer research center at the University of Kentucky.

''It is an honor to receive this award on behalf of our work in the legislature,'' Stivers said in a statement. ''We are fortunate to have so many dedicated servants in the Kentucky General Assembly who were willing to put aside politics and do what was best for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. While there is still plenty of work to be done, I am very thankful to my colleagues and staff for their work on significant pieces of legislation. It has been a great year.''

Stivers was appointed this year as the incoming chairman of the Southern Legislative Conference, which is to hold its annual meeting in Lexington in 2016. Stivers also will be chairman of the Council on State Governments in 2018.

Stivers will travel to Washington, D.C., next month to receive the award. He represents the 25th District, which encompasses Clay, Knox, Lee, Owsley, Whitley and Wolfe counties.

RECOGNIZING THE LAS VEGAS LATIN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 40th anniversary of the Las Vegas Latin Chamber of Commerce.

Since its inception, the Latin Chamber of Commerce has been a champion for the Hispanic business community in Nevada. In working to fulfill its mission of promoting the success of its members and the more than 18,000 Hispanic-owned small businesses in the Silver State, the chamber is driving growth in Nevada and enriching the U.S. economy. By cultivating positive business, cultural, and educational relationships and expanding opportunities for Latino businessowners, the Latin Chamber of Commerce has ensured the success of hundreds of new businesses and transformed the very fabric of southern Nevada.

The Latin Chamber of Commerce was founded nearly four decades ago by a handful of determined individuals who were seeking the resources and support necessary to realize their personal and professional goals. Under the leadership of Arturo Cambeiro, the organization's first president, the chamber developed the foundation needed to become a leading advocate for Hispanic-owned businesses and Latino entrepreneurs. Today, the Latin Chamber of Commerce has grown to include more than 1,500 members throughout the Silver State, making it one of the largest organizations of its kind in the country. I applaud the Latin Chamber of Commerce for its 40th anniversary of dedicated service to the Hispanic community. The chamber's work is truly appreciated and admired.

I also commend the leadership of the Latin Chamber of Commerce, particularly Mr. Otto Merida and Ms. Victoria Napoles-Earl. Their tireless commitment to the Latino business community has played a critical role in the growth and success of the chamber. For the last 40 years, Mr. Merida has dedicated his work to developing and expanding the presence of the Latin Chamber of Commerce in southern Nevada. He has worked hard to fulfill the Chamber's mission and led the organization with the highest standards, currently serving as the organization's chief executive officer. Ms. Napoles-Earl joined the chamber in 1987 and recently announced her retirement after 30 years of service. I would like to congratulate her on her upcoming retirement and career accomplishments. From starting as the chamber's office manager to becoming its senior vice president, Ms. Napoles-Earl has dedicated her career to investing in Latino-owned businesses. During their distinguished careers, Mr. Merida and Ms. Napoles-Earl have successfully secured millions of dollars in funding for Latino businessowners, including grants, loans, and contracts. On behalf of the chamber and the thousands of Hispanic-owned businesses in Nevada, Mr. Merida and Ms. Napoles-Earl have effectively advocated for policies that help Latino entrepreneurs start and expand their business.

In addition to their roles at the Latin Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Merida and Ms. Napoles are active members in the community and have held various leadership positions at the State and local levels. Mr. Merida has worked for the State of Nevada's Department of Education, served as chair of the Las Vegas Housing Authority, and was appointed to the Nevada Commission on Economic Development. Ms. Napoles-Earl has served as a commissioner for the Nevada Commission on Minority Affairs and on the board of directors of Dignity Health's St. Rose Dominican Hospitals. I have had the honor and privilege of working closely with Mr. Merida and Ms. Napoles-Earl throughout my time in Congress, and I can say without reservation that the Hispanic business community in Nevada is fortunate to have them working on its behalf. You will be hard pressed to find more effective advocates.

As the Latin Chamber of Commerce begins its next chapter, I wish them continued success for years to come and thank them for supporting the economic growth and development of Latino entrepreneurs for 40 years and counting.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PLANNED PARENTHOOD OF NORTHERN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this week, Planned Parenthood of Northern New England marked its 50th anniversary with a well-attended gathering in South Burlington, VT. The event came less than a week after the deadly tragedy at a Planned Parenthood center in Colorado. The weight of that tragedy, more than 2,500 miles away from Vermont, was evident as those in the crowd bowed their heads in a moment of silence as the names of victims were read. But this South Burlington gathering also illustrated the depth of support for an organization that plays a critical role in health care for women of all ages throughout Vermont, throughout New England, and throughout our country.

The Planned Parenthood Association of Vermont began in 1965 when a small but active band of women gathered at the Unitarian Church in Burlington. Within the next 3 years, Maine and New Hampshire also established family planning centers, and by the mid-1980s, Planned Parenthood of Northern New England was formed.

In 2014 alone, Planned Parenthood centers around Vermont provided vital primary and preventive services to over 16,000 patients. In a rural State like Vermont, the need for health care providers in remote areas is acute. More than 90 percent of Vermont's Planned Parenthood centers are located in rural or medically underserved areas. Many Vermonters describe Planned Parenthood as their primary source of health care. In just one example, without the services that Planned Parenthood provides, thousands of low-income women in Vermont would lose their ability to have regular cancer screenings that could save their lives.

Over five decades, Planned Parenthood has weathered many challenges that include ensuring the safety of its own health care providers. In the aftermath of 9/11, more than 500 anthrax threat letters were sent to Planned Parenthood locations and other reproductive health care providers; yet it seems unimaginable that we are here in December 2015, in the U.S. Senate, once again debating whether to defund an organization that does so much to ensure the health and well-being of women across the country.

In August I spoke in opposition to this misguided, distortion-filled, partisan effort. I said at the time that the issue was unfortunately all too familiar. With the critical issues that face us today, why are we spending our time and energy on this ideologically driven effort to bar funding for women's health centers? I am saddened that we are even talking about this provision today, not even 1 week since a gunman stormed that Planned Parenthood in Colorado and caused such carnage. This is shameful, and it is cynical. It is time for the mean-spirited assault on women's health care to end.

I was heartened by the supporters, both women and men, who turned out to mark the 50th anniversary of Planned Parenthood of Northern New England this week in South Burlington. They included the next generation of young women who have been ''passed the torch'' to stand up for their rights to health care and reproductive freedom. They are committed to making sure Planned Parenthood will be around for another 50 years—and they give me hope. Let us not turn our backs on them by turning back the clock.

SUPPORTING THE COFFEE FARMERS IN THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, like many Senators, I have followed the appalling situation facing citizens of the Eastern Congo, where armed groups have fought for years over control of minerals and territory, pillaging, raping, and killing civilians in the process.

The innocent people who struggle to survive in the midst of this violence and destruction rely on subsistence agriculture, as well as raising crops for export; yet their own government makes it doubly difficult.

For decades, coffee was an important agricultural export from Eastern Congo. But after years of armed conflict, official coffee exports have reportedly decreased by over 80 percent from peak levels 30 years ago. The majority of this coffee is produced by

smallholder farmers, most of whom are women, and for whom coffee is a significant source of income.

Today a consortium, including the Eastern Congo Initiative, the Howard Buffett Foundation, and Starbucks Coffee Company, are trying to help Congolese farmers by revitalizing the industry. Needed infrastructure has been built, a supply chain is in place, and America's largest coffee company has provided a reliable buyer. This is a welcome and worthwhile effort to improve the lives of people in rural Congolese communities that should have the support of the Congolese Government.

Despite this collective effort, Congolese coffee farmers are being crippled by oppressive taxes that make their coffee uncompetitive in the global marketplace. While Congo's official export tax rate is 0.25 percent, many export officials reportedly continue to levy taxes of 7.5 percent, which is the previous rate. In addition, there are often informal tax levies that charge another 3 to 8 percent. These excessive taxes force exporters to pay smallholder farmers less for their coffee, with the result that farmers smuggle their crop into neighboring countries. The livelihoods of these farmers and the success of the Eastern Congo Initiative-Buffett-Starbucks joint venture are put at risk by the Congolese Government's actions.

I want to yield to Senator GRAHAM, who has traveled to Africa and observed the challenges facing small farmers like those I have mentioned.

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to thank my friend from Vermont with whom I have worked for years to help improve the lives of small farmers in Africa and elsewhere. The situation facing coffee farmers in the Eastern Congo should concern all Senators, as there is an opportunity, thanks to the Eastern Congo Initiative, the Buffett Foundation, and Starbucks, to significantly increase the income of people who have long struggled to get out of poverty. The Congolese Government should take immediate steps to eliminate this unofficial tax rate and other specious financial charges that are jeopardizing the livelihoods of their own people. The government must be part of the solution—and not the problem—to Congo's myriad challenges.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations, who chaired a hearing earlier this year when we heard compelling testimony about this subject.

I ask my friend from Delaware, the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, who has traveled to Africa many times, including this year with President Obama, to discuss how this situation in the Eastern Congo relates to the requirements of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Mr. COONS. I thank the Senator from Vermont for calling the Senate's attention to the challenges facing coffee producers in the Eastern Congo. The Congress passed the African Growth and Opportunity Act, AGOA, to advance economic growth and political stability in sub-Saharan Africa. AGOA furthers these objectives by offering trade benefits to countries that meet certain requirements, including commitments to policies that alleviate poverty and reflect market based economic principles. Moreover, as part of this year's AGOA renewal, we included provisions to enhance industries where African women are making strong contributions. Since its inception, exports from AGOA countries to the United States have grown 300 percent. Agriculture is the largest employer in Africa, and in the years to come, farming can play a key role in accelerating exports even further and realizing the vision of AGOA.

To meet the standards of AGOA and gain eligibility, the Congolese Government must do away with the excessive export and other taxes currently being levied on its coffee farmers. Impeding the growth of their coffee industry and lowering the standard of living of their own farmers is inconsistent with the language, intent, and spirit of AGOA. Lowering this tax burden should be required before the Democratic Republic of the Congo is granted AGOA benefits.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the senior Senator from Vermont for his leadership on this issue. Last year, I had the privilege of leading the first all-women Senate delegation to sub-Saharan Africa to examine food, agriculture, and the critical role women play in local economies. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, nearly 50 percent of all the agricultural work in the region is done by women.

Yet, too often, women are not afforded equal opportunities to own property, earn an education, or participate in the political process. That is why I was eager to lead two bipartisan provisions included in the recent AGOA renewal. The first makes clear that we expect our African trading partners to make progress toward establishing policies that support men and women. And the second expands existing agricultural trade technical assistance programs at USDA and USAID and prioritizes outreach to organizations and sectors that support women.

At its core, AGOA is about creating the building blocks of an improved trading relationship with sub-Saharan African nations. For the Democratic Republic of the Congo, coffee production presents a critical export opportunity. That is why we must insist that the Congolese Government addresses its inconsistent and burdensome export taxes on coffee producers—most of whom are women—before regaining eligibility for AGOA benefits. We have an opportunity to send a strong message to our African trading partners that we expect them to recognize how vital women are to the development of those nations' economies.

Ms. CANTWELL. I thank the senior Senator from Vermont for his leadership on this issue. Last year, I travelled to sub-Saharan Africa with Senator STABENOW. In Africa, we saw firsthand that empowering women and girls as leaders in agriculture is important to promoting economic development. When we returned, we fought to make sure promoting economic opportunities for women was an important aspect of renewal of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Investing in women produces a good return on investment. According to the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization, if women had the same access to economic resources as men, this could increase agricultural productivity by 20–30 percent.

The Congolese Government's export taxes on coffee producers have the opposite effect. It unfairly burdens women. It should be repealed before the Democratic Republic of the Congo receives any additional AGOA benefits.

Mr. ISAKSON. I want to thank the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Vermont for their important work in improving United States foreign assistance. I thank Senator LEAHY for bringing this issue to our attention today. The Senator from Delaware and I have worked for years on the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on African Affairs, and I look forward to continuing that work. Throughout our travels on the African continent, we have seen the beneficial effects of increased agriculture productivity and better access to markets, facilitated by U.S. economic development and trade preference programs.

I am proud of our work to reauthorize the African Growth and Opportunity Act. We made it stronger, more accountable, and hopefully more accessible to sub-Saharan African countries and their people. Unfortunately, Congo's ineligibility makes export opportunities more difficult for Congolese businessmen and farmers. I echo my colleagues' call on the Congolese Government to become more transparent and responsive to the needs of its people.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as you can see, there is bipartisan support for these coffee farmers who face oppressive economic constraints that limit their ability to be competitive in the marketplace and earn a decent living. I join my colleagues who have spoken on this issue today in urging the Congolese Government to address these concerns for the benefit of its people.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, due to a prior commitment, I regret I was not present to vote on six amendments to H.R. 3762, the Budget Reconciliation Act. Had I been present, I would have voted yes on amendment No. 2908, Manchin-Toomey expanded background checks, and amendment No. 2910, denying firearms to suspected terrorists. I

strongly support these commonsense gun safety proposals.

In addition, I would have supported amendment No. 2892, Senator SHAHEEN's funding for mental illness and substance abuse services, and amendment No. 2907, Senator BENNET's proposal to improving access to care at the Veterans Administration. However, I would have voted no on amendment No. 2912, Cornyn side-by-side to No. 2910; amendment No. 2914, Grassley side-by-side to No. 2908; and amendment No. 2899, Paul refugee resettlement.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 4305 of S. Con. Res. 11, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, allows the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to revise the allocations, aggregates, and levels in the budget resolution for legislation related to health care reform. The authority to adjust is contingent on the legislation not increasing the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016–2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016–2025.

I find that Senate amendment 2916 fulfills the conditions of deficit neutrality found in section 4305 of S. Con. Res. 11. Accordingly, I am revising the allocations to the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, HELP, and the budgetary aggregates to account for the budget effects of the amendment. I am also adjusting the unassigned to committee savings levels in the budget resolution to reflect that, while there are savings in the amendment attributable to both the HELP and Finance committees, the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Committee on Taxation are unable to produce unique estimates for each provision due to interactions and other effects that are estimated simultaneously.

The adjustments that I filed on Tuesday, December 2, 2015, are now void and replaced by these new adjustments.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET AGGREGATES
BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS

(Pursuant to Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and Section 4305 of S.Con. Res 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016)

$ Millions	2016
Current Aggregates:*	
Spending:	
Budget Authority	3,033,488
Outlays	3,091,974
Adjustments:	
Spending:	
Budget Authority	−32,200
Outlays	−32,300
Revised Aggregates:	
Spending:	
Budget Authority	3,001,288
Outlays	3,059,674

BUDGET AGGREGATE REVENUES

(Pursuant to Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and Section 4305 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016)

$ Millions	2016	2016–2020	2016–2025
Current Aggregates:			
Revenue	2,675,967	14,415,914	32,233,099
Adjustments:			
Revenue	−65,400	−438,000	−1,103,600
Revised Aggregates:			
Revenue	2,610,567	13,977,914	31,129,499

REVISION TO ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

(Pursuant to Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and Section 4305 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016)

$ Millions	2016	2016–2020	2016–2025
Current Allocation:			
Budget Authority	2,179,749	12,342,551	29,428,176
Outlays	2,169,759	12,322,705	29,403,199
Adjustments:			
Budget Authority	−2,000	−4,600	16,200
Outlays	−2,000	−4,600	16,200
Revised Allocation:			
Budget Authority	2,177,749	12,337,951	29,444,376
Outlays	2,167,759	12,318,105	29,419,399

REVISION TO ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

(Pursuant to Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and Section 4305 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016)

$ Millions	2016	2016–2020	2016–2025
Current Allocation:			
Budget Authority	12,137	87,301	174,372
Outlays	14,271	87,783	182,631
Adjustments:			
Budget Authority	0	−4,200	−13,700
Outlays	0	−2,400	−10,900
Revised Allocation:			
Budget Authority	12,137	83,101	160,672
Outlays	14,271	85,383	171,731

REVISION TO ALLOCATION TO THE UNASSIGNED COMMITTEE

(Pursuant to Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and Section 4305 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016)

$ Millions	2016	2016–2020	2016–2025
Current Allocation:			
Budget Authority	−930,099	−6,014,283	−15,268,775
Outlays	−884,618	−5,887,158	−14,949,026
Adjustments:			
Budget Authority	−30,200	−517,500	−1,489,900
Outlays	−30,200	−517,500	−1,489,900
Revised Allocation:			
Budget Authority	−960,299	−6,531,783	−16,758,675
Outlays	−914,818	−6,404,658	−16,438,926

TRIBUTE TO PATRICIA GEADELMANN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to a friend of mine, Patricia Geadelmann. Pat serves as special assistant to the president for board and governmental relations at the University of Northern Iowa, my alma mater. Pat is retiring in January after more than 43 years at the university.

She began her career teaching physical education and health at the Malcolm Price Laboratory School and achieved the rank of professor. Since 1984, she has served in the UNI administration under four different presidents. In fact, in total, Pat has worked at UNI under 5 of the 10 presidents the university has had. Before that, she was an undergraduate student at the university.

Her experience and her knowledge of the University of Northern Iowa is unmatched. Needless to say, she has been an invaluable resource for each of the presidents she has served with and to the university as a whole. In fact, it is hard to imagine UNI without her. I have worked with Pat in her capacity as the head of government relations for the University of Northern Iowa for most of my time in the Senate. With someone who has her level of knowledge and experience, you would be tempted to wonder whether she reports to the president or the president reports to her. But, if you know her, you know she is as unassuming as she is dogged in her dedication to the university's best interests.

The University of Northern Iowa was lucky to have her, and on behalf of the UNI family, we are sorry to lose her. We wish her well in her new ''retired'' career as minister of care and visitation at First Presbyterian Church in Waterloo.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR JIM HAGGERTON

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today with my colleague Senator CANTWELL, I wish to commemorate Mayor Jim Haggerton for his 30 years of public service. Mr. Haggerton first served the people of Tukwila, WA as a member of the planning commission from 1985 to 1994 and thereafter as a member of the city council from 1994 to 2007. Since 2008, Mr. Haggerton has served as mayor of Tukwila. On December 31, Mr. Haggerton will retire after 30 years of service to Tukwila.

During his tenure, Mr. Haggerton has consistently provided outstanding leadership, kept the interests of the public at the forefront of his work, celebrated the city's diversity, and supported its neighborhoods, businesses, and residents. Mr. Haggerton successfully spearheaded dozens of major development and public infrastructure projects including the new Klickitat interchange, the Tukwila South Development Agreement, opening the LINK Light Rail Station in Tukwila, the South Park Bridge, a permanent Tukwila Commuter Rail and Amtrak Station, the Southcenter Parkway, and the redevelopment of Interurban Avenue. Mayor Haggerton fought to redevelop neglected and crime-ridden property along Tukwila International Boulevard, which culminated in the Tukwila Village Development Agreement. Additionally, Mr. Haggerton fiercely advocated to fund new crimefighting initiatives and led efforts to build sports and recreational facilities in Tukwila. Throughout his career, I was consistently impressed with Mayor Haggerton's commitment and contributions to the local community.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I join my colleague Senator MURRAY in commemorating Mayor Haggerton's 30 years of public service. As mayor, Mr. Haggerton led the effort to develop and adopt Tukwila's first strategic plan,

providing a clear vision for economic development in the city. Mayor Haggerton was also among the first to offer regional assistance to the Oso, Arlington, and Darrington communities following the devastating State Route 530 mudslide in 2014. Throughout his tenure, Mayor Haggerton has served on multiple regional and national boards and always carried out his job with a passion for and commitment to helping others.

As our constituents in Washington State know, Mr. Haggerton had a genuine interest in learning about the issues facing those he was elected to serve. He has been an integral leader in Tukwila and played a critical role in shaping the city's history. I have no doubt that Mr. Haggerton's work in Tukwila and the greater Puget Sound region will have a lasting impact on generations for years to come.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, together Senator CANTWELL and I commend Mayor Haggerton for his longstanding dedication to public service. Over the past 30 years, Mayor Haggerton has always been an unwavering partner for the citizens of Tukwila, available with a friendly smile and positive attitude. We express our sincere gratitude, respect, and appreciation to Mr. Jim Haggerton for his service to the city and residents of Tukwila, South King County, and the State of Washington and for his friendship and partnership as we have worked with him in Washington, DC, on behalf of the people of the great State of Washington.

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL J. JONES

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to praise today the work of Mr. Daniel Jones, a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee staff, who is leaving the Senate tomorrow.

Many of us enter public service for the simple goal of making a difference. After knowing Dan for 9 years, I can say that he is one of the few people working here on Capitol Hill who has helped make history. Without his indefatigable work on the Intelligence Committee staff, the Senate report on the CIA's Detention and Interrogation Program would not have been completed, nor would its executive summary have been released to the public, an effort that led to the recent passage of critically important and long overdue anti-torture legislation.

Dan came to the Intelligence Committee in January 2007 from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, where he served as an intelligence analyst. In his first 2 years on the staff, he played a key role in overseeing counterterrorism efforts and the FBI's transition from a pure law enforcement agency to an intelligence agency—a transition that has proven instrumental to the Bureau's ability to identify and thwart numerous terrorist attacks over the past several years.

However, his service and focus shifted following the revelation in December 2007 that the CIA had previously destroyed interrogation videotapes that showed the brutal treatment and questioning of two detainees, Abu Zubaydah and Abd al-Rahim al-Nashiri. Then-Chairman Jay Rockefeller assigned Dan and fellow staffer Alissa Starzak to review the CIA cables describing those interrogation sessions. For the next several months, Dan worked at his full-time job at the committee while also working nights and weekends at CIA headquarters, poring through the cables.

The report that he and Alissa produced in early 2009 was graphic, and it was shocking. It demonstrated in documented fact and in the CIA's own words treatment by the U.S. Government that stood in contrast to our values and to what the committee had previously been led to believe. The report sparked a comprehensive investigation by the committee, with a 14–1 vote in March 2009, that Dan led and then saw through to its completion.

While carrying out the investigation into the CIA program, Dan also co-led the committee's investigation into the attempted bombing of Northwest Flight 253 over Detroit on Christmas Day 2009 by Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab. Five months later, the committee produced a bipartisan report that found 14 specific points of failure that resulted in Abdulmutallab being able to board the flight and attempt to detonate his explosive device at the direction of al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula. The report also made both classified and unclassified recommendations to improve our counterterrorism efforts.

But back to the investigation on the CIA Detention and Interrogation Program—to say that Dan worked diligently on this study is a gross understatement. He, along with other committee staff, worked day and night, often 7 days a week, from 2009 through December 2012. He became an expert in one of the most unfortunate activities in the history of our intelligence community, going through more than 6 million pages of materials produced for the study, as well as immersing himself in the anti-torture provisions in U.S. law, as well as human rights materials, and the background of other similar historic Senate investigations. Throughout this period, Dan regularly briefed me on the team's findings. Each time, I noted the obvious toll that this was taking on him physically, but he always remained committed to concluding the report.

From the end of 2012 through the end of 2014, Dan stewarded the report through two bipartisan committee votes, a lengthy period of review and meetings with the CIA, and an 8-month long redaction review leading to the release of the executive summary of the study on December 9, 2014. He then played a key role in enacting reforms following the release of the executive summary, in particular the passage of a provision in this year's National Defense Authorization Act that will prevent the future use of coercive interrogation techniques or indefinite, secret detention in the future.

While Dan is known most for his leadership on the CIA detention and interrogation review, his public service doesn't end there. Before his Federal service, Dan taught for Teach for America in an inner-city school in Baltimore, MD, and he has served on the board of his alma mater, Elizabethtown College. His dedication to service is also demonstrated by his two master's degrees, a master's of public policy from the Kennedy School of Government and a master's of arts in teaching from Johns Hopkins.

I want to use this opportunity to thank Dan Jones for his indispensable work over the past 9 years and to wish him the very best as he moves on to future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO LEFFRICH ''TIM'' MAYO, SR.

Mr. SESSIONS: Mr. President, today I wish to say goodbye to one of the great members of the staff of this institution, Leffrich ''Tim'' Mayo, an exceptional individual with a deep devotion to the Senate, who retired from service on December 3, 2015, after over 35 years of service.

Tim, who some called ''Mayo'', began working at the U.S. Capitol in May of 1979 as a bus boy in the Senators dining room on the recommendation of a friend, the late Lawrence Green. Following that position, he held many positions in the Russell Building coffee shop, Senate labor division, and finally in the Architect of the Capitol's furniture division.

Tim really enjoyed working with Senators and their staff. He was exceptional at finding the perfect pieces of furniture that would fit the needs of Members and staff alike. If he knew you were looking for something in particular, he would search the warehouses until he found it. He knew every office and their styles and needs.

Tim would always greet you with a smile and a big hello. He was willing to help others no matter what the task or situation. Nothing was too challenging or difficult for him. He got great pleasure out of meeting new staff, visitors, and people from all over the world.

We will all miss Tim's smiling face and eager assistance in the Halls of the Senate, but also wish him the best as he moves on to bigger and better things in his retirement. Thank you, Mayo.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I want to recognize Rick Young, a proud veteran from Forsyth, MT. Montana is blessed with a rich legacy of service, and it is my honor to recognize not only Rick's service to our country, but

his work to make quality health care accessible for all Montana veterans.

Rick proudly served our country as a marine from January 1971 to January 1975. Unfortunately, his current illness requires constant care and attention. His wife, Sharon, long served as his primary round-the-clock caretaker and was confined to their home due to Rick's condition, which required an external ventilator to breathe at all times. Eventually his needs surpassed his ability to stay home, and he had to move into a long-term care facility.

While Rick was still at home, the Rosebud Health Care Center, RHCC, facility initiated a contract with the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, to be able to provide care and services to veterans in its long-term care unit. The previous aging and resource center for Rosebud County was in Glendive, MT, about 1 hour and 40 minutes away from Rick's home in Forsyth, MT. Thankfully, RHCC received approval from the VA to provide care services close to home for Rick on November 1, 2015.

Rick's persistence and advocacy throughout his illness helped serve as the catalyst for RHCC establishing a contract with the VA that allows for veterans to receive long-term care in Forsyth. Our State has one of the largest populations of veterans per capita, and Rick's efforts have led the VA to create additional resources to help to provide health care services to Montana's extensive veteran population.

I am so proud to have advocates like Rick and Sharon fighting for veterans in Montana. Through his inspiring work to increase veterans' access to care, Rick Young has created an unmatchable legacy that will leave a lasting mark on our State. Keep fighting, Rick. I am rooting for you.●

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR JOE RILEY

● Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to speak today about Mayor Joe Riley, who is retiring after decades of service to the people of Charleston, SC.

Simply put, Joe Riley is one of the best mayors in America and a living legend in South Carolina political history. He is a hard-working, dedicated public servant who has spent most of his adult life serving the people of Charleston. I have never known anyone who loves their job more than he.

Years ago, Mayor Riley came into office with a vision for Charleston, but like all great leaders, he understood he couldn't do it alone. He went to work doing what he does best—bringing people together for the common good.

Now, as he retires from serving as mayor of the city he loves, the revitalization of this historic city is absolutely stunning. Thanks to his years of service, Charleston is now recognized as one of the best destinations to visit, not only in the United States but in the world.

Joe Riley will go down in history as a transformative mayor who turned his vision for Charleston into reality. We are all better because of his service.●

TRIBUTE TO PAUL KOESTER

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Paul Koester on his retirement after over 41 years of service to the U.S. Air Force. It gives me great pleasure to recognize his years of dedication to protecting our country and our State.

Mr. Koester grew up in Colorado Springs, CO, and later enlisted in the U.S. Air Force in 1974 with the intention of serving 4 years as a jet engine mechanic. During his time in basic training, he decided to change course and test to become a pararescue airman. After successfully passing his training, he spent the next 4 years at Elmendorf Air Force Base in Alaska as part of the 71st Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Squadron. During his time serving in this squadron, he was credited with saving over 75 lives.

From 1980 to 1986, Mr. Koester served at McClellan Air Force Base in California and Little Rock Air Force Base in Arkansas. He soon after decided to join the Air National Guard. For the next 16 years, Mr. Koester served in the 102nd Rescue Squadron at Francis S. Gabreski Air National Guard Base in New York. On September 11, 2001, Mr. Koester and his squadron assisted as first responders during the collapse of the World Trade Center, aiding in saving the lives of many victims of the attack. His bravery and selflessness during this time of crisis will never be forgotten.

Three weeks later, Mr. Koester was deployed to the border of Kuwait and Iraq to serve as part of Operation Southern Watch. Following his return from this mission, Mr. Koester made the decision to resume Active Duty and was sent to Nellis Air Force Base in 2003 as part of the 58th Rescue Squadron. He concluded his service with this unit after 12 years of service. At his 60th birthday celebration, Mr. Koester was recognized as the oldest enlisted member actively serving in the Air Force and the longest serving pararescue airman with 13 deployments throughout his career. Our country and the Silver State are fortunate to have had someone of such dedication serving to protect our freedoms.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have had no greater honor than the opportunity to engage with the men and women who served in our Nation's military. I recognize Congress has a responsibility not only to honor the brave individuals who serve our Nation, but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for veterans like Mr. Koester in Nevada and throughout the Nation.

Mr. Koester has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the U.S. Air Force. I am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan, and I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Mr. Koester for his years of service and in congratulating him on his retirement. I wish him well in all of his future endeavors.●

CONGRATULATING BILL LANDON

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Bill Landon on receiving the 2015 Air and Surface Transport Nurses Association Lynn Stevens Excellence in Safety Award. It gives me great pleasure to see him receive this prestigious award after years of hard work within northern Nevada.

In 1998, Mr. Landon began his air ambulance career in Greeley, CO. In 2003, he joined Care Flight in Reno and has since served as safety and training coordinator and flight paramedic. During his time at Care Flight, he has been a key contributor in the founding of a formalized safety committee, which meets twice a month and is comprised of medical flight staff pilots, air communication specialists, managers, and maintenance personnel. This important committee, chaired by Mr. Landon, works to review, develop, and implement safety initiatives for Care Flight and those that it serves. As chair, Mr. Landon spearheads important safety trainings, including an annual training for hospital emergency departments, pre-hospital agencies, and ski patrols servicing a 40,000 square mile area. His unwavering dedication to Care Flight in Reno has helped provide hundreds of hours of safety and medical training needed to save lives throughout northern Nevada. His work for our State is invaluable.

The Lynn Steven's Excellence in Safety Award goes to individuals who have gone above and beyond in the transportation community to promote safety awareness. This accolade is truly prestigious and attained by only the most influential members in this community. Since 1981, Care Flight has served northern Nevada's health organizations as an important resource for transportation with flight paramedics and pilots to respond to a variety of medical emergencies. Our State is fortunate to have someone like Mr. Landon serving Care Flight and its safety initiatives.

Throughout his tenure, Mr. Landon has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to his trade. I am honored by his service and am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan. Today, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Landon on receiving this award, and I extend my deepest appreciation for all that he has done for many across northern Nevada. I offer him my best wishes in his role as safety and training coordinator in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO KRISTI BLACKLER

● Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I recognize Kristi Blackler, an

intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Kristi is a graduate of Stevens High School in Rapid City, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of South Dakota, where she is majoring in international studies and political science. She is a positive and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Kristi for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO SOPHIE DOEDEN

● Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I recognize Sophie Doeden, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Sophie is a graduate of Beresford High School in Beresford, SD. Currently, she is attending Northern State University in Aberdeen, SD, where she is majoring in political science and minoring in history and economics. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience and who has been a true asset to the office.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Sophie for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

REMEMBERING DR. JOHN A. KNAUSS

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, recently the oceans lost one of their greatest champions. With the passing of Dr. John A. Knauss, Rhode Island has lost a beloved teacher, a visionary leader, and a brilliant scientist. We will all miss him a great deal.

John's accomplishments are too many to list, but I will note a few.

In 1966, Dr. Knauss was named to the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, where he and his colleagues recommended that Congress form a new and independent Federal agency to advance marine and atmospheric sciences and better understand our oceans, coastlines, and Great Lakes. That agency became the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which conducts some of the most important ocean science in the world and where John served as Administrator from 1989 to 1993.

Along with Rhode Island Senator Claiborne Pell and Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, Dr. Knauss developed the National Sea Grant College Program. Their model was the country's land grant college system—century-old centers of learning that promote better use of America's vast resources of land. Pell and Knauss thought that surely our oceans and Great Lakes needed a similar network of institutions to conduct coastal and marine science and promote conservation of such important natural assets.

Congress agreed. In 2016, Sea Grant will celebrate 50 years of good work on behalf of our oceans and Great Lakes. In recognition of his vision and leadership in forming Sea Grant, NOAA named one of its most prestigious fellowships in his honor—the NOAA Sea Grant John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship. Every year, around 50 of the Nation's top graduate and postgraduate students are selected for Knauss fellowships to spend a year working on marine and coastal policy issues for the Federal agencies and congressional offices in Washington, DC. Two Knauss fellows, Adena Leibman and Anna-Marie Laura, have worked in my Senate office, helping shape national oceans policy.

But perhaps his most significant achievement is the Graduate School of Oceanography, GSO, at the University of Rhode Island. John founded the GSO in 1962, served as its dean for over 25 years, and built it into an international leader in marine research. Today, sitting atop a bluff overlooking Rhode Island's beautiful Narragansett Bay, the GSO is home to 41 faculty and 170 graduate students engaged in cutting-edge oceanographic science and pursuing degrees across a range of specialties, including the country's first marine affairs and ocean engineering programs. It is a true Rhode Island treasure, one we should continue investing in, and a testament to Dean Knauss's leadership and commitment to our oceans.

Easily lost among his accomplishments in founding and leading ocean research institutions are his personal contributions to oceanography. In his dissertation for the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, John was the first to make comprehensive measurements of the Pacific Equatorial Undercurrent—a current that runs for thousands of miles beneath the surface of the Pacific Ocean. He later discovered another major current in the Indian Ocean.

John will be remembered for his collegiality and gift for collaboration among the administrators, faculty, students, and other researchers and ocean-minded professionals that he touched. Like the currents he studied, connecting vast oceans in one system, the institutions and programs he created and led bind together leading minds in ocean science, bettering our understanding of our ocean world and how important it is to us.

I offer my and Sandra's condolences to the Knauss family, to the marine science community, and to the countless people John Knauss taught, mentored, and inspired through the years.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

At 9:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions:

S. 1170. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units''.

S.J. Res. 24. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Generating Units''.

The enrolled bill and joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 10:34 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1177) to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 644) to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and on December 2, 2015, appoints Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, as managers of the conference on the part of the House.

At 1:55 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 22) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2359. A bill to restore Second Amendment rights in the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 3, 2015, she

had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1170. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

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–3641. A communication from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2014 Annual Report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation (SIPC); to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3642. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Lake Chelan National Recreation Area, Solid Waste Disposal'' (RIN1024–AE09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 24, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3643. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Recovery and State Grants, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of the Delmarva Peninsula Fox Squirrel From the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife'' (RIN1018–AY83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3644. 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 ''Increase in De Minimis Safe Harbor Limit for Taxpayers Without an Applicable Financial Statement'' (Notice 2015–82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Finance .

EC–3645. 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 ''Additional Rules Regarding Inversions and Related Transactions'' (Notice 2015–79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3646. 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 ''Publication of the Tier 2 Tax Rates'' (Railroad Retirement Tax Act sections 3201(b), 3221(b), and 3211(b)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3647. 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 ''Interim Guidance Regarding Certain Provisions of the Proposed Regulations Relating to Qualified ABLE Programs'' (Notice 2015–81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3648. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015–0150—2015–0165); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3649. A communication from Director, Office of Government Relations, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards'' (RIN3045–AA61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3650. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–049); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3651. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–060); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3652. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3653. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Administration's fiscal year 2015 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3654. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Department of Homeland Security Privacy Office 2015 Annual Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3655. A communication from the Acting Director, Pay and Leave, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''General Schedule Locality Pay Areas'' (RIN3206–AM88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 24, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3656. A communication from the Board Chair and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the period from April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3657. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation's response; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3658. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Corporation for National and Community Service's Response and Report on Final Action for the period from April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3659. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3660. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administrator's Semiannual Management Report to Congress for the period from April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3661. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3662. A communication from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3663. A communication from the Chairwoman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3664. A communication from the Director, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3665. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, a report of proposed legislation entitled ''Servicemembers Legislative Package''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–3666. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–092); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3667. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–106); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3668. 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–2015–2461)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3669. 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–2015–4207)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3670. 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–2015–4205)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3671. 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–2015–0498)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3672. 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–2014–0649)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3673. 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–2014–0454)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3674. 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–2015–0593)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3675. 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 for the following Missouri Towns: Chillicothe, MO; Cuba, MO; Farmington, MO; Lamar, MO; Mountain View, MO; Nevada, MO; and Poplar Bluff, MO'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0842)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3676. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's eleventh annual report on ethanol market concentration; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3677. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Amendment to List of Field Offices: Expansion of San Ysidro, California Port of Entry to include the Cross Border Xpress User Fee facility'' (CBP Dec. 15–17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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–108. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the President of the United States and United States Congress and the United States Office of Management and Budget to support plans to upgrade the Soo Locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and approve the United States Army Corps of Engineers' reprogramming request to fund an Economic Reevaluation Report for replacing the Davis and Sabin locks; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 105

Whereas, The Soo Locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, are of the utmost importance to Michigan and play a critical role in our nation's economy and security. Each year, approximately 10,000 Great Lakes vessels, carrying 80 million tons of iron ore, coal, grain, and other cargo, safely and efficiently traverse the locks. Nearly 80 percent of domestic iron ore, the primary material used to manufacture steel, travels from mines in Minnesota and Michigan's Upper Peninsula through the Soo Locks; and

Whereas, Only one of the four Soo Locks is large enough to accommodate the modern vessels that commonly traverse the Great Lakes. Seventy percent of cargo is carried on these large ships that can only pass through the Poe Lock. The remainder of cargo goes through the smaller MacArthur Lock, with the smallest 100-year-old Davis and Sabin locks rarely used; and

Whereas, The reliance on one lock poses a serious risk to national security and the economies of the state of Michigan and the United States. A long-term outage of the Poe Lock due to lock failure or terrorist attack could cripple the economy and disrupt steel production in the United States. It is estimated that a 30-day outage would result in economic losses of $160 million; and

Whereas, Upgrades to the Soo Locks are needed to ensure national security and unfettered commerce through the Great Lakes. To this end, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has requested funding to conduct a study crucial to moving forward with the construction of a second, large lock. The Economic Reevaluation Report would examine the economic benefits and costs of replacing the Davis and Sabin locks with a lock similar in size to the current Poe Lock: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we encourage the President and Congress of the United States and the U.S. Office of Management and Budget to support plans to upgrade the Soo Locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and approve the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' reprogramming request to fund an Economic Reevaluation Report for replacing the Davis and Sabin locks; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, and the Director of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1704. A bill to amend the Indian Tribal Justice Act to secure urgent resources vital to Indian victims of crime, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–172).

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 2820. A bill to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2136. A bill to establish the Regional SBIR State Collaborative Initiative Pilot Program, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 2347. A bill to extend temporarily the extended period of protection for members of uniformed services relating to mortgages, mortgage foreclosure, and eviction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEE, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2348. A bill to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 2349. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the annual reporting of data on enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 2350. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for full expensing of tangible property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

S. 2351. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the annual comment period for payment rates under Medicare Advantage; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 2352. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to require mandatory reporting of incidents of child abuse or neglect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2353. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the incentives for biodiesel; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. 2354. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to employers who provide paid family and medical leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2355. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify Federal law with respect to reporting certain positive consumer credit information to consumer reporting

agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 2356. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to require an electronic communication service provider that generates call detail records pursuant to an order under that Act to notify the Attorney General if the provider intends to retain such records for a period less than 18 months; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2357. A bill to extend temporarily the extended period of protection for members of uniformed services relating to mortgages, mortgage foreclosure, and eviction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2358. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out a pilot program to work with municipalities that are seeking to develop and implement integrated plans to meet wastewater and stormwater obligations under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 2359. A bill to restore Second Amendment rights in the District of Columbia; read the first time.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. HATCH, and Mrs. ERNST):

S.J. Res. 26. A joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and its associated forces; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. Res. 326. A resolution celebrating the 135th anniversary of diplomatic relations between the United States and Romania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COONS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KING, Mr. TESTER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. Res. 327. A resolution condemning violence that targets healthcare for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. Res. 328. A resolution supporting the December 3, 2015, National Day of Remembrance for victims of drunk and drugged driving and for victims of the consequences of underage drinking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 236

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 236, a bill to amend the Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 to create an expedited procedure to enact recommendations of the Government Accountability Office for consolidation and elimination to reduce duplication.

S. 290

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 290, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 553

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 553, a bill to marshal resources to undertake a concerted, transformative effort that seeks to bring an end to modern slavery, and for other purposes.

S. 713

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 713, a bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

S. 871

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 871, a bill to provide for an application process for interested parties to apply for an area to be designated as a rural area, and for other purposes.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction from the gift tax for gifts made to certain exempt organizations.

S. 1127

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1127, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes.

S. 1315

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1315, a bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions.

S. 1333

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1333, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude cannabidiol and cannabidiol-rich plants from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 1668

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1668, a bill to restore longstanding United States policy that the Wire Act prohibits all forms of Internet gambling, and for other purposes.

S. 1698

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1698, a bill to exclude payments from State eugenics compensation programs from consideration in determining eligibility for, or the amount of, Federal public benefits.

S. 1874

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1874, a bill to provide protections for workers with respect to their right to select or refrain from selecting representation by a labor organization.

S. 1909

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1909, a bill to protect communities from destructive Federal overreach by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

S. 1919

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1919, a

bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 2006

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2006, a bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents.

S. 2022

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2022, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of special pension for Medal of Honor recipients, and for other purposes.

S. 2123

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2123, a bill to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2170

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 2275

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2275, a bill to provide for automatic acquisition of United States citizenship for certain internationally adopted individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2337

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2337, a bill to improve homeland security by enhancing the requirements for participation in the Visa Waiver Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2344

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2344, a bill to provide authority for access to certain business records collected under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 prior to November 29, 2015, to make the authority for roving surveillance, the authority to treat individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers, and title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 permanent, and to modify the certification requirements for access to telephone toll and transactional records by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 148

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 2876

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2876 proposed to H.R. 3762, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

AMENDMENT NO. 2884

At the request of Mr. VITTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2884 proposed to H.R. 3762, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2884 proposed to H.R. 3762, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 2886

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2886 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3762, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2353. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the incentives for biodiesel; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Biodiesel Tax Incentive Reform and Extension Act of 2015. I am pleased to be joined by Senator CANTWELL. Our bill will modify the biodiesel fuel blenders credit to a domestic production credit, and extend the credit through 2018.

Congress created the biodiesel tax incentive in 2005. As a result of this incentive, and the Renewable Fuel Standard, biodiesel is providing significant benefits to the nation. Domestic biodiesel production supports tens of thousands of jobs. Replacing traditional diesel with biodiesel reduces emissions and creates cleaner air.

Homegrown biodiesel improves our energy security by diversifying our transportation fuels and reducing our dependence on foreign oil. Biodiesel itself is a very diverse fuel. It can be produced from a wide array of resources such as recycled cooking oil, soybean and other plant oils, and animal fats.

Senator CANTWELL and I have been advocating for years a modification to the current incentive. We have proposed making the credit available for the domestic production of biodiesel, rather than a mixture credit available to the blender of the fuel, going back to 2009.

The bill we are introducing today is similar to an amendment that I offered with Senator CANTWELL during consideration of the tax extenders package in the Senate Finance Committee in July of this year. Our biodiesel reform amendment passed unanimously by voice vote.

Converting to a producer credit improves the incentive in many ways. The blenders credit can be difficult to administer, because the blending of the fuel can occur at many different stages of the fuel distribution. This can make it difficult to ensure that only fuel that qualifies for the credit claims the incentive It has been susceptible to abuse because of this.

A credit for domestic production will also ensure that we are incentivizing the domestic industry, rather than subsidizing imported biofuels. It's projected that imports from Argentina, Singapore, the European Union, South Korea and others could exceed 1.5 billion gallons over this year and next.

We should not provide a U.S. taxpayer benefit to imported biofuels. By restricting the credit to domestic production, we will also save taxpayer money. The amendment adopted in the Finance Committee is estimated to reduce the cost of the extension by $90 million.

Importantly, modifying the credit will have little to no impact on the consumer. Much of the credit will continue to be passed on to the blender and ultimately, the consumer. Additionally, the U.S. biodiesel industry is currently operating at only 60 percent of capacity. The domestic biodiesel industry has the capacity and access to affordable feedstocks to meet the demand of U.S. consumers.

It is my understanding that representatives from the House and Senate, along with the White House, are currently meeting to finalize a tax extender package before the end of the year. I strongly urge them to maintain the Senate position, and include the biodiesel reform policies that were adopted in the Senate Finance Committee.

This modification will ensure that the credit is doing what Congress intended—incentivizing investment in domestic biodiesel production. Surely, House and Senate leaders recognize that we should not be providing a U.S. taxpayer subsidy to already heavily subsidized foreign biodiesel imports.

I therefore urge my colleagues to support this common-sense, cost reduction modification.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 326—CELEBRATING THE 135TH ANNIVERSARY OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND ROMANIA

Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 326

Whereas the United States established diplomatic relations with Romania in June 1880;

Whereas the Governments of the United States and Romania strive to continually improve cooperation between government leaders and strengthen the two countries' strategic partnership, focusing on the political-military relationship, law-enforcement collaboration, trade and investment opportunities, and energy security;

Whereas the Governments of the United States and Romania are committed to supporting human rights, advancing the rule of law, democratic governance, economic growth, and freedom;

Whereas Romania joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 2004, and has established itself as a resolute ally of both the United States and strong NATO member;

Whereas the Government of Romania continues to improve its military capabilities, and has repeatedly demonstrated its willingness to provide forces and assets in support of operations that address the national security interests of the United States and all NATO members, including deployments to Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and Kosovo;

Whereas, in 2011, the United States and Romania issued the ''Joint Declaration on Strategic Partnership for the 21st Century Between the United States of America and Romania,'' reflecting increasing cooperation between our countries to promote security, democracy, free market opportunities, and cultural exchange;

Whereas the United States and Romania signed a ballistic missile defense (BMD) agreement in 2011, allowing the deployment of United States personnel, equipment, and anti-missile interceptors to Romania;

Whereas, in October 2014, the United States Navy formally launched Naval Support Facility Deveselu to achieve the goals of the 2011 BMD agreement and thus established the first new United States Navy base since 1987;

Whereas, in September 2015, Romania stood up a NATO Force Integration Unit;

Whereas Romania will host the Alliance's Multinational Division-Southeast headquarters in Bucharest and commits significant resources to the Very High Readiness Joint Task Force;

Whereas Romania has agreed to host components of the United States' European Phased Adaptive Approach missile defense system, which will be operational by the end of 2015; and

Whereas, for the past 25 years, the Government of Romania has shown leadership in advancing stability, security, and democratic principles in Central and Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans, and the Black Sea region, especially in the current difficult regional context: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 135th anniversary of United States-Romanian diplomatic relations;

(2) congratulates the people of Romania on their accomplishments as a great nation; and

(3) expresses appreciation for Romania's unwavering partnership with the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 327—CONDEMNING VIOLENCE THAT TARGETS HEALTHCARE FOR WOMEN

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COONS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KING, Mr. TESTER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 327

Whereas the constitutional right of the people of the United States to make healthcare decisions about their own bodies was established more than 43 years ago;

Whereas in Eisenstadt v. Baird, 405 U.S. 438 (1972), the Supreme Court confirmed the constitutional right of all men and women to legally access birth control;

Whereas the Supreme Court decided Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973) 42 years ago and reaffirmed that women have a constitutional right to comprehensive reproductive healthcare;

Whereas for decades, healthcare providers for women and people who access healthcare services for women have been subjected to intimidation, threats, and violence;

Whereas since 1993, there have been 11 murders and numerous attempted murders of individuals associated with care provided at health centers for women;

Whereas since 1977—

(1) nearly 7,000 violent acts have been reported against providers at health centers for women, including bombings, arsons, death threats, kidnappings, and assaults; and

(2) more than 190,000 acts of disruption, including bomb threats and harassing calls, have been reported;

Whereas between June and December 2015, arson, vandalism, and threats have increased at Planned Parenthood health centers and other health centers for women, including—

(1) health centers in—

(A) Aurora, Illinois;

(B) Pullman, Washington;

(C) Louisville, Kentucky; and

(D) Claremont, New Hampshire; and

(2) on November 27, 2015, an attack by a gunman at a Planned Parenthood health center in Colorado Springs, Colorado, in which 3 people were killed and 9 people were injured;

Whereas extreme and demonizing rhetoric contributes to a climate that is dangerous for individuals who provide or access comprehensive healthcare services;

Whereas since more than 40 percent of the patients of Planned Parenthood are people of color, people of color are disproportionately impacted by attacks on health centers for women; and

Whereas over their lifetimes, 1 in 5 women in the United States will access healthcare at Planned Parenthood, which—

(1) in 2013 provided—

(A) over 1,400,000 emergency contraception kits;

(B) nearly 4,500,000 tests and treatments for sexually transmitted infections; and

(C) nearly 900,000 cervical cancer screenings and breast exams;

(2) continues to be the leading reproductive healthcare provider in the United States; and

(3) along with many other reproductive health providers, continues to provide expert, quality reproductive healthcare in safe and supportive environments across the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) denounces the attacks on healthcare centers for women, providers of healthcare for women, and patients; and

(2) affirms that all women have the right to access reproductive healthcare services without fear of violence, intimidation, or harassment.

SENATE RESOLUTION 328—SUPPORTING THE DECEMBER 3, 2015, NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR VICTIMS OF DRUNK AND DRUGGED DRIVING AND FOR VICTIMS OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF UNDERAGE DRINKING

Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 328

Whereas drunk driving is still a leading cause of death and injury on the roadways of the United States and nearly 1 in 3 traffic fatalities involved alcohol-impaired crashes, according to studies conducted by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration;

Whereas, in 2014, there were 9,967 people killed in alcohol-impaired crashes, representing an average of 27 alcohol-impaired driving fatalities every day and 1 alcohol-impaired driving fatality every 53 minutes;

Whereas countless victims, survivors, families, and loved ones are left to cope with the aftermath of these terrible crashes;

Whereas victims and survivors of drunk and drugged driving and the consequences of underage drinking are cause for concern;

Whereas Mothers Against Drunk Driving (referred to in this preamble as ''MADD'') was founded in 1980 and today continues with the mission to end drunk driving, help fight drugged driving, support the victims of these crimes and crashes, and prevent underage drinking;

Whereas drunk driving deaths have been reduced dramatically since 1980, from more than 25,000 deaths per year to just under 10,000 in 2014, thanks to efforts from MADD, other community organizations, States, schools, law enforcement agencies, safety technologies and programs, improved laws, and growing public recognition of the risks posed by drunk driving;

Whereas combating drunk and drugged driving is a legislative priority for the Senate in the 114th Congress, advancing a multi-

year transportation reauthorization bill that provides incentives to States to adopt measures to reduce impaired driving and authorizes impaired driving research and development;

Whereas, on December 3, 2015, MADD locations across the United States will honor those individuals killed, injured, or emotionally devastated by drunk and drugged driving and underage drinking with a National Day of Remembrance; and

Whereas the National Day of Remembrance is a chance for the public to come together in communities across the United States and online to show that the victims and survivors of these senseless tragedies are not alone: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the victims of drunk and drugged driving; and

(2) recognizes the consequences of underage drinking on the first annual National Day of Remembrance.

S. RES. 328

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, no family should lose a loved one to a drunk driver. But, sadly, so many families do—every day, every month, every year. It happens in my State. It happens all across our Nation. It is tragic, it is senseless, and it must stop.

Last weekend, according to the Albuquerque Journal, police reported that an ''extremely intoxicated'' driver ran a red light and smashed into the car of three young people.

Robert Mendez was 27 years old. His brother Sergio Mendez-Aguirre was 23, and their friend Grace Sinfield was 20.

The violence of the collision was so great that their car flipped over. They died early Sunday morning—at the end of the Thanksgiving weekend. The police investigation continues. But this much is certain: A holiday that began in joy—for these families—ended in great sorrow.

Sergio Mendez-Aguirre graduated from the University of New Mexico with honors in chemistry. Robert Mendez was a student at UNM. Grace Sinfield was studying to be a writer.

Our hearts go out to the Mendez and Sinfield families. These young people were just beginning, just starting out in life, and just finding their way.

Robert Mendez's family remembers how he believed that, ''Fear is everyone's number one enemy. Take chances, make mistakes, and learn from them. After all, we grow from experience. Life is too short to live timidly.''

The Albuquerque Journal reported that Sergio Mendez-Aguirre once asked, ''What can make you more happy than making others happy?'' His answer was, ''Nothing can.''

Grace Sinfield's family spoke of her great spirit. ''She was a true friend who taught us how to love unconditionally; she was the life of every party. She attracted laughter like she was a magnet. Just as important and relevantly, she was always responsible and by proxy made those around her more responsible and better people.''

Three young lives—full of promise—and now over in one terrible moment—they will be missed by so many in Albuquerque.

Every DWI death is a tragedy—and an unnecessary tragedy. It doesn't have to happen. But, year after year, for too many families, it does. More than 10,000 people are killed every year, and another 290,000 are injured, all as a result of drunk driving.

Those are horrific numbers, but they are more than just numbers. They are stories of profound loss and should outrage us all. In years past, it was even worse. In 1980, 25,000 people—two and one-half times more people than now—died because of drunk driving—25,000 people, in 1 year.

We are making progress thanks to determined families and law enforcement and thanks to groups like Mothers Against Drunk Driving. I am proud to work with them. But we still have work to do. There are 10,000 families—every year—to remind us—10,000 families in grief, in pain, and all because of drunk driving. No parent should have to grieve a child's loss on the holidays—or any day.

When I was elected attorney general in New Mexico 25 years ago, we had the highest rate of DWI deaths in the Nation. We were the worst—too many drunk drivers, too many repeat offenders, too many innocent people dying every year.

We pushed for reform. We identified solutions—in law enforcement and in prevention. But there was a lot of push back, a lot of opposition in the State legislature. And then along came a mom named Nadine Milford. Her daughter and granddaughters were killed by a drunk driver on Christmas Eve 1992. It is hard to imagine such a loss.

So we changed New Mexico's DWI and traffic safety laws. We got it done because of moms like Nadine, because of families and friends who had had enough and would not take no for an answer.

In the early 1990s, my State had up to 500 DWI deaths a year. Last year, it was 166. But that is still 166 too many. We still lose too many innocent lives—young and old alike—in New Mexico and all across our Nation.

I believe new technology will help. That is why I have pushed for the Driver Alcohol Detection System for Safety, or DADSS. This technology is critically important and will make a critical difference. We all know this. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration knows it. The auto industry knows it. And they are working together to make it happen.

DADSS would be built into new vehicles. It would analyze a driver's breath or blood alcohol content. It would stop drunk drivers from turning on the engine. If you are drunk, you will not drive, period.

This could save 59,000 lives over 15 years. It could save up to $343 billion. The highway bill includes continued funding for DADSS research over the next 5 years. I am grateful the conference committee supported this vital technology.

But technology alone is not enough. In the meantime, the message should be loud and clear. Anyone who gets behind the wheel while impaired should not drive.

That is why I also urge passage of a resolution I am submitting—supporting the December 3, 2015, National Day of Remembrance for victims of drunk and drugged driving. We want to say to their families—we have not forgotten them. We remember. We will do all we can to prevent these tragedies.

There are still far too many, far too often. In the time I have been speaking, two more people have been injured in a drunk driving crash. Every hour, another life is taken.

We all have to say—enough is enough. We have to keep saying it—until every single person in this country gets the message: If you drink, don't drive.

Albuquerque police officer Simon Drobik spoke for all of us—when he said, ''Talk to your kids about drinking and driving. Share these tragic stories with them so they understand driving is a big responsibility. If you see your friend or loved one trying to get behind the wheel after drinking STOP THEM. Do the right thing.''

Officer Drobik is right. We all need to do the right thing. Let's not wait for 10,000 more families to lose their loved ones.

We have to keep up the fight. Nelson Mandela said, ''It always seems impossible—until it is done.'' We can keep drunk drivers off the road. It is not impossible. We can get it done.

For the sake of all families, for those who grieve now—and for those who may grieve in the future—let's do all we can. Let's work together. Let's stop these senseless tragedies. Let's get it done.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2891. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2892. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

SA 2893. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. REED) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

SA 2894. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2895. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2896. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2897. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2898. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2899. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

SA 2900. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2901. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2902. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2903. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2904. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2905. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2906. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2907. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

SA 2908. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

SA 2909. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2910. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

SA 2911. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2912. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

SA 2913. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

SA 2914. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

SA 2915. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

SA 2916. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

SA 2917. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2916 submitted by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

SA 2918. Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2916 submitted by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

SA 2919. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2916 submitted by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2891. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE USE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF MENTAL HEALTH PARITY AND ADDICTION EQUITY.—Section 1311(j) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031(j)) is amended to read as follows:

''(j) APPLICABILITY OF MENTAL HEALTH PARITY AND ADDICTION EQUITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2726 of the Public Health Service Act shall apply to qualified health plans in the same manner and to the same extent as such section applies to health insurance issuers and group health plans.

''(2) TRANSPARENCY OF CLAIMS DENIAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require an Exchange to collect data on the percentage of health insurance claims denied for mental health benefits and the percentage of such claims denied for substance use disorder benefits. Such Exchange shall maintain an Internet website for the publication of claims denial rates for all qualified health plans offering coverage on the exchange.

''(B) GRANTS TO SUPPORT TRANSPARENCY.—For purposes of implementing this paragraph, there is authorized to be appropriated, and there is appropriated, $5,000,000 to enable the Secretary to award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to appropriate entities or Exchanges.

''(3) IMPROVING MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTION EQUITY AWARENESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to appropriate entities or Exchanges for the establishment of public education programs to raise awareness about the availability of mental health and substance use disorder benefits within qualified health plans.

''(B) GRANTS TO SUPPORT PUBLIC EDUCATION.—For purposes of implementing this paragraph, there is authorized to be appropriated, and there is appropriated, $30,000,000 to enable the Secretary to award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to appropriate entities or Exchanges.

''(4) ACCESS TO MEDICATION ASSISTED THERAPY.—

''(A) REQUIREMENT.—A qualified health plan shall provide coverage for more than one Food and Drug Administration-approved drug that is used in the medication-assisted treatment of addiction.

''(B) NO LIFETIME LIMITS.—A qualified health plan shall not establish a lifetime limit on the coverage of Food and Drug Administration-approved drugs used in the medication-assisted treatment of addiction.

''(C) MEDICAL JUSTIFICATION FOR TREATMENT LIMITATIONS.—Upon the request of an Exchange, a qualified health plan shall provide the medical justification for any treatment limitation on the coverage of drugs for medication-assisted treatment of addiction. If a qualified health plan requires prior authorization as a treatment limitation on the coverage of drugs for medication-assisted treatment of addiction, such plans shall utilize an automated, electronic means of obtaining prior authorization.

''(D) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to support the establishment of a standardized system for electronic prior authorization for coverage of drugs for medication assisted treatment of addiction. For purposes of implementing this subparagraph, there is authorized to be appropriated, and there is appropriated, $5,000,000 to enable the Secretary to ward grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to appropriate entities.''.

(b) FULL REPEAL OF IMD EXCLUSION IN MEDICAID EXPANSION STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The first sentence of section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(29), by inserting ''and subsection (ee)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(ee) NONAPPLICATION OF IMD EXCLUSION IN MEDICAID EXPANSION STATES.—Beginning January 1, 2016, in the case of a State that makes medical assistance available pursuant to section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) to individuals described in such section—

''(1) the payments exclusion in subsection (a)(29)(B) shall not apply to the State; and

''(2) the following provisions shall be applied to the State as if '65 years of age or older' and '65 years of age or over' were struck from such provisions each place such phrases appear:

''(A) Paragraphs (20) and (21) of section 1902(a).

''(B) Subsection(a)(14).

''(C) Section 1919(d)(7)(B)(i)(I).''.

(c) IMPROVING ACCESS TO ASSERTIVE COMMUNITY TREATMENT PROGRAMS FOR MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES.—Effective January 1, 2016, section 1903(a)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(3)) is amended by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following:

''(G)(i) 90 percent of so much of the sums expended during such quarter as are attributable to payments made for items and services provided to individuals who are eligible for medical assistance under the State plan by Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) programs that provide integrated, evidence-

based treatment, rehabilitation, case management, and support services for individuals with serious mental illness; and''.

(d) IMPROVING ACCESS TO MEDICATION ASSISTED TREATMENT FOR MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES.—Effective January 1, 2016, section 1903(a)(3)(G) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(3)(G)), as added by section 3, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) 90 percent of so much of the sums expended during such quarter as are attributable to payments made for items and services provided to individuals who are eligible for medical assistance under the State plan by person-centered health homes that are focused on the treatment of substance use disorders, offer access to evidence-based behavioral health therapies and medication assistance treatment, and offer screening and management of co-occurring physical health issues and screening and management of co-occurring mental health issues; and''.

(e) SUPPORTING STATE STERILE SYRINGE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.—Effective January 1, 2016, section 1903(a)(3)(G) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(3)(G)), as added by section 3 and amended by section 4, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) 90 percent of so much of the sums expended during such quarter as are attributable to payments for sterile syringe exchange programs (without regard to whether a recipient of items and services under such a program is eligible for medical assistance under the State plan or otherwise has health insurance coverage); plus''.

(f) IMPROVING THE PUBLIC HEALTH RESPONSE TO THE SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER EPIDEMIC.—

(1) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this subsection to establish a new Substance Use and Mental Health Capacity Expansion Fund (referred to in this subsection as the ''Fund''), to be administered through the Department of Health and Human Services, to provide for an expanded and sustained national investment in the prevention and treatment of individuals with substance use disorders and mental illnesses.

(2) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated, and there is appropriated, to the Fund, out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

(A) for fiscal year 2016, $500,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2017, $750,000,000;

(C) for fiscal year 2018, $1,000,000,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2019, $1,250,000,000;

(E) for fiscal year 2020, $1,500,000,000; and

(F) for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter, $2,500,000,000.

(3) USE OF FUND.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall transfer amounts in the Fund to accounts serving the Block Grants for Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse program under subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–21 et seq.) and the Block Grants for Community Mental Health Services program under subpart I of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x et seq.). The Fund shall be used to supplement, not supplant, funding that is otherwise allocated to such programs.

(4) STERILE SYRINGE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.—With respect to fiscal year 2016, and each subsequent fiscal year, in the case of a State that operates a sterile syringe exchange program, the Secretary shall use the funds appropriated in this section to increase such State's allotment under subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act for such fiscal year, by 5 percent.

SEC. ____. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

''Sec. 59A. Fair share tax.

''SEC. 59A. FAIR SHARE TAX.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—

''(1) IMPOSITITION OF TAX.—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

''(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

''(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

''(I) the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, over

''(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

''(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

''(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

''(B) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year, determined without regard to any tax liability determined under this section,

''(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

''(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

''(b) TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

''(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

''(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

''(2) MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

''(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

''(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

''(B) TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

''(c) HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'high-income taxpayer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of $1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

''(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2016, the $1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $10,000.

''(d) PAYROLL TAX.—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

''(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such tax is attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year or wages or compensation received during such taxable year, over

''(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

''(f) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. ____. MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON EXCESSIVE REMUNERATION.

(a) REPEAL OF PERFORMANCE-BASED COMPENSATION AND COMMISSION EXCEPTIONS FOR LIMITATION ON EXCESSIVE REMUNERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (B) through (E), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 162(m)(5) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof'' in subparagraph (E) and inserting ''subparagraph (B) thereof'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraphs (F) and (G)'' in subparagraph (G) and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)''.

(B) Section 162(m)(6) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof'' in subparagraph (D) and inserting ''subparagraph (B) thereof'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraphs (F) and (G)'' in subparagraph (G) and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)''.

(b) EXPANSION OF APPLICABLE EMPLOYER.—Paragraph (2) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) PUBLICLY HELD CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'publicly held corporation' means any corporation which is an issuer (as defined in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c))—

''(A) the securities of which are registered under section 12 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 781), or

''(B) that is required to file reports under section 15(d) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78o(d)).''.

(c) APPLICATION TO ALL CURRENT AND FORMER OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, AND EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by striking ''covered employee'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (4) and inserting ''covered individual'', and

(B) by striking ''such employee'' each place it appears in subparagraphs (A) and (E) of paragraph (4) and inserting ''such individual''.

(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(3) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered individual' means any individual who is an officer, director, or employee of the taxpayer or a former officer, director, or employee of the taxpayer.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 48D(b)(3)(A) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(as in effect for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2016)'' after ''section 162(m)(3)''.

(B) Section 409A(b)(3)(D)(ii) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(as in effect for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2016)'' after ''section 162(m)(3)''.

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(m), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) SPECIAL RULE FOR REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Remuneration shall not fail to be applicable employee remuneration merely because it is includible in the income of, or paid to, a person other than the covered individual, including after the death of the covered individual.''.

(e) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such guidance, rules, or regulations, including with respect to reporting, as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (6) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (H).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. _____. MODIFICATIONS TO RULES RELATING TO INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if—

''(A) such corporation would be a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting '80 percent' for '60 percent', or

''(B) such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation.

''(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

''(B) after the acquisition, more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(i) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

''(ii) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership.

''(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) and the preceding sentence, the term 'substantial business activities' shall have the meaning given such term under regulations in effect on May 8, 2014, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 7874(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''after March 4, 2003,'' and inserting ''after March 4, 2003, and before May 9, 2014,''.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 7874 of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(ii) by inserting ''or (b)(2)(A)'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(i)'' in subparagraph (B),

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''or (b)(2)(B), as the case may be,'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(ii)'',

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(D) in paragraph (6), by inserting ''or inverted domestic corporation, as the case may be,'' after ''surrogate foreign corporation''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after May 8, 2014.

SA 2892. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE USE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF MENTAL HEALTH PARITY AND ADDICTION EQUITY.—Section 1311(j) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031(j)) is amended to read as follows:

''(j) APPLICABILITY OF MENTAL HEALTH PARITY AND ADDICTION EQUITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2726 of the Public Health Service Act shall apply to qualified health plans in the same manner and to the same extent as such section applies to health insurance issuers and group health plans.

''(2) TRANSPARENCY OF CLAIMS DENIAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require an Exchange to collect data on the percentage of health insurance claims denied for mental health benefits and the percentage of such claims denied for substance use disorder benefits. Such Exchange shall maintain an Internet website for the publication of claims denial rates for all qualified health plans offering coverage on the exchange.

''(B) GRANTS TO SUPPORT TRANSPARENCY.—For purposes of implementing this paragraph, there is authorized to be appropriated, and there is appropriated, $5,000,000 to enable the Secretary to award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to appropriate entities or Exchanges.

''(3) IMPROVING MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTION EQUITY AWARENESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to appropriate entities or Exchanges for the establishment of public education programs to raise awareness about the availability of mental health and substance use disorder benefits within qualified health plans.

''(B) GRANTS TO SUPPORT PUBLIC EDUCATION.—For purposes of implementing this paragraph, there is authorized to be appropriated, and there is appropriated, $30,000,000 to enable the Secretary to award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to appropriate entities or Exchanges.

''(4) ACCESS TO MEDICATION ASSISTED THERAPY.—

''(A) REQUIREMENT.—A qualified health plan shall provide coverage for more than one Food and Drug Administration-approved drug that is used in the medication-assisted treatment of addiction.

''(B) NO LIFETIME LIMITS.—A qualified health plan shall not establish a lifetime limit on the coverage of Food and Drug Administration-approved drugs used in the medication-assisted treatment of addiction.

''(C) MEDICAL JUSTIFICATION FOR TREATMENT LIMITATIONS.—Upon the request of an Exchange, a qualified health plan shall provide the medical justification for any treatment limitation on the coverage of drugs for medication-assisted treatment of addiction. If a qualified health plan requires prior authorization as a treatment limitation on the coverage of drugs for medication-assisted treatment of addiction, such plans shall utilize an automated, electronic means of obtaining prior authorization.

''(D) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to support the establishment of a standardized system for electronic prior authorization for coverage of drugs for medication assisted treatment of addiction. For purposes of implementing this subparagraph, there is authorized to be appropriated, and there is appropriated, $5,000,000 to enable the Secretary to ward grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to appropriate entities.''.

(b) FULL REPEAL OF IMD EXCLUSION IN MEDICAID EXPANSION STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The first sentence of section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(29), by inserting ''and subsection (ee)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(ee) NONAPPLICATION OF IMD EXCLUSION IN MEDICAID EXPANSION STATES.—Beginning January 1, 2016, in the case of a State that makes medical assistance available pursuant to section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) to individuals described in such section—

''(1) the payments exclusion in subsection (a)(29)(B) shall not apply to the State; and

''(2) the following provisions shall be applied to the State as if '65 years of age or older' and '65 years of age or over' were

struck from such provisions each place such phrases appear:

''(A) Paragraphs (20) and (21) of section 1902(a).

''(B) Subsection(a)(14).

''(C) Section 1919(d)(7)(B)(i)(I).''.

(c) IMPROVING ACCESS TO ASSERTIVE COMMUNITY TREATMENT PROGRAMS FOR MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES.—Effective January 1, 2016, section 1903(a)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(3)) is amended by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following:

''(G)(i) 90 percent of so much of the sums expended during such quarter as are attributable to payments made for items and services provided to individuals who are eligible for medical assistance under the State plan by Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) programs that provide integrated, evidence-based treatment, rehabilitation, case management, and support services for individuals with serious mental illness; and''.

(d) IMPROVING ACCESS TO MEDICATION ASSISTED TREATMENT FOR MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES.—Effective January 1, 2016, section 1903(a)(3)(G) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(3)(G)), as added by section 3, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) 90 percent of so much of the sums expended during such quarter as are attributable to payments made for items and services provided to individuals who are eligible for medical assistance under the State plan by person-centered health homes that are focused on the treatment of substance use disorders, offer access to evidence-based behavioral health therapies and medication assistance treatment, and offer screening and management of co-occurring physical health issues and screening and management of co-occurring mental health issues; and''.

(e) SUPPORTING STATE STERILE SYRINGE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.—Effective January 1, 2016, section 1903(a)(3)(G) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(3)(G)), as added by section 3 and amended by section 4, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) 90 percent of such much of the sums expended during such quarter as are attributable to payments for sterile syringe exchange programs (without regard to whether a recipient of items and services under such a program is eligible for medical assistance under the State plan or otherwise has health insurance coverage); plus''.

(f) IMPROVING THE PUBLIC HEALTH RESPONSE TO THE SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER EPIDEMIC.—

(1) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this subsection to establish a new Substance Use and Mental Health Capacity Expansion Fund (referred to in this subsection as the ''Fund''), to be administered through the Department of Health and Human Services, to provide for an expanded and sustained national investment in the prevention and treatment of individuals with substance use disorders and mental illnesses.

(2) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated, and there is appropriated, to the Fund, out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

(A) for fiscal year 2016, $500,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2017, $750,000,000;

(C) for fiscal year 2018, $1,000,000,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2019, $1,250,000,000;

(E) for fiscal year 2020, $1,500,000,000; and

(F) for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter, $2,500,000,000.

(3) USE OF FUND.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall transfer amounts in the Fund to accounts serving the Block Grants for Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse program under subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–21 et seq.) and the Block Grants for Community Mental Health Services program under subpart I of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x et seq.). The Fund shall be used to supplement, not supplant, funding that is otherwise allocated to such programs.

(4) STERILE SYRINGE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.—With respect to fiscal year 2016, and each subsequent fiscal year, in the case of a State that operates a sterile syringe exchange program, the Secretary shall use the funds appropriated in this section to increase such State's allotment under subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act for such fiscal year, by 5 percent.

SEC. ___. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

''Sec. 59A. Fair share tax.

''SEC. 59A. FAIR SHARE TAX.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—

''(1) IMPOSITITION OF TAX.—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

''(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

''(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

''(I) the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, over

''(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

''(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

''(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

''(B) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year, determined without regard to any tax liability determined under this section,

''(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

''(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

''(b) TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

''(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

''(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

''(2) MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

''(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

''(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

''(B) TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

''(c) HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'high-income taxpayer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of $1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

''(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2016, the $1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $10,000.

''(d) PAYROLL TAX.—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

''(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such tax is attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year or wages or compensation received during such taxable year, over

''(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

''(f) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. ___. MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON EXCESSIVE REMUNERATION.

(a) REPEAL OF PERFORMANCE-BASED COMPENSATION AND COMMISSION EXCEPTIONS FOR LIMITATION ON EXCESSIVE REMUNERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (B) through (E), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 162(m)(5) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof'' in subparagraph (E) and inserting ''subparagraph (B) thereof'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraphs (F) and (G)'' in subparagraph (G) and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)''.

(B) Section 162(m)(6) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof'' in subparagraph (D) and inserting ''subparagraph (B) thereof'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraphs (F) and (G)'' in subparagraph (G) and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)''.

(b) EXPANSION OF APPLICABLE EMPLOYER.—Paragraph (2) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) PUBLICLY HELD CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'publicly held corporation' means any corporation which is an issuer (as defined in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c))—

''(A) the securities of which are registered under section 12 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78l), or

''(B) that is required to file reports under section 15(d) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78o(d)).''.

(c) APPLICATION TO ALL CURRENT AND FORMER OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, AND EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by striking ''covered employee'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (4) and inserting ''covered individual'', and

(B) by striking ''such employee'' each place it appears in subparagraphs (A) and (E) of paragraph (4) and inserting ''such individual''.

(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(3) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered individual' means any individual who is an officer, director, or employee of the taxpayer or a former officer, director, or employee of the taxpayer.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 48D(b)(3)(A) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(as in effect for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2016)'' after ''section 162(m)(3)''.

(B) Section 409A(b)(3)(D)(ii) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(as in effect for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2016)'' after ''section 162(m)(3)''.

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(m), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) SPECIAL RULE FOR REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Remuneration shall not fail to be applicable employee remuneration merely because it is includible in the income of, or paid to, a person other than the covered individual, including after the death of the covered individual.''.

(e) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such guidance, rules, or regulations, including with respect to reporting, as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (6) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (H).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. _____. MODIFICATIONS TO RULES RELATING TO INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if—

''(A) such corporation would be a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting '80 percent' for '60 percent', or

''(B) such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation.

''(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes after Nov. 30, 2015, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

''(B) after the acquisition, more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(i) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

''(ii) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership.

''(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) and the preceding sentence, the term 'substantial business activities' shall have the meaning given such term under regulations in effect on Nov. 30, 2015, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 7874(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''after March 4, 2003,'' and inserting ''after March 4, 2003, and before Dec. 1, 2015,''.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 7874 of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(ii) by inserting ''or (b)(2)(A)'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(i)'' in subparagraph (B),

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''or (b)(2)(B), as the case may be,'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(ii)'',

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(D) in paragraph (6), by inserting ''or inverted domestic corporation, as the case may be,'' after ''surrogate foreign corporation''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after Nov. 30, 2015.

SA 2893. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. REED) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CREDIT FOR DUAL-EARNER FAMILIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 25D the following new section:

''SEC. 25E. DUAL-EARNER FAMILIES.

''(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of an eligible taxpayer, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to 7 percent of the lesser of—

''(1) $10,000, or

''(2) the earned income of the spouse with the lower amount of earned income for such taxable year.

''(b) LIMITATION.—The amount of the credit allowable under subsection (a) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount determined under subsection (a) (as determined without regard to this subsection) as the amount of the taxpayer's excess adjusted gross income bears to $20,000.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) EARNED INCOME.—The term 'earned income' has the same meaning given such term in section 32(c)(2).

''(2) ELIGIBLE TAXPAYER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'eligible taxpayer' means a taxpayer who—

''(i) files a joint return for the taxable year under section 6013, and

''(ii) has at least 1 qualifying child (as defined in section 152(c)) who has not attained 12 years of age before the close of the taxable year.

''(3) EXCESS ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—The term 'excess adjusted gross income' means so much of the eligible taxpayer's adjusted gross income for the taxable year as exceeds $110,000.

''(d) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2016, each of the dollar amounts in subsections (a)(1) and (c)(3) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(2) ROUNDING.—If any dollar amount in subsection (a)(1) or (c)(3), after being increased under paragraph (1), is not a multiple of $1,000, such dollar amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $1,000.

''(e) ADDITIONAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) INDIVIDUAL CLAIMING BENEFITS UNDER SECTION 911.—No credit shall be allowed under this section if an individual (or the individual's spouse) claims the benefits of section 911 for the taxable year.

''(2) NON-RESIDENT ALIENS.—No credit shall be allowed under this section if an individual (or the individual's spouse) is a nonresident alien individual for any portion of the taxable year unless such individual is treated for such taxable year as a resident of the United States for purposes of this chapter by reason of an election under subsection (g) or (h) of section 6013.

''(3) IDENTIFICATION NUMBER REQUIREMENT.—No credit shall be allowed under this section if the eligible taxpayer does not include on the joint return of tax for the taxable year—

''(A) the taxpayer identification number of the individual and the individual's spouse, and

''(B) the name, age, and taxpayer identification number of any qualifying children.

''(f) TAXABLE YEAR MUST BE FULL TAXABLE YEAR.—Except in the case of a taxable year

closed by reason of the death of an individual, no credit shall be allowable under this section in the case of a taxable year covering a period of less than 12 months.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 25D the following:

''Sec. 25E. Dual-earner families.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. _____. ENHANCEMENT OF THE DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT.

(a) INCREASE IN DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT.—

(1) INCREASE IN INCOMES ELIGIBLE FOR FULL CREDIT.—Paragraph (2) of section 21(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'applicable percentage' means 35 percent reduced (but not below zero) by 1 percentage point for each $5,000 (or fraction thereof) by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for the taxable year exceeds $110,000.''.

(2) INCREASE IN DOLLAR LIMIT ON AMOUNT CREDITABLE.—Subsection (c) of section 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''$3,000'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''$8,000'', and

(B) by striking ''$6,000'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$16,000''.

(3) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g), and

(B) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

''(f) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2016, the $110,000 amount in subsection (a)(2) and each of the dollar amounts in subsection (c) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

''(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting '2015' for '1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(2) ROUNDING.—The amount of any increase under paragraph (1) shall be rounded—

''(A) for purposes of the dollar amount in subsection (a)(2), the nearest multiple of $1,000, and

''(B) for purposes of the dollar amounts in subsection (c), the nearest multiple of $100.''.

(b) DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT TO BE REFUNDABLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 21, as amended by subsection (a), as section 36C, and

(B) by moving section 36C, as so redesignated, from subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 to the location immediately before section 37 in subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Paragraph (1) of section 23(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''21(e)'' and inserting ''36C(e)''.

(B) Paragraph (6) of section 35(g) of such Code is amended by striking ''21(e)'' and inserting ''36C(e)''.

(C) Paragraph (1) of section 36C(a) of such Code (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) is amended by striking ''this chapter'' and inserting ''this subtitle''.

(D) Subparagraph (C) of section 129(a)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 21(e)'' and inserting ''section 36C(e)''.

(E) Paragraph (2) of section 129(b) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 21(d)(2)'' and inserting ''section 36C(d)(2)''.

(F) Paragraph (1) of section 129(e) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 21(b)(2)'' and inserting ''section 36C(b)(2)''.

(G) Subsection (e) of section 213 of such Code is amended by striking ''section 21'' and inserting ''section 36C''.

(H) Subparagraph (A) of section 6211(b)(4) of such Code is amended by inserting ''36C,'' after ''36B,''.

(I) Subparagraph (H) of section 6213(g)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 21'' and inserting ''section 36C''.

(J) Subparagraph (L) of section 6213(g)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 21, 24, or 32,'' and inserting ''section 24, 32, or 36C,''.

(K) Paragraph (2) of section 1324(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''36C,'' after ''36B,''.

(L) The table of sections for subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 36B the following:

''Sec. 36C. Expenses for household and dependent care services necessary for gainful employment.''.

(M) The table of sections for subpart A of such part IV of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 21.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. _____. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

''Sec. 59A. Fair share tax.

''SEC. 59A. FAIR SHARE TAX.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—

''(1) IMPOSITITION OF TAX.—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

''(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

''(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

''(I) the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, over

''(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

''(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

''(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

''(B) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year, determined without regard to any tax liability determined under this section,

''(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

''(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

''(b) TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

''(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

''(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

''(2) MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

''(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

''(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

''(B) TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

''(c) HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'high-income taxpayer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of $1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

''(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2016, the $1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $10,000.

''(d) PAYROLL TAX.—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

''(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such tax is attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year or wages or compensation received during such taxable year, over

''(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

''(f) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. _____. MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON EXCESSIVE REMUNERATION.

(a) REPEAL OF PERFORMANCE-BASED COMPENSATION AND COMMISSION EXCEPTIONS FOR LIMITATION ON EXCESSIVE REMUNERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (B) through (E), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 162(m)(5) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof'' in subparagraph (E) and inserting ''subparagraph (B) thereof'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraphs (F) and (G)'' in subparagraph (G) and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)''.

(B) Section 162(m)(6) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof'' in subparagraph (D) and inserting ''subparagraph (B) thereof'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraphs (F) and (G)'' in subparagraph (G) and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)''.

(b) EXPANSION OF APPLICABLE EMPLOYER.—Paragraph (2) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) PUBLICLY HELD CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'publicly held corporation' means any corporation which is an issuer (as defined in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c))—

''(A) the securities of which are registered under section 12 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78l), or

''(B) that is required to file reports under section 15(d) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78o(d)).''.

(c) APPLICATION TO ALL CURRENT AND FORMER OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, AND EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by striking ''covered employee'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (4) and inserting ''covered individual'', and

(B) by striking ''such employee'' each place it appears in subparagraphs (A) and (E) of paragraph (4) and inserting ''such individual''.

(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(3) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered individual' means any individual who is an officer, director, or employee of the taxpayer or a former officer, director, or employee of the taxpayer.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 48D(b)(3)(A) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(as in effect for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2016)'' after ''section 162(m)(3)''.

(B) Section 409A(b)(3)(D)(ii) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(as in effect for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2016)'' after ''section 162(m)(3)''.

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(m), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) SPECIAL RULE FOR REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Remuneration shall not fail to be applicable employee remuneration merely because it is includible in the income of, or paid to, a person other than the covered individual, including after the death of the covered individual.''.

(e) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such guidance, rules, or regulations, including with respect to reporting, as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (6) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (H).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. ____. MODIFICATIONS TO RULES RELATING TO INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if—

''(A) such corporation would be a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting '80 percent' for '60 percent', or

''(B) such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation.

''(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes after November 30, 2015, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

''(B) after the acquisition, more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(i) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

''(ii) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership.

''(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) and the preceding sentence, the term 'substantial business activities' shall have the meaning given such term under regulations in effect on November 30, 2015, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 7874(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''after March 4, 2003,'' and inserting ''after March 4, 2003, and before December 1, 2015,''.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 7874 of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(ii) by inserting ''or (b)(2)(A)'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(i)'' in subparagraph (B),

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''or (b)(2)(B), as the case may be,'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(ii)'',

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(D) in paragraph (6), by inserting ''or inverted domestic corporation, as the case may be,'' after ''surrogate foreign corporation''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after November 30, 2015.

SA 2894. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES.

Section 6903 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''A payment'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (e), a payment''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) ALTERNATE PAYMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A unit of general local government may opt out of the payment calculation that would otherwise apply under subsection (b)(1), by notifying the Secretary of the Interior, by the deadline established by the Secretary of the Interior, of the election of the unit of general local government to receive an alternate payment amount, as calculated in accordance with the formula established under paragraph (2).

''(2) FORMULA.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of the Interior shall establish an alternate payment formula that is based on the estimated forgone property taxes, using a fair market valuation, due to the presence of Federal land within the unit of general local government without raising new revenue.''.

SA 2895. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SUPPORT FOR STATE RESPONSE TO SUBSTANCE ABUSE PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS AND URGENT MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated, and are appropriated, out of monies in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, $750,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017, to the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') to award grants to States to address the substance abuse public health crisis or to respond to urgent mental health needs within the State. In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary may give preference to States with an incidence or prevalence of substance use disorders that is substantial relative to other States or to States that identify mental health needs within their communities that are urgent relative to such needs of other States. Funds

appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded to a State under subsection (a) shall be used for one or more of the following public health-related activities:

(1) Improving State prescription drug monitoring programs.

(2) Implementing prevention activities, and evaluating such activities to identify effective strategies to prevent substance abuse.

(3) Training for health care practitioners, such as best practices for prescribing opioids, pain management, recognizing potential cases of substance abuse, referral of patients to treatment programs, and overdose prevention.

(4) Supporting access to health care services provided by federally certified opioid treatment programs or other appropriate health care providers to treat substance use disorders or mental health needs.

(5) Supporting initiatives designed to help individuals with a substance use disorder achieve and sustain recovery.

(6) Other public health-related activities, as the State determines appropriate, related to addressing the substance abuse public health crisis or responding to urgent mental health needs within the State.

SA 2896. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. LIMITATION ON REFUGEE ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding chapter 2 of title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1521 et seq.), refugees who have been nationals of any of the countries listed in subsection (b) are not eligible to receive any assistance under such chapter.

(b) COUNTRIES.—The countries listed in this subsection are—

(1) Afghanistan;
(2) Algeria;
(3) Bahrain;
(4) Bangladesh;
(5) Egypt;
(6) Eritrea;
(7) Indonesia;
(8) Iran;
(9) Iraq;
(10) Jordan;
(11) Kazakhstan;
(12) Kuwait;
(13) Kyrgyzstan;
(14) Lebanon;
(15) Libya;
(16) Mali;
(17) Morocco;
(18) Nigeria;
(19) North Korea;
(20) Oman;
(21) Pakistan;
(22) Palestinian Territories;
(23) Qatar;
(24) Russia;
(25) Saudi Arabia;
(26) Somalia;
(27) Sudan;
(28) Syria;
(29) Tajikistan;
(30) Tunisia;
(31) Turkey;
(32) United Arab Emirates;
(33) Uzbekistan; and
(34) Yemen.

SA 2897. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REFUGEE ASSISTANCE.

Chapter 2 of title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1521 et seq.) is repealed.

SA 2898. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. GRANTS TO STATES.

(a) TANF.—Section 403(a)(5)(v)(I) of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C., is amended by inserting ''(excluding individuals who were admitted to the United States as refugees under section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157))'' after ''individuals in the State''.

(b) SSI.—Section 1611(a) of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C., is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''(excluding individuals who were admitted to the United States as refugees under section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157))'' after ''disabled individual''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''(excluding individuals who were admitted to the United States as refugees under section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157))'' after ''disabled individual''.

SA 2899. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

TITLE III—HOMELAND SECURITY

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Stop Extremists Coming Under Refugee Entry Act'' or the ''SECURE Act''.

SEC. 302. ENHANCED REFUGEE SECURITY SCREENING.

(a) REGISTRATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify each alien admitted as a refugee under section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157) or granted asylum under section 208 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1158) that the alien, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) shall register with the Department of Homeland Security as part of the enhanced screening process described in section 303; and

(2) shall be interviewed and fingerprinted by an official of the Department of Homeland Security.

(b) BACKGROUND CHECK.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall screen and perform a security review on all individuals seeking asylum or refugee status under section 207 or 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157 and 1158) to ensure that such individuals do not present a national security risk to the United States.

(c) MONITORING.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall monitor individuals granted asylum or admitted as refugees for indications of terrorism.

(d) REPORTS AND CERTIFICATIONS.—

(1) ANNUAL SCREENING EFFECTIVENESS REPORTS.—Not later than 25 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to Congress that—

(A) describes the effectiveness with which the Department is screening applicants for asylum and refugee status;

(B) identifies the number of aliens seeking asylum or refugee status who were screened and registered during the past fiscal year, broken down by country of origin;

(C) identifies the number of unfinished or unresolved security screenings for aliens described in subparagraph (B);

(D) identifies the number of refugees admitted to the United States under section 207 or 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157 and 1158) who—

(i) have not yet participated in the enhanced screening process required under section 303(a); or

(ii) have not been notified by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a);

(E) identifies the number of aliens seeking asylum or refugee status who were deported as a result of information gathered during interviews and background checks conducted pursuant to subsections (a)(2) and (b), broken down by country of origin; and

(F) indicates whether the enhanced screening process has been implemented in a manner that is overbroad or results in the deportation of individuals who pose no reasonable national security threat.

(2) CERTIFICATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall certify to Congress that—

(A) the requirements described in subsections (a) through (c) have been completed;

(B) the report required under paragraph (1) was timely submitted; and

(C) all necessary steps have been taken to improve the refugee screening process to prevent terrorists from threatening national security by gaining admission to the United States by claiming refugee or asylee status and refugee status.

(e) TEMPORARY MORATORIUM ON REFUGEE ADMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State may not approve an application for refugee status under section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157) and the Secretary of Homeland Security may not approve an application for asylum under section 208 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1158) to any national of a high-risk country.

(2) HIGH-RISK COUNTRY.—In this subsection, the term ''high-risk country'' means any of the following countries or territories:

(A) Afghanistan.
(B) Algeria.
(C) Bahrain.
(D) Bangladesh.
(E) Egypt.
(F) Eritrea.
(G) Indonesia.
(H) Iran.
(I) Iraq.
(J) Jordan.
(K) Kazakhstan.
(L) Kuwait.

(M) Kyrgyzstan.
(N) Lebanon.
(O) Libya.
(P) Mali.
(Q) Morocco.
(R) Nigeria.
(S) North Korea.
(T) Oman.
(U) Pakistan.
(V) Qatar.
(W) Russia.
(X) Saudi Arabia.
(Y) Somalia.
(Z) Sudan.
(AA) Syria.
(BB) Tajikistan.
(CC) Tunisia.
(DD) Turkey.
(EE) United Arab Emirates.
(FF) Uzbekistan.
(GG) Yemen.
(HH) The Palestinian Territories.

(f) CONDITIONS FOR RESUMPTION OF APPROVALS.—The moratorium under subsection (e) may be lifted after—

(1) the Secretary of Homeland Security—

(A) submits the reports required under subsection (d)(1);

(B) makes the certifications required in subsection (d)(2); and

(C) certifies to Congress that any backlog in screening existing cases from those aliens already approved, or pending approval, has been eliminated; and

(2) Congress enacts a law to reinstate, based upon the information provided, the approval of applications for refugee or asylee status.

SEC. 303. ADDITIONAL WAITING PERIODS AND SECURITY SCREENINGS FOR NEW VISA APPLICANTS.

(a) ENHANCED SECURITY SCREENINGS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that a new application for a visa to enter the United States is not approved until—

(1) at least 30 days after such application is submitted; and

(2) after the completion of an enhanced security screening with respect to the applicant.

(b) VISA WAIVER PROGRAM COUNTRIES.—Unless otherwise permitted under this title, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that no alien enters the United States until after 30 days of security assessments have been conducted on such alien, regardless of whether the alien's country of origin is participating in the Visa Waiver Program established under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187).

(c) TRUSTED TRAVELER EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) or section 4(a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall accept applications, and may approve qualified applicants, for enrollment in the Global Entry trusted traveler program described in section 235.12 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, regardless of the nationality or country of habitual residence of the applicant.

(2) PRIORITY.—In review applications for enrollment in the Global Entry trusted traveler program, the Secretary shall assign priority status in the following order:

(A) United States citizens.

(B) United States legal permanent residents.

(C) Citizens of any country that is designated as a Visa Waiver Program country under section 217(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(c)).

(D) Aliens that have a documented frequent travel history to and from the United States.

(E) Applicants not described in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(3) USE OF FEES.—Fees collected from applicants for the Global Entry trusted traveler program shall be used to pay for the cost of enhanced screening required under this title.

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title may be construed as requiring the Secretary of Homeland Security to approve an unqualified or high-risk applicant for enrollment in the Global Entry trusted traveler program.

SEC. 304. ENHANCED SECURITY SCREENING FOR HIGHER-RISK VISA APPLICANTS.

(a) MORATORIUM ON HIGH-RISK VISAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Homeland Security may not approve any application for entry to the United States from an alien who is a national of, or who is applying from, a high-risk country (as defined in section 302(e)) until after—

(A) the completion of the congressional review process described in subsection (b); and

(B) the enactment of a law that authorizes the termination of the visa moratorium under this subsection.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The visa moratorium under paragraph (1) shall not apply to individuals who are enrolled in the Global Entry trusted traveler program.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF SCREENING POLICIES.—

(1) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, and the Director of National Intelligence shall jointly submit a report to Congress certifying that—

(A) a national security screening process has been established and implemented that significantly improves the Federal Government's ability to identify security risks posed by aliens from high-risk countries who—

(i) seek to travel to the United States; or

(ii) have been approved for entry to the United States;

(B) the process identified in subparagraph (A) requires a 30-day security assessment for each applicant from high-risk countries;

(C) the national security screening process for aliens from high-risk countries will be used to assess the risk posed by applicants from such countries, including a description of such process;

(D) the screening process identified in subparagraph (A) will be used to assess national security risks posed by aliens who are already in the United States or have been approved to enter the United States;

(E) the complete biometric entry-exit control system required under section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104–208; 8 U.S.C. 1221 note) has been fully implemented;

(F) all necessary steps have been taken to prevent the national security vulnerability of allowing individuals to overstay a temporary legal status in the United States; and

(G) a policy has been implemented to remove aliens that are identified as having overstayed their period of lawful presence in the United States.

(2) CONDITIONS FOR RESUMPTION OF APPROVALS.—After the certifications required under paragraph (1) have been made, Congress may enact a law, based on the information provided, to lift the moratorium described in subsection (a).

SEC. 305. ONE HUNDRED PERCENT EXIT TRACKING FOR ALL UNITED STATES VISITORS.

(a) RECORDING EXITS AND CORRELATION TO ENTRY DATA.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall integrate the records collected through the automated entry-exit control system referred to in section 304(b)(1)(E) into an interoperable data system and any other database necessary to correlate an alien's entry and exit data.

(b) PROCESSING OF RECORDS.—Before the departure of outbound aliens at each point of entry, the Secretary shall provide for cross-reference capability between databases designated by the Secretary under subsection (a) to determine and record whether an outbound alien has been in the United States without lawful immigration status.

(c) RECORDS INCLUSION REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall maintain readily accessible entry-exit data records for immigration and other law enforcement and improve immigration control and enforcement by including information necessary to determine whether an outbound alien without lawful presence in the United States entered the country through—

(1) unauthorized entry between points of entry;

(2) visa or other temporary authorized status;

(3) fraudulent travel documents;

(4) misrepresentation of identity; or

(5) any other method of entry.

(d) PROHIBITION ON COLLECTING EXIT RECORDS FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AT LAND POINTS OF ENTRY.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—While documenting the departure of outbound individuals at each land point of entry along the Southern or Northern border, the Secretary may not—

(A) process travel documents of United States citizens;

(B) log, store, or transfer exit data for United States citizens;

(C) create, maintain, operate, access, or support any database containing information collected through outbound processing at a point of entry that contains records identifiable to an individual United States citizen.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition set forth in paragraph (1) does not apply to the records of an individual if an officer processing travel documentation in the outbound lanes at a point of entry along the Southern or Northern border—

(A) has a strong suspicion that the individual has engaged in criminal or other prohibited activities; or

(B) needs to verify an individual's identity because the individual is attempting to exit the United States without travel documentation.

(3) VERIFICATION OF TRAVEL DOCUMENTS.—Subject to the prohibition set forth in paragraph (1), the Secretary may provide for the confirmation of a United States citizen's travel documentation validity in the outbound lanes at a point of entry along the Southern border.

(e) REPORT ON INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO CARRY OUT 100 PERCENT LAND EXIT TRACKING.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that assesses the infrastructure needs for each point of entry along the Southern border to fulfill the requirements under this section, including—

(1) a description of anticipated infrastructure needs within each point of entry;

(2) a description of anticipated infrastructure needs adjacent to each point of entry;

(3) an assessment of the availability of secondary inspection areas at each point of entry;

(4) an assessment of space available at or adjacent to a point of entry to perform processing of outbound aliens;

(5) an assessment of the infrastructure demands relative to the volume of outbound crossings for each point of entry; and

(6) anticipated wait times for outbound individuals during processing of travel documents at each point of entry, relative to possible improvements at the point of entry.

(f) LIMITATIONS ON OUTBOUND SECONDARY INSPECTIONS.—The Secretary may not designate an outbound United States citizen for secondary inspection or collect biometric information from a United States citizen under outbound inspection procedures unless criminal or other prohibited activity has been detected or is strongly suspected.

(g) OUTBOUND PROCESSING OF PERSONS IN THE UNITED STATES WITHOUT LAWFUL PRESENCE.—

(1) PROCESS FOR RECORDING UNLAWFUL PRESENCE.—If the Secretary determines, at a point of entry along the Southern border, that an outbound alien has been in the United States without lawful presence, the Secretary shall—

(A) collect and record biometric data from the individual;

(B) combine data related to the individual's unlawful presence with any other information related to the individual in the interoperable database, in accordance with subsection (b); and

(C) except as provided in subparagraph (B), permit the individual to exit the United States.

(2) EXCEPTION.—An individual shall not be permitted to leave the United States if, during outbound inspection, the Secretary detects previous unresolved criminal activity by the individual.

(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title, or in the amendments made by this title, may be construed as replacing or repealing the requirements for biometric entry-exit capture required under section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104–208; 8 U.S.C. 1221 note).

SEC. 306. REQUIREMENTS TO ENSURE LEGAL VOTING.

(a) RESTRICTIONS.—

(1) AFFIDAVIT REQUIRED.—Any individual in asylum status, refugee status, legal permanent resident status, or any other permanent or temporary visa status who intends to remain in the United States in such status for longer than 6 months shall submit to the Secretary, during the period specified by the Secretary, a signed affidavit that states that the alien—

(A) has not cast a ballot in any Federal election in the United States; and

(B) will not register to vote, or cast a ballot, in any Federal election in the United States while in such status.

(2) PENALTY.—If an alien described in paragraph (1) fails to timely submit the affidavit described in paragraph (1) or violates any term of such affidavit—

(A) the Secretary shall immediately—

(i) revoke the legal status of such alien; and

(ii) deport the alien to the country from which he or she originated; and

(B) the alien will be permanently ineligible for United States citizenship.

(3) BARS TO LEGAL STATUS.—Any individual in asylum status, refugee status, legal permanent resident status, or any other permanent or temporary visa status who illegally registers to vote or who votes in any Federal election after receiving such status or visa—

(A) shall not be eligible to apply for permanent residence or citizenship; and

(B) if such individual has already been granted permanent residence, shall lose such status and be subject to deportation pursuant to section 237(a)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(6)).

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—

(1) ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION.—In determining whether an individual described in subsection (a)(1) is eligible for legal status, including naturalization, under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall verify that the alien has not registered to vote, or cast a ballot, in a Federal election in the United States.

(2) VERIFICATION OF CITIZENSHIP.—The Secretary shall provide the election director of each State, and such local election officials as may be designated by such State directors, with access to relevant databases containing information about aliens who have been granted asylum, refugee status, or any other permanent or temporary visa status authorized under the Immigration and Nationality Act or by executive action, for the sole purpose of verifying the citizenship status of registered voters and all individuals applying to register to vote.

(3) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit an annual report to Congress that identifies all jurisdictions in the United States that have registered individuals who are not United States citizens to vote in a Federal election.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF STATES.—

(1) PROOF OF CITIZENSHIP.—Notwithstanding the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.), and any other Federal law, all States and local governments—

(A) shall require individuals registering to vote in Federal elections to provide adequate proof of citizenship;

(B) may not accept an affirmation of citizenship as adequate proof of citizenship for voter registration purposes; and

(C) may require identification information from all such voter registration applicants.

(2) COOPERATION WITH DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—All States and local governments shall provide the Department of Homeland Security with the registration and voting history of any alien seeking registered provisional status, naturalization, or any other immigration benefit, upon the request of the Secretary.

(3) CONSEQUENCE OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(A) FIRST YEAR.—If any State is not in compliance with the proof of citizenship requirements set forth in paragraph (1) on or before the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall reduce the apportionment calculated under section 104(c) of title 23, United States Code, for that State for the following fiscal year by 10 percent.

(B) SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—For each subsequent year in which any State is not in compliance with the proof of citizenship requirements set forth in paragraph (1), the Secretary of Transportation shall reduce the apportionment calculated under section 104(c) of title 23, United States Code, for that State for the following fiscal year by an additional 10 percent.

SEC. 307. SECURE THE TREASURY.

(a) NO WELFARE FOR REFUGEES OR ASYLEES BEGINNING 1 YEAR AFTER DATE OF ADMISSION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an alien admitted to the United States as a refugee under section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157) or granted asylum under section 208 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1158), beginning 1 year after the date of such admission—

(1) is not be eligible for any assistance or benefits from a Federal means-tested benefit program listed in subsection (c); and

(2) may not claim the earned income tax credit under section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) NO CITIZENSHIP FOR ALIENS WHO APPLY FOR AND RECEIVE WELFARE.—Any alien granted refugee status or asylee admission to the United States under a permanent or temporary visa, and who is prohibited under subsection (a) from applying for, or receiving, assistance or benefits described in subsection (c) or from claiming the earned income tax credit under section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or any other credit allowed by subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code shall be permanently prohibited from becoming naturalized as a citizen of the United States if the alien—

(1) applies for and receives any such assistance or benefits; or

(2) claims and is allowed any such credit.

(c) FEDERAL MEANS-TESTED BENEFIT PROGRAMS.—The Federal means-tested benefit programs listed in this subsection are—

(1) the temporary assistance for needy families program under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)

(2) the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.);

(3) the State children's health insurance program authorized under title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.);

(4) the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.); and

(5) the program of block grants to States for social services under subtitle A of title XX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397 et seq.).

(d) VERIFICATION PROCEDURES.—In order to comply with the limitation under subsection (a)—

(1) proof of citizenship shall be required as a condition for receipt of assistance or benefits under the Federal means-tested benefit programs listed in subsection (c);

(2) proof of citizenship shall be verified as a condition for receiving assistance or benefits under the Federal means-tested benefit programs listed in subsection (c), including by using the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements Program of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to confirm that an individual who has presented proof of citizenship as a condition for receipt of assistance or benefits under any such program is not an alien; and

(3) officers and employees of State agencies that administer a Federal means-tested benefit program listed in subsection (c) shall report to any suspicious or fraudulent identity information provided by an individual applying for assistance or benefits to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(e) NONAPPLICATION OF THE PRIVACY ACT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Privacy Act'') may not be construed as prohibiting an officer or employee of a State from verifying a claim of citizenship for purposes of eligibility for assistance or benefits under a Federal means-tested benefit program listed in subsection (c).

SA 2900. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. RESTORATION OF THE MEDICARE COMPARATIVE COST ADJUSTMENT (CCA) PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1102(f) of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation

Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152), including the amendment made by such section, is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1860C–1 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–29), as restored pursuant to the repeal made by subsection (a), is amended—

(1) by striking ''2010'' each place it appears and inserting ''2017'';

(2) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''2015'' and ''2023''; and

(3) in subsection (d)(3), by striking ''2013'' and ''2021''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of, and the amendments made by, this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2901. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. ___. REPEAL OF ESSENTIAL HEALTH BENEFITS REQUIREMENT.

On January 1, 2016, section 1302 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18022) shall cease to have force or effect.

SA 2902. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPEAL OF AGE RATING RESTRICTIONS.

Section 2701(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg(a)(1)(A)(iii)) is amended by striking '', except that'' and all that follows through ''2707(c))''.

SA 2903. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. GAO ANALYSIS OF CO-OP PLANS.

Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an analysis, and submit to Congress a report concerning the results of such analysis, of the health insurance issuers that participated in the Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan program under section 1322 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18042) and are no longer offering such a Plan under such program.

SA 2904. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPEAL OF PATIENT-CENTERED OUTCOMES RESEARCH.

(a) REPEAL OF MEDICARE TRUST FUNDS FUNDING.—Section 1183(a)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320e–2(a)(2)) is amended by striking ''2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019'' and inserting ''and 2016''.

(b) PREVENTION OF LIMITATION OF TREATMENT OPTIONS.—Section 1182 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320e–1) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c)(2); and

(2) by striking subsection (d)(2).

(c) REPEAL OF PATIENT-CENTERED OUTCOMES RESEARCH TRUST FUND.—

(1) APPROPRIATION.—Section 9511(b)(1)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019'' and inserting ''and 2016''.

(2) TERMINATION.—Section 9511(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''September 30, 2019'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

(d) REPEAL OF FEES ON INSURED AND SELF-INSURED HEALTH PLANS.—

(1) INSURED.—Section 4375(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2015''.

(2) SELF-INSURED.—Section 4376(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2015''.

SA 2905. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPEAL OF DISQUALIFICATION OF EXPENSES FOR OVER-THE-COUNTER DRUGS UNDER CERTAIN ACCOUNTS AND ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) HSAS.—Section 223(d)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the last sentence.

(b) ARCHER MSAS.—Section 220(d)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(c) HEALTH FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS AND HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.—Section 106 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (f).

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

SA 2906. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 5, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 6, line 3, and insert the following:

SEC. 105A. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

''Sec. 59A. Fair share tax.

''SEC. 59A. FAIR SHARE TAX.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—

''(1) IMPOSITITION OF TAX.—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

''(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

''(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

''(I) the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, over

''(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

''(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

''(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

''(B) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year, determined without regard to any tax liability determined under this section,

''(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

''(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

''(b) TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

''(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

''(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

''(2) MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

''(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

''(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

''(B) TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

''(c) HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'high-income taxpayer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of $1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

''(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2016, the $1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015'

for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $10,000.

''(d) PAYROLL TAX.—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

''(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such tax is attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year or wages or compensation received during such taxable year, over

''(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

''(f) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 105B. MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON EXCESSIVE REMUNERATION.

(a) REPEAL OF PERFORMANCE-BASED COMPENSATION AND COMMISSION EXCEPTIONS FOR LIMITATION ON EXCESSIVE REMUNERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (B) through (E), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 162(m)(5) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof'' in subparagraph (E) and inserting ''subparagraph (B) thereof'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraphs (F) and (G)'' in subparagraph (G) and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)''.

(B) Section 162(m)(6) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof'' in subparagraph (D) and inserting ''subparagraph (B) thereof'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraphs (F) and (G)'' in subparagraph (G) and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)''.

(b) EXPANSION OF APPLICABLE EMPLOYER.—Paragraph (2) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) PUBLICLY HELD CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'publicly held corporation' means any corporation which is an issuer (as defined in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c))—

''(A) the securities of which are registered under section 12 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78l), or

''(B) that is required to file reports under section 15(d) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78o(d)).''.

(c) APPLICATION TO ALL CURRENT AND FORMER OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, AND EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by striking ''covered employee'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (4) and inserting ''covered individual'', and

(B) by striking ''such employee'' each place it appears in subparagraphs (A) and (E) of paragraph (4) and inserting ''such individual''.

(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(3) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered individual' means any individual who is an officer, director, or employee of the taxpayer or a former officer, director, or employee of the taxpayer.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 48D(b)(3)(A) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(as in effect for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2016)'' after ''section 162(m)(3)''.

(B) Section 409A(b)(3)(D)(ii) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(as in effect for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2016)'' after ''section 162(m)(3)''.

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(m), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) SPECIAL RULE FOR REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Remuneration shall not fail to be applicable employee remuneration merely because it is includible in the income of, or paid to, a person other than the covered individual, including after the death of the covered individual.''.

(e) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such guidance, rules, or regulations, including with respect to reporting, as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (6) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (H).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 105C. MODIFICATIONS TO RULES RELATING TO INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if—

''(A) such corporation would be a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting '80 percent' for '60 percent', or

''(B) such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation.

''(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

''(B) after the acquisition, more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(i) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

''(ii) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership.

''(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) and the preceding sentence, the term 'substantial business activities' shall have the meaning given such term under regulations in effect on May 8, 2014, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 7874(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''after March 4, 2003,'' and inserting ''after March 4, 2003, and before May 9, 2014,''.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 7874 of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(ii) by inserting ''or (b)(2)(A)'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(i)'' in subparagraph (B),

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''or (b)(2)(B), as the case may be,'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(ii)'',

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(D) in paragraph (6), by inserting ''or inverted domestic corporation, as the case may be,'' after ''surrogate foreign corporation''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after May 8, 2014.

SA 2907. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ADDITIONAL FUNDING TO INCREASE ACCESS OF VETERANS TO CARE AND IMPROVE PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to any increase in revenues received in the Treasury as the result of the enactment of section 59A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(1) $20,000,000,000 shall be made available, without further appropriation, to carry out the purposes described in section 801(b) of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note); and

(2) any remaining amounts shall be used for Federal budget deficit reduction or, if

there is no Federal budget deficit, for reducing the Federal debt in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate.

SEC. _____. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

"PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

''Sec. 59A. Fair share tax.

"SEC. 59A. FAIR SHARE TAX.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—

''(1) IMPOSITITION OF TAX.—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

''(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

''(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

''(I) the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, over

''(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

''(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

''(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

''(B) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year, determined without regard to any tax liability determined under this section,

''(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

''(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

''(b) TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

''(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

''(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

''(2) MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

''(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

''(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

''(B) TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

''(c) HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'high-income taxpayer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of $1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

''(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2016, the $1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $10,000.

''(d) PAYROLL TAX.—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

''(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such tax is attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year or wages or compensation received during such taxable year, over

''(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

''(f) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SA 2908. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT

SECTION 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2015''.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Congress supports, respects, and defends the fundamental, individual right to keep and bear arms guaranteed by the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(2) Congress supports and reaffirms the existing prohibition on a national firearms registry.

(3) Congress believes the Department of Justice should prosecute violations of background check requirements to the maximum extent of the law.

(4) There are deficits in the background check system in existence prior to the date of enactment of this Act and the Department of Justice should make it a top priority to work with States to swiftly input missing records, including mental health records.

(5) Congress and the citizens of the United States agree that in order to promote safe and responsible gun ownership, dangerous criminals and the seriously mentally ill should be prohibited from possessing firearms; therefore, it should be incumbent upon all citizens to ensure weapons are not being transferred to such people.

SEC. 203. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title, or any amendment made by this title, shall be construed to—

(1) expand in any way the enforcement authority or jurisdiction of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives; or

(2) allow the establishment, directly or indirectly, of a Federal firearms registry.

SEC. 204. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title or an amendment made by this title, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid for any reason in any court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this title and amendments made by this title, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected.

Subtitle A—Ensuring That All Individuals Who Should Be Prohibited From Buying a Gun Are Listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System

SEC. 211. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 106(b) of Public Law 103–159 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''of this Act'' and inserting ''of the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2015''; and

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

''(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this subsection $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019.''.

SEC. 212. IMPROVEMENT OF METRICS AND INCENTIVES.

Section 102(b) of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2015, the Attorney General, in coordination with the States, shall establish for each State or Indian tribal government desiring a grant under section 103 a 4-year implementation plan to ensure maximum coordination and automation of the reporting of records or making records available to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

''(2) BENCHMARK REQUIREMENTS.—Each 4-year plan established under paragraph (1) shall include annual benchmarks, including both qualitative goals and quantitative measures, to assess implementation of the 4-year plan.

''(3) PENALTIES FOR NON-COMPLIANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—During the 4-year period covered by a 4-year plan established under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall withhold—

''(i) 10 percent of the amount that would otherwise be allocated to a State under section 505 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) if the State does not meet the benchmark established under paragraph (2) for the first year in the 4-year period;

''(ii) 11 percent of the amount that would otherwise be allocated to a State under section 505 of the Omnibus Crime Control and

Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) if the State does not meet the benchmark established under paragraph (2) for the second year in the 4-year period;

''(iii) 13 percent of the amount that would otherwise be allocated to a State under section 505 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) if the State does not meet the benchmark established under paragraph (2) for the third year in the 4-year period; and

''(iv) 15 percent of the amount that would otherwise be allocated to a State under section 505 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) if the State does not meet the benchmark established under paragraph (2) for the fourth year in the 4-year period.

''(B) FAILURE TO ESTABLISH A PLAN.—A State that fails to establish a plan under paragraph (1) shall be treated as having not met any benchmark established under paragraph (2).''.

SEC. 213. GRANTS TO STATES FOR IMPROVEMENT OF COORDINATION AND AUTOMATION OF NICS RECORD REPORTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) by striking section 103 and inserting the following:

''SEC. 103. GRANTS TO STATES FOR IMPROVEMENT OF COORDINATION AND AUTOMATION OF NICS RECORD REPORTING.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—From amounts made available to carry out this section, the Attorney General shall make grants to States, Indian Tribal governments, and State court systems, in a manner consistent with the National Criminal History Improvement Program and consistent with State plans for integration, automation, and accessibility of criminal history records, for use by the State, or units of local government of the State, Indian Tribal government, or State court system to improve the automation and transmittal of mental health records and criminal history dispositions, records relevant to determining whether a person has been convicted of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence, court orders, and mental health adjudications or commitments to Federal and State record repositories in accordance with section 102 and the National Criminal History Improvement Program.

''(b) USE OF GRANT AMOUNTS.—Grants awarded to States, Indian Tribal governments, or State court systems under this section may only be used to—

''(1) carry out, as necessary, assessments of the capabilities of the courts of the State or Indian Tribal government for the automation and transmission of arrest and conviction records, court orders, and mental health adjudications or commitments to Federal and State record repositories;

''(2) implement policies, systems, and procedures for the automation and transmission of arrest and conviction records, court orders, and mental health adjudications or commitments to Federal and State record repositories;

''(3) create electronic systems that provide accurate and up-to-date information which is directly related to checks under the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, including court disposition and corrections records;

''(4) assist States or Indian Tribal governments in establishing or enhancing their own capacities to perform background checks using the National Instant Criminal Background Check System; and

''(5) develop and maintain the relief from disabilities program in accordance with section 105.

''(c) ELIGIBILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible for a grant under this section, a State, Indian Tribal government, or State court system shall certify, to the satisfaction of the Attorney General, that the State, Indian Tribal government, or State court system—

''(A) is not prohibited by State law or court order from submitting mental health records to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System; and

''(B) subject to paragraph (2), has implemented a relief from disabilities program in accordance with section 105.

''(2) RELIEF FROM DISABILITIES PROGRAM.—For purposes of obtaining a grant under this section, a State, Indian Tribal government, or State court system shall not be required to meet the eligibility requirement described in paragraph (1)(B) until the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2015.

''(d) FEDERAL SHARE.—

''(1) STUDIES, ASSESSMENTS, NON-MATERIAL ACTIVITIES.—The Federal share of a study, assessment, creation of a task force, or other non-material activity, as determined by the Attorney General, carried out with a grant under this section shall be not more than 25 percent.

''(2) INFRASTRUCTURE OR SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT.—The Federal share of an activity involving infrastructure or system development, including labor-related costs, for the purpose of improving State or Indian Tribal government record reporting to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System carried out with a grant under this section may amount to 100 percent of the cost of the activity.

''(e) GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.—Up to 5 percent of the grant funding available under this section may be reserved for Indian tribal governments for use by Indian tribal judicial systems.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019.'';

(2) by striking title III; and

(3) in section 401(b), by inserting after ''of this Act'' the following: ''and 18 months after the date of enactment of the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2015''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections in section 1(b) of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by striking the item relating to section 103 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 103. Grants to States for improvement of coordination and automation of NICS record reporting.''.

SEC. 214. RELIEF FROM DISABILITIES PROGRAM.

Section 105 of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) PENALTIES FOR NON-COMPLIANCE.—

''(1) 10 PERCENT REDUCTION.—During the 1-year period beginning 2 years after the date of enactment of the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2015, the Attorney General shall withhold 10 percent of the amount that would otherwise be allocated to a State under section 505 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) if the State has not implemented a relief from disabilities program in accordance with this section.

''(2) 11 PERCENT REDUCTION.—During the 1-year period after the expiration of the period described in paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall withhold 11 percent of the amount that would otherwise be allocated to a State under section 505 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) if the State has not implemented a relief from disabilities program in accordance with this section.

''(3) 13 PERCENT REDUCTION.—During the 1-year period after the expiration of the period described in paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall withhold 13 percent of the amount that would otherwise be allocated to a State under section 505 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) if the State has not implemented a relief from disabilities program in accordance with this section.

''(4) 15 PERCENT REDUCTION.—After the expiration of the 1-year period described in paragraph (3), the Attorney General shall withhold 15 percent of the amount that would otherwise be allocated to a State under section 505 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) if the State has not implemented a relief from disabilities program in accordance with this section.''.

SEC. 215. ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS FOR OUR VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In any case arising out of the administration by the Secretary of laws and benefits under this title, a person who is determined by the Secretary to be mentally incompetent shall not be considered adjudicated pursuant to subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18 until—

''(1) in the case in which the person does not request a review as described in subsection (c)(1), the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the person receives notice submitted under subsection (b); or

''(2) in the case in which the person requests a review as described in paragraph (1) of subsection (c), upon an assessment by the board designated or established under paragraph (2) of such subsection or court of competent jurisdiction that a person cannot safely use, carry, possess, or store a firearm due to mental incompetency.

''(b) NOTICE.—Notice submitted under this subsection to a person described in subsection (a) is notice submitted by the Secretary that notifies the person of the following:

''(1) The determination made by the Secretary.

''(2) A description of the implications of being considered adjudicated as a mental defective under subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18.

''(3) The person's right to request a review under subsection (c)(1).

''(c) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—(1) Not later than 30 days after the date on which a person described in subsection (a) receives notice submitted under subsection (b), such person may request a review by the board designed or established under paragraph (2) or a court of competent jurisdiction to assess whether a person cannot safely use, carry, possess, or store a firearm due to mental incompetency. In such assessment, the board may consider the person's honorable discharge or decoration.

''(2) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2015, the Secretary shall designate or establish a board that shall, upon request of a person under paragraph (1), assess whether a person cannot safely use, carry, possess, or store a firearm due to mental incompetency.

''(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Not later than 30 days after the date of an assessment of a person under subsection (c) by the board designated or established under paragraph (2) of such subsection, such person may file a petition for judicial review of such assessment with a Federal court of competent jurisdiction.

''(e) PROTECTING RIGHTS OF VETERANS WITH EXISTING RECORDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2015, the Secretary shall provide written notice of the opportunity for administrative review and appeal under subsection (c) to all persons who, on the date of enactment of the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2015, are considered adjudicated pursuant to subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18 as a result of having been found by the Department of Veterans Affairs to be mentally incompetent.

''(f) FUTURE DETERMINATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the enactment of the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2015, the Secretary shall review the policies and procedures by which individuals are determined to be mentally incompetent, and shall revise such policies and procedures as necessary to ensure that any individual who is competent to manage his own financial affairs, including his receipt of Federal benefits, but who voluntarily turns over the management thereof to a fiduciary is not considered adjudicated pursuant to subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18.

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the Secretary has made the review and changes required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report detailing the results of the review and any resulting policy and procedural changes.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes.''.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—Section 5511 of title 38, United States Code (as added by this section), shall apply only with respect to persons who are determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, to be mentally incompetent, except that those persons who are provided notice pursuant to section 5511(e) shall be entitled to use the administrative review under section 5511(c) and, as necessary, the subsequent judicial review under section 5511(d).

SEC. 216. CLARIFICATION THAT FEDERAL COURT INFORMATION IS TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.

Section 103(e)(1) of Public Law 103–159 (18 U.S.C. 922 note), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) APPLICATION TO FEDERAL COURTS.—In this subsection—

''(i) the terms 'department or agency of the United States' and 'Federal department or agency' include a Federal court; and

''(ii) for purposes of any request, submission, or notification, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall perform the functions of the head of the department or agency.''.

SEC. 217. CLARIFICATION THAT SUBMISSION OF MENTAL HEALTH RECORDS TO THE NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM IS NOT PROHIBITED BY THE HEALTH INSURANCE PORTABILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT.

Information collected under section 102(c)(3) of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) to assist the Attorney General in enforcing section 922(g)(4) of title 18, United States Code, shall not be subject to the regulations promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 1320d–2 note).

SEC. 218. PUBLICATION OF NICS INDEX STATISTICS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and biannually thereafter, the Attorney General shall make the National Instant Criminal Background Check System index statistics available on a publically accessible Internet website.

SEC. 219. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Subtitle B—Providing a Responsible and Consistent Background Check Process

SEC. 221. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to enhance the current background check process in the United States to ensure criminals and the mentally ill are not able to purchase firearms.

SEC. 222. FIREARMS TRANSFERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by repealing subsection (s);

(2) by redesignating subsection (t) as subsection (s);

(3) in subsection (s), as redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''or'';

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) in the case of an instant background check conducted at a gun show or event during the 4-year period beginning on the effective date under section 230(a) of the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2015, 48 hours have elapsed since the licensee contacted the system, and the system has not notified the licensee that the receipt of a firearm by such other person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of this section; or

''(iv) in the case of an instant background check conducted at a gun show or event after the 4-year period described in clause (iii), 24 hours have elapsed since the licensee contacted the system, and the system has not notified the licensee that the receipt of a firearm by such other person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of this section; and'';

(B) in paragraph (3)(C)(ii), by striking ''(as defined in subsection (s)(8))''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'chief law enforcement officer' means the chief of police, the sheriff, or an equivalent officer or the designee of any such individual; and

''(B) the term 'gun show or event' has the meaning given the term in subsection (t)(7).

''(8) The Federal Bureau of Investigation shall not charge a user fee for a background check conducted pursuant to this subsection.

''(9) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, upon receiving a request for an instant background check that originates from a gun show or event, the system shall complete the instant background check before completing any pending instant background check that did not originate from a gun show or event.''; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (s), as redesignated, the following:

''(t)(1) Beginning on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall be unlawful for any person other than a licensed dealer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed importer to complete the transfer of a firearm to any other person who is not licensed under this chapter, if such transfer occurs—

''(A) at a gun show or event, on the curtilage thereof; or

''(B) pursuant to an advertisement, posting, display or other listing on the Internet or in a publication by the transferor of his intent to transfer, or the transferee of his intent to acquire, the firearm.

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply if—

''(A) the transfer is made after a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer has first taken possession of the firearm for the purpose of complying with subsection (s), and upon taking possession of the firearm, the licensee—

''(i) complies with all requirements of this chapter as if the licensee were transferring the firearm from the licensee's business inventory to the unlicensed transferee, except that when processing a transfer under this chapter the licensee may accept in lieu of conducting a background check a valid permit issued within the previous 5 years by a State, or a political subdivision of a State, that allows the transferee to possess, acquire, or carry a firearm, if the law of the State, or political subdivision of a State, that issued the permit requires that such permit is issued only after an authorized government official has verified that the information available to such official does not indicate that possession of a firearm by the unlicensed transferee would be in violation of Federal, State, or local law;

''(B) the transfer is made between an unlicensed transferor and an unlicensed transferee residing in the same State, which takes place in such State, if—

''(i) the Attorney General certifies that State in which the transfer takes place has in effect requirements under law that are generally equivalent to the requirements of this section; and

''(ii) the transfer was conducted in compliance with the laws of the State;

''(C) the transfer is made between spouses, between parents or spouses of parents and their children or spouses of their children, between siblings or spouses of siblings, or between grandparents or spouses of grandparents and their grandchildren or spouses of their grandchildren, or between aunts or uncles or their spouses and their nieces or nephews or their spouses, or between first cousins, if the transferor does not know or have reasonable cause to believe that the transferee is prohibited from receiving or possessing a firearm under Federal, State, or local law; or

''(D) the Attorney General has approved the transfer under section 5812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(3) A licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer who processes a transfer of a firearm authorized under paragraph (2)(A) shall not be subject to a license revocation or license denial based solely upon a violation of those paragraphs, or a violation of the rules or regulations promulgated under this paragraph, unless the licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer—

''(A) knows or has reasonable cause to believe that the information provided for purposes of identifying the transferor, transferee, or the firearm is false;

''(B) knows or has reasonable cause to believe that the transferee is prohibited from

purchasing, receiving, or possessing a firearm by Federal or State law, or published ordinance; or

''(C) knowingly violates any other provision of this chapter, or the rules or regulations promulgated thereunder.

''(4)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, except for section 923(m), the Attorney General may implement this subsection with regulations.

''(B) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph may not include any provision requiring licensees to facilitate transfers in accordance with paragraph (2)(A).

''(C) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph may not include any provision requiring persons not licensed under this chapter to keep records of background checks or firearms transfers.

''(D) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph may not include any provision placing a cap on the fee licensees may charge to facilitate transfers in accordance with paragraph (2)(A).

''(5)(A) A person other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer, who makes a transfer of a firearm in accordance with this section, or who is the organizer of a gun show or event at which such transfer occurs, shall be immune from a qualified civil liability action relating to the transfer of the firearm as if the person were a seller of a qualified product.

''(B) A provider of an interactive computer service shall be immune from a qualified civil liability action relating to the transfer of a firearm as if the provider of an interactive computer service were a seller of a qualified product.

''(C) In this paragraph—

''(i) the term 'interactive computer service' shall have the meaning given the term in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)); and

''(ii) the terms 'qualified civil liability action', 'qualified product', and 'seller' shall have the meanings given the terms in section 4 of the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act (15 U.S.C. 7903).

''(D) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the immunity of a provider of an interactive computer service under section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230).

''(6) In any civil liability action in any State or Federal court arising from the criminal or unlawful use of a firearm following a transfer of such firearm for which no background check was required under this section, this section shall not be construed—

''(A) as creating a cause of action for any civil liability; or

''(B) as establishing any standard of care.

''(7) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'gun show or event'—

''(A) means any event at which 75 or more firearms are offered or exhibited for sale, exchange, or transfer, if 1 or more of the firearms has been shipped or transported in, or otherwise affects, interstate or foreign commerce; and

''(B) does not include an offer or exhibit of firearms for sale, exchange, or transfer by an individual from the personal collection of that individual, at the private residence of that individual, if the individual is not required to be licensed under section 923.''.

(b) PROHIBITING THE SEIZURE OF RECORDS OR DOCUMENTS.—Section 923(g)(1)(D) is amended by striking, ''The inspection and examination authorized by this paragraph shall not be construed as authorizing the Attorney General to seize any records or other documents other than those records or documents constituting material evidence of a violation of law,'' and inserting the following: ''The Attorney General shall be prohibited from seizing any records or other documents in the course of an inspection or examination authorized by this paragraph other than those records or documents constituting material evidence of a violation of law.''.

(c) PROHIBITION OF NATIONAL GUN REGISTRY.—Section 923 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) The Attorney General may not consolidate or centralize the records of the—

''(1) acquisition or disposition of firearms, or any portion thereof, maintained by—

''(A) a person with a valid, current license under this chapter;

''(B) an unlicensed transferor under section 922(t); or

''(2) possession or ownership of a firearm, maintained by any medical or health insurance entity.''.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION 922.—Section 922(y)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking '', (g)(5)(B), and (s)(3)(B)(v)(II)'' and inserting ''and (g)(5)(B)''.

(2) CONSOLIDATED AND FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012.—Section 511 of title V of division B of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by striking ''subsection 922(t)'' and inserting ''subsection (s) or (t) of section 922'' each place it appears.

SEC. 223. PENALTIES.

Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

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

''(8) Whoever makes or attempts to make a transfer of a firearm in violation of section 922(t) to a person not licensed under this chapter who is prohibited from receiving a firearm under subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 or State law, to a law enforcement officer, or to a person acting at the direction of, or with the approval of, a law enforcement officer authorized to investigate or prosecute violations of section 922(t), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(q) IMPROPER USE OF STORAGE OF RECORDS.—Any person who knowingly violates section 923(m) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.''.

SEC. 224. FIREARMS DISPOSITIONS.

Section 922(b)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''located'' and inserting ''located or temporarily located''; and

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''rifle or shotgun'' and inserting ''firearm'';

(B) by striking ''located'' and inserting ''located or temporarily located''; and

(C) by striking ''both such States'' and inserting ''the State in which the transfer is conducted and the State of residence of the transferee''.

SEC. 225. FIREARM DEALER ACCESS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION.

Section 103(b) of Public Law 103–159 (18 U.S.C. 922 note), is amended—

(1) by striking ''Not later than'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) VOLUNTARY BACKGROUND CHECKS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2015, the Attorney General shall promulgate regulations allowing licensees to use the National Instant Criminal Background Check System established under this section for purposes of conducting voluntary preemployment background checks on prospective employees.''.

SEC. 226. DEALER LOCATION.

Section 923 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (j)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking '', and such location is in the State which is specified on the license''; and

(B) in the last sentence—

(i) by inserting ''transfer,'' after ''sell,''; and

(ii) by striking ''Act,'' and all that follows and inserting ''Act.''; and

(2) by adding after subsection (m), as added by section 222(c), the following:

''(n) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prohibit the sale, transfer, delivery, or other disposition of a firearm or ammunition not otherwise prohibited under this chapter—

''(1) by a person licensed under this chapter to another person so licensed, at any location in any State; or

''(2) by a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer to a person not licensed under this chapter, at a temporary location described in subsection (j) in any State.''.

SEC. 227. RESIDENCE OF UNITED STATES OFFICERS.

Section 921 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) For purposes of this chapter:

''(1) A member of the Armed Forces on active duty, or a spouse of such a member, is a resident of—

''(A) the State in which the member or spouse maintains legal residence;

''(B) the State in which the permanent duty station of the member is located; and

''(C) the State in which the member maintains a place of abode from which the member commutes each day to the permanent duty station of the member.

''(2) An officer or employee of the United States (other than a member of the Armed Forces) who is stationed outside the United States for a period of more than 1 year, and a spouse of such an officer or employee, is a resident of the State in which the person maintains legal residence.''.

SEC. 228. INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF FIREARMS OR AMMUNITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 926A of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 926A. Interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'transport'—

''(1) includes staying in temporary lodging overnight, stopping for food, fuel, vehicle maintenance, an emergency, medical treatment, and any other activity incidental to the transport; and

''(2) does not include transportation—

''(A) with the intent to commit a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year that involves a firearm; or

''(B) with knowledge, or reasonable cause to believe, that a crime described in subparagraph (A) is to be committed in the course of, or arising from, the transportation.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding any provision of any law (including a rule or regulation) of a State or any political subdivision thereof, a person who is not prohibited by this chapter from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a firearm or ammunition shall be entitled to—

''(1) transport a firearm for any lawful purpose from any place where the person may

lawfully possess, carry, or transport the firearm to any other such place if, during the transportation—

''(A) the firearm is unloaded; and

''(B)(i) if the transportation is by motor vehicle—

''(I) the firearm is not directly accessible from the passenger compartment of the motor vehicle; or

''(II) if the motor vehicle is without a compartment separate from the passenger compartment, the firearm is—

''(aa) in a locked container other than the glove compartment or console; or

''(bb) secured by a secure gun storage or safety device; or

''(ii) if the transportation is by other means, the firearm is in a locked container or secured by a secure gun storage or safety device; and

''(2) transport ammunition for any lawful purpose from any place where the person may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the ammunition, to any other such place if, during the transportation—

''(A) the ammunition is not loaded into a firearm; and

''(B)(i) if the transportation is by motor vehicle—

''(I) the ammunition is not directly accessible from the passenger compartment of the motor vehicle; or

''(II) if the motor vehicle is without a compartment separate from the passenger compartment, the ammunition is in a locked container other than the glove compartment or console; or

''(ii) if the transportation is by other means, the ammunition is in a locked container.

''(c) LIMITATION ON ARREST AUTHORITY.—A person who is transporting a firearm or ammunition may not be—

''(1) arrested for violation of any law or any rule or regulation of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, relating to the possession, transportation, or carrying of firearms or ammunition, unless there is probable cause that the transportation is not in accordance with subsection (b); or

''(2) detained for violation of any law or any rule or regulation of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, relating to the possession, transportation, or carrying of firearms or ammunition, unless there is reasonable suspicion that the transportation is not in accordance with subsection (b).''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 926A and inserting the following:

''926A. Interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition.''.

SEC. 229. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this subtitle, or an amendment made by this subtitle, shall be construed—

(1) to extend background check requirements to transfers other than those made at gun shows or on the curtilage thereof, or pursuant to an advertisement, posting, display, or other listing on the Internet or in a publication by the transferor of the intent of the transferor to transfer, or the transferee of the intent of the transferee to acquire, the firearm; or

(2) to extend background check requirements to temporary transfers for purposes including lawful hunting or sporting or to temporary possession of a firearm for purposes of examination or evaluation by a prospective transferee.

SEC. 230. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) FIREARM DEALER ACCESS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION.—Section 225 and the amendments made by section 225 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—National Commission on Mass Violence

SEC. 241. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''National Commission on Mass Violence Act of 2015''.

SEC. 242. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MASS VIOLENCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.—There is established a commission to be known as the National Commission on Mass Violence (in this subtitle referred to as the ''Commission'') to study the availability and nature of firearms, including the means of acquiring firearms, issues relating to mental health, and all positive and negative impacts of the availability and nature of firearms on incidents of mass violence or in preventing mass violence.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) APPOINTMENTS.—The Commission shall be composed of 12 members, of whom—

(A) 6 members of the Commission shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate, in consultation with the Democratic leadership of the House of Representatives, 1 of whom shall serve as Chairman of the Commission; and

(B) 6 members of the Commission shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Republican leadership of the Senate, 1 of whom shall serve as Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(2) PERSONS ELIGIBLE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The members appointed to the Commission shall include—

(i) well-known and respected individuals among their peers in their respective fields of expertise; and

(ii) not less than 1 non-elected individual from each of the following categories, who has expertise in the category, by both experience and training:

(I) Firearms.

(II) Mental health.

(III) School safety.

(IV) Mass media.

(B) EXPERTS.—In identifying the individuals to serve on the Commission, the appointing authorities shall take special care to identify experts in the fields described in section 243(a)(2).

(C) PARTY AFFILIATION.—Not more than 6 members of the Commission shall be from the same political party.

(3) COMPLETION OF APPOINTMENTS; VACANCIES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the appointing authorities under paragraph (1) shall each make their respective appointments. Any vacancy that occurs during the life of the Commission shall not affect the powers of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment not later than 30 days after the vacancy occurs.

(4) OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION.—

(A) MEETINGS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman.

(ii) INITIAL MEETING.—The initial meeting of the Commission shall be conducted not later than 30 days after the later of—

(I) the date of the appointment of the last member of the Commission; or

(II) the date on which appropriated funds are available for the Commission.

(B) QUORUM; VACANCIES; VOTING; RULES.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum to conduct business, but the Commission may establish a lesser quorum for conducting hearings scheduled by the Commission. Each member of the Commission shall have 1 vote, and the vote of each member shall be accorded the same weight. The Commission may establish by majority vote any other rules for the conduct of the Commission's business, if such rules are not inconsistent with this subtitle or other applicable law.

SEC. 243. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the duty of the Commission to conduct a comprehensive factual study of incidents of mass violence, including incidents of mass violence not involving firearms, in the context of the many acts of senseless mass violence that occur in the United States each year, in order to determine the root causes of such mass violence.

(2) MATTERS TO BE STUDIED.—In determining the root causes of these recurring and tragic acts of mass violence, the Commission shall study any matter that the Commission determines relevant to meeting the requirements of paragraph (1), including at a minimum—

(A) the role of schools, including the level of involvement and awareness of teachers and school administrators in the lives of their students and the availability of mental health and other resources and strategies to help detect and counter tendencies of students towards mass violence;

(B) the effectiveness of and resources available for school security strategies to prevent incidents of mass violence;

(C) the role of families and the availability of mental health and other resources and strategies to help families detect and counter tendencies toward mass violence;

(D) the effectiveness and use of, and resources available to, the mental health system in understanding, detecting, and countering tendencies toward mass violence, as well as the effects of treatments and therapies;

(E) whether medical doctors and other mental health professionals have the ability, without negative legal or professional consequences, to notify law enforcement officials when a patient is a danger to himself or others;

(F) the nature and impact of the alienation of the perpetrators of such incidents of mass violence from their schools, families, peer groups, and places of work;

(G) the role that domestic violence plays in causing incidents of mass violence;

(H) the effect of depictions of mass violence in the media, and any impact of such depictions on incidents of mass violence;

(I) the availability and nature of firearms, including the means of acquiring such firearms, and all positive and negative impacts of such availability and nature on incidents of mass violence or in preventing mass violence;

(J) the role of current prosecution rates in contributing to the availability of weapons that are used in mass violence;

(K) the availability of information regarding the construction of weapons, including explosive devices, and any impact of such information on such incidents of mass violence;

(L) the views of law enforcement officials, religious leaders, mental health experts, and other relevant officials on the root causes and prevention of mass violence;

(M) incidents in which firearms were used to stop mass violence; and

(N) any other area that the Commission determines contributes to the causes of mass violence.

(3) TESTIMONY OF VICTIMS AND SURVIVORS.—In determining the root causes of these recurring and tragic incidents of mass violence, the Commission shall, in accordance

with section 244(a), take the testimony of victims and survivors to learn and memorialize their views and experiences regarding such incidents of mass violence.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Based on the findings of the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall make recommendations to the President and Congress to address the causes of these recurring and tragic incidents of mass violence and to reduce such incidents of mass violence.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than 3 months after the date on which the Commission first meets, the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress an interim report describing any initial recommendations of the Commission.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the Commission first meets, the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a comprehensive report of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with the recommendations of the Commission.

(3) SUMMARIES.—The report under paragraph (2) shall include a summary of—

(A) the reports submitted to the Commission by any entity under contract for research under section 244(e); and

(B) any other material relied on by the Commission in the preparation of the report.

SEC. 244. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers advisable to carry out its duties under section 243.

(2) WITNESS EXPENSES.—Witnesses requested to appear before the Commission shall be paid the same fees as are paid to witnesses under section 1821 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out its duties under section 243. Upon the request of the Commission, the head of such agency may furnish such information to the Commission.

(c) INFORMATION TO BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be considered an agency of the Federal Government for purposes of section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, and any individual employed by any individual or entity under contract with the Commission under subsection (d) shall be considered an employee of the Commission for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) DISCLOSURE.—Information obtained by the Commission or the Attorney General under this subtitle and shared with the Commission, other than information available to the public, shall not be disclosed to any person in any manner, except—

(A) to Commission employees or employees of any individual or entity under contract to the Commission under subsection (d) for the purpose of receiving, reviewing, or processing such information;

(B) upon court order; or

(C) when publicly released by the Commission in an aggregate or summary form that does not directly or indirectly disclose—

(i) the identity of any person or business entity; or

(ii) any information which could not be released under section 1905 of title 18, United States Code.

(d) CONTRACTING FOR RESEARCH.—The Commission may enter into contracts with any entity for research necessary to carry out the duties of the Commission under section 243.

SEC. 245. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of service for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional employees as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment and termination of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by a majority of the members of the Commission.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The executive director shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code. The Chairman may fix the compensation of other employees without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for such employees may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(3) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee, with the approval of the head of the appropriate Federal agency, may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status, benefits, or privilege.

(d) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The Chairman of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

SEC. 246. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission and any agency of the Federal Government assisting the Commission in carrying out its duties under this subtitle such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subtitle. Any sums appropriated shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until expended.

SEC. 247. TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate 30 days after the Commission submits the final report under section 243(c)(2).

SA 2909. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. FUNDING FOR RESEARCH BY CDC ON FIREARMS SAFETY OR GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021 for the purpose of conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention under the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.). The amount authorized to be appropriated by the preceding sentence is in addition to any other amounts authorized to be appropriated for such purpose.

SA 2910. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. GRANTING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL THE AUTHORITY TO DENY THE SALE, DELIVERY, OR TRANSFER OF A FIREARM OR THE ISSUANCE OF A FIREARMS OR EXPLOSIVES LICENSE OR PERMIT TO DANGEROUS TERRORISTS.

(a) STANDARD FOR EXERCISING ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETION REGARDING TRANSFERRING FIREARMS OR ISSUING FIREARMS PERMITS TO DANGEROUS TERRORISTS.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after section 922 the following:

''§ 922A. Attorney General's discretion to deny transfer of a firearm

''The Attorney General may deny the transfer of a firearm under section 922(t)(1)(B)(ii) of this title if the Attorney General—

''(1) determines that the transferee is known (or appropriately suspected) to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation for, in aid of, or related to terrorism, or providing material support or resources for terrorism; and

''(2) has a reasonable belief that the prospective transferee may use a firearm in connection with terrorism.

''§ 922B. Attorney General's discretion regarding applicants for firearm permits which would qualify for the exemption provided under section 922(t)(3)

''The Attorney General may determine that—

''(1) an applicant for a firearm permit which would qualify for an exemption under

section 922(t)(3) is known (or appropriately suspected) to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation for, in aid of, or related to terrorism, or providing material support or resources for terrorism; and

''(2) the Attorney General has a reasonable belief that the applicant may use a firearm in connection with terrorism.'';

(2) in section 921(a), by adding at the end the following:

''(36) The term 'terrorism' includes international terrorism and domestic terrorism, as defined in section 2331 of this title.

''(37) The term 'material support or resources' has the meaning given the term in section 2339A of this title.

''(38) The term 'responsible person' means an individual who has the power, directly or indirectly, to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of the applicant or licensee pertaining to firearms.''; and

(3) in the table of sections, by inserting after the item relating to section 922 the following:

''922A. Attorney General's discretion to deny transfer of a firearm.

''922B. Attorney General's discretion regarding applicants for firearm permits which would qualify for the exemption provided under section 922(t)(3).''.

(b) EFFECT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL THROUGH THE NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM (NICS) ON FIREARMS PERMITS.—Section 922(t) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), by inserting ''or State law, or that the Attorney General has determined to deny the transfer of a firearm pursuant to section 922A of this title'' before the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', or if the Attorney General has not determined to deny the transfer of a firearm pursuant to section 922A of this title'' after ''or State law'';

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) in subclause (I), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(II) by adding at the end the following:

''(III) was issued after a check of the system established pursuant to paragraph (1);'';

(ii) in clause (ii), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) the State issuing the permit agrees to deny the permit application if such other person is the subject of a determination by the Attorney General pursuant to section 922B of this title;'';

(4) in paragraph (4), by inserting '', or if the Attorney General has not determined to deny the transfer of a firearm pursuant to section 922A of this title'' after ''or State law''; and

(5) in paragraph (5), by inserting '', or if the Attorney General has determined to deny the transfer of a firearm pursuant to section 922A of this title'' after ''or State law''.

(c) UNLAWFUL SALE OR DISPOSITION OF FIREARM BASED UPON ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL.—Section 922(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) has been the subject of a determination by the Attorney General under section 922A, 922B, 923(d)(3), or 923(e) of this title.''.

(d) ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL AS PROHIBITOR.—Section 922(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the comma at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

''(10) who has received actual notice of the Attorney General's determination made under section 922A, 922B, 923(d)(3) or 923(e) of this title,''.

(e) ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL OF FEDERAL FIREARMS LICENSES.—Section 923(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''Any'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (3), any''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) The Attorney General may deny a license application if the Attorney General determines that the applicant (including any responsible person) is known (or appropriately suspected) to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation for, in aid of, or related to terrorism, or providing material support or resources for terrorism, and the Attorney General has a reasonable belief that the applicant may use a firearm in connection with terrorism.''.

(f) DISCRETIONARY REVOCATION OF FEDERAL FIREARMS LICENSES.—Section 923(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(e)'';

(2) by striking ''revoke any license'' and inserting the following: ''revoke—

''(A) any license'';

(3) by striking ''. The Attorney General may, after notice and opportunity for hearing, revoke the license'' and inserting the following: '';

''(B) the license''; and

(4) by striking ''. The Secretary's action'' and inserting the following: ''; or

''(C) any license issued under this section if the Attorney General determines that the holder of such license (including any responsible person) is known (or appropriately suspected) to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation for, in aid of, or related to terrorism or providing material support or resources for terrorism, and the Attorney General has a reasonable belief that the applicant may use a firearm in connection with terrorism.

''(2) The Attorney General's action''.

(g) ATTORNEY GENERAL'S ABILITY TO WITHHOLD INFORMATION IN FIREARMS LICENSE DENIAL AND REVOCATION SUIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 923(f)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: ''However, if the denial or revocation is pursuant to subsection (d)(3) or (e)(1)(C), any information upon which the Attorney General relied for this determination may be withheld from the petitioner, if the Attorney General determines that disclosure of the information would likely compromise national security.''.

(2) SUMMARIES.—Section 923(f)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the third sentence the following: ''With respect to any information withheld from the aggrieved party under paragraph (1), the United States may submit, and the court may rely upon, summaries or redacted versions of documents containing information the disclosure of which the Attorney General has determined would likely compromise national security.''.

(h) ATTORNEY GENERAL'S ABILITY TO WITHHOLD INFORMATION IN RELIEF FROM DISABILITIES LAWSUITS.—Section 925(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the third sentence the following: ''If the person is subject to a disability under section 922(g)(10) of this title, any information which the Attorney General relied on for this determination may be withheld from the applicant if the Attorney General determines that disclosure of the information would likely compromise national security. In responding to the petition, the United States may submit, and the court may rely upon, summaries or redacted versions of documents containing information the disclosure of which the Attorney General has determined would likely compromise national security.''.

(i) PENALTIES.—Section 924(k) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the comma at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) constitutes an act of terrorism, or providing material support or resources for terrorism,''.

(j) REMEDY FOR ERRONEOUS DENIAL OF FIREARM OR FIREARM PERMIT EXEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 925A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**Remedy for erroneous denial of firearm**'' and inserting ''**Remedies**'';

(B) by striking ''Any person denied a firearm pursuant to subsection (s) or (t) of section 922'' and inserting the following:

''(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), any person denied a firearm pursuant to subsection (t) of section 922 or a firearm permit pursuant to a determination made under section 922B''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) In any case in which the Attorney General has denied the transfer of a firearm to a prospective transferee pursuant to section 922A of this title or has made a determination regarding a firearm permit applicant pursuant to section 922B of this title, an action challenging the determination may be brought against the United States. The petition shall be filed not later than 60 days after the petitioner has received actual notice of the Attorney General's determination under section 922A or 922B of this title. The court shall sustain the Attorney General's determination upon a showing by the United States by a preponderance of evidence that the Attorney General's determination satisfied the requirements of section 922A or 922B, as the case may be. To make this showing, the United States may submit, and the court may rely upon, summaries or redacted versions of documents containing information the disclosure of which the Attorney General has determined would likely compromise national security. Upon request of the petitioner or the court's own motion, the court may review the full, undisclosed documents ex parte and in camera. The court shall determine whether the summaries or redacted versions, as the case may be, are fair and accurate representations of the underlying documents. The court shall not consider the full, undisclosed documents in deciding whether the Attorney General's determination satisfies the requirements of section 922A or 922B.''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 925A and inserting the following:

''925A. Remedies.''.

(k) PROVISION OF GROUNDS UNDERLYING INELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION BY THE NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.—Section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)—

(A) by inserting ''or the Attorney General has made a determination regarding an applicant for a firearm permit pursuant to section 922B of title 18, United States Code,'' after ''is ineligible to receive a firearm''; and

(B) by inserting ''except any information for which the Attorney General has determined that disclosure would likely compromise national security,'' after ''reasons to the individual,''; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) the first sentence—

(i) by inserting ''or if the Attorney General has made a determination pursuant to section 922A or 922B of title 18, United States Code,'' after ''or State law,''; and

(ii) by inserting '', except any information for which the Attorney General has determined that disclosure would likely compromise national security'' before the period at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: ''Any petition for review of information withheld by the Attorney General under this subsection shall be made in accordance with section 925A of title 18, United States Code.''.

(l) UNLAWFUL DISTRIBUTION OF EXPLOSIVES BASED UPON ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL.—Section 842(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) has received actual notice of the Attorney General's determination made pursuant to subsection (j) or (d)(1)(B) of section 843 of this title.''.

(m) ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL AS PROHIBITOR.—Section 842(i) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by inserting ''; or'' at the end; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) who has received actual notice of the Attorney General's determination made pursuant to subsection (j) or (d)(1)(B) of section 843 of this title,''.

(n) ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL OF FEDERAL EXPLOSIVES LICENSES AND PERMITS.—Section 843 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''Upon'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (j), upon''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(j) The Attorney General may deny the issuance of a permit or license to an applicant if the Attorney General determines that the applicant or a responsible person or employee possessor thereof is known (or appropriately suspected) to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation of, in aid of, or related to terrorism, or providing material support or resources for terrorism, and the Attorney General has a reasonable belief that the person may use explosives in connection with terrorism.''.

(o) ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY REVOCATION OF FEDERAL EXPLOSIVES LICENSES AND PERMITS.—Section 843(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(d)'';

(2) by striking ''if in the opinion'' and inserting the following: ''if—

''(A) in the opinion''; and

(3) by striking ''. The Secretary's action'' and inserting the following: ''; or

''(B) the Attorney General determines that the licensee or holder (or any responsible person or employee possessor thereof) is known (or appropriately suspected) to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation for, in aid of, or related to terrorism, or providing material support or resources for terrorism, and that the Attorney General has a reasonable belief that the person may use explosives in connection with terrorism.

''(2) The Attorney General's action''.

(p) ATTORNEY GENERAL'S ABILITY TO WITHHOLD INFORMATION IN EXPLOSIVES LICENSE AND PERMIT DENIAL AND REVOCATION SUITS.—Section 843(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting after the first sentence the following: ''However, if the denial or revocation is based upon an Attorney General determination under subsection (j) or (d)(1)(B), any information which the Attorney General relied on for this determination may be withheld from the petitioner if the Attorney General determines that disclosure of the information would likely compromise national security.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following: ''In responding to any petition for review of a denial or revocation based upon an Attorney General determination under subsection (j) or (d)(1)(B), the United States may submit, and the court may rely upon, summaries or redacted versions of documents containing information the disclosure of which the Attorney General has determined would likely compromise national security.''.

(q) ABILITY TO WITHHOLD INFORMATION IN COMMUNICATIONS TO EMPLOYERS.—Section 843(h)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or in subsection (j) of this section (on grounds of terrorism)'' after ''section 842(i)''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting ''or in subsection (j) of this section,'' after ''section 842(i),''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting '', except that any information that the Attorney General relied on for a determination pursuant to subsection (j) may be withheld if the Attorney General concludes that disclosure of the information would likely compromise national security'' after ''determination''.

(r) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—Section 101(a)(43)(E)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43)(E)(ii)) is amended by striking ''or (5)'' and inserting ''(5), or (10)''.

(s) GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall issue guidelines describing the circumstances under which the Attorney General will exercise the authority and make determinations under subsections (d)(1)(B) and (j) of section 843 and sections 922A and 922B of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this title.

(2) CONTENTS.—The guidelines issued under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) provide accountability and a basis for monitoring to ensure that the intended goals for, and expected results of, the grant of authority under subsections (d)(1)(B) and (j) of section 843 and sections 922A and 922B of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this title, are being achieved; and

(B) ensure that terrorist watch list records are used in a manner that safeguards privacy and civil liberties protections, in accordance with requirements outlines in Homeland Security Presidential Directive 11 (dated August 27, 2004).

SA 2911. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. EXPANSION AND MODIFICATION OF CREDIT FOR EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSES OF SMALL EMPLOYERS.

(a) EXPANSION OF DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE SMALL EMPLOYER.—Subparagraph (A) of section 45R(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''25'' and inserting ''50''.

(b) AMENDMENT TO PHASEOUT DETERMINATION.—Subsection (c) of section 45R of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(c) PHASEOUT OF CREDIT AMOUNT BASED ON NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES AND AVERAGE WAGES.—The amount of the credit determined under subsection (b) (without regard to this subsection) shall be adjusted (but not below zero) by multiplying such amount by the product of—

''(1) the lesser of—

''(A) a fraction the numerator of which is the excess (if any) of 50 over the total number of full-time equivalent employees of the employer and the denominator of which is 30, and

''(B) 1, and

''(2) the lesser of—

''(A) a fraction—

''(i) the numerator of which is the excess (if any) of—

''(I) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (d)(3)(B) for the taxable year, multiplied by 3, over

''(II) the average annual wages of the employer for such taxable year, and

''(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount so in effect under subsection (d)(3)(B), multiplied by 2, and

''(B) 1.''.

(c) EXTENSION OF CREDIT PERIOD.—Paragraph (2) of section 45R(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''2-consecutive-taxable year period'' and all that follows and inserting ''3-consecutive-taxable year period beginning with the 1st taxable year beginning after 2014 in which—

''(A) the employer (or any predecessor) offers 1 or more qualified health plans to its employees through an Exchange, and

''(B) the employer (or any predecessor) claims the credit under this section.''.

(d) AVERAGE ANNUAL WAGE LIMITATION.—Subparagraph (B) of section 45R(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(B) DOLLAR AMOUNT.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B) and subsection (c)(2), the dollar amount in effect under this paragraph is the amount equal to 110 percent of the poverty line (within the meaning of section 36B(d)(3)) for a family of 4.''.

(e) ELIMINATION OF UNIFORM PERCENTAGE CONTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT.—Paragraph (4) of section 45R(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''a uniform percentage (not less than 50 percent)'' and inserting ''at least 50 percent''.

(f) ELIMINATION OF CAP RELATING TO AVERAGE LOCAL PREMIUMS.—Subsection (b) of section 45R of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''the lesser of'' and all that follows and inserting ''the aggregate amount of nonelective contributions the employer made on behalf of its employees during the taxable year under the arrangement described in subsection (d)(4) for premiums for qualified health plans offered by the employer to its employees through an Exchange.''.

(g) AMENDMENT RELATING TO ANNUAL WAGE LIMITATION.—Subparagraph (B) of section 45R(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''twice'' and inserting ''three times''.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts

paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. _____. MODIFICATIONS TO RULES RELATING TO INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if—

''(A) such corporation would be a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting '80 percent' for '60 percent', or

''(B) such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation.

''(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes after November 30, 2015, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

''(B) after the acquisition, more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(i) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

''(ii) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership.

''(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) and the preceding sentence, the term 'substantial business activities' shall have the meaning given such term under regulations in effect on November 30, 2015, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 7874(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''after March 4, 2003,'' and inserting ''after March 4, 2003, and before December 1, 2015,''.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 7874 of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(ii) by inserting ''or (b)(2)(A)'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(i)'' in subparagraph (B),

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''or (b)(2)(B), as the case may be,'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(ii)'',

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(D) in paragraph (6), by inserting ''or inverted domestic corporation, as the case may be,'' after ''surrogate foreign corporation''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after November 30, 2015.

SA 2912. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____—PROTECT AMERICA ACT OF 2015

SECTION __01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Protect America Act of 2015''.

SEC. __02. GRANTING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL THE AUTHORITY TO DENY THE SALE, DELIVERY, OR TRANSFER OF FIREARMS TO DANGEROUS TERRORISTS; REQUIRING INFORMATION SHARING REGARDING ATTEMPTED FIREARMS PURCHASES BY SUSPECTED TERRORISTS; AUTHORIZING THE INVESTIGATION AND ARREST OF TERRORISTS WHO ATTEMPT TO PURCHASE FIREARMS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Preventing Terrorists From Obtaining Firearms Act of 2015''.

(b) AMENDMENTS.—Section 922(t) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7)(A) If the Attorney General is notified of a request to transfer a firearm to a person who is a known or suspected terrorist, the Attorney General shall—

''(i) as appropriate, take further steps to confirm the identity of the prospective transferee and confirm or rule out the suspected nexus to terrorism of the prospective transferee;

''(ii) as appropriate, notify relevant Federal, State, or local law enforcement agencies or intelligence agencies concerning the identity of the prospective transferee; and

''(iii) determine whether the prospective transferee is already the subject of an ongoing terrorism investigation and, as appropriate, initiate such an investigation.

''(B) Upon being notified of a prospective transfer under subparagraph (A), the Attorney General or the United States attorney for the district in which the licensee is located may—

''(i) delay the transfer of the firearm for a period not to exceed 72 hours; and

''(ii) file an emergency petition in a court of competent jurisdiction to prohibit the transfer of the firearm.

''(C)(i) An emergency petition filed under subparagraph (B)(ii) shall be granted upon a showing of probable cause to believe that the transferee has committed or will commit an act of terrorism.

''(ii) In the case of an emergency petition filed under subparagraph (B)(ii) to prohibit the transfer of a firearm, the petition may only be granted after a hearing—

''(I) of which the transferee receives actual notice; and

''(II) at which the transferee has an opportunity to participate with counsel.

''(D) The Attorney General may arrest and detain any transferee with respect to whom an emergency petition is granted under subparagraph (C).

''(E) For purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) the term 'known or suspected terrorist' means a person determined by the Attorney General to be known (or appropriately suspected) to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation for, in aid of, or related to terrorism, or providing material support or resources for terrorism;

''(ii) the term 'material support or resources' has the meaning given the term in section 2339A; and

''(iii) the term 'terrorism' includes international terrorism and domestic terrorism, as defined in section 2331.''.

SEC. __03. STOP SANCTUARY POLICIES AND PROTECT AMERICANS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Stop Sanctuary Policies and Protect Americans Act''.

(b) SANCTUARY JURISDICTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''sanctuary jurisdiction'' means any State or political subdivision of a State, including any law enforcement entity of a State or of a political subdivision of a State, that—

(1) has in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that is in violation of subsection (a) or (b) of section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373); or

(2) has in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that prohibits any government entity or official from complying with a detainer that has been lawfully issued or a request to notify about the release of an alien that has been made by the Department of Homeland Security in accordance with section 236 and 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357) and section 287.7 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations.

(c) LIMITATION ON GRANTS TO SANCTUARY JURISDICTIONS.—

(1) INELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.—

(A) LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS.—

(i) SCAAP GRANTS.—A sanctuary jurisdiction shall not be eligible to receive funds pursuant to the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program under section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)).

(ii) COPS GRANTS.—No law enforcement entity of a State or of a political subdivision of a State that has a departmental policy or practice that renders it a sanctuary jurisdiction, and such a policy or practice is not required by statute, ordinance, or other codified law, or by order of a chief executive officer of the jurisdiction, or the executive or legislative board of the jurisdiction, shall be eligible to receive funds directly or indirectly under the 'Cops on the Beat' program under part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.).

(iii) ENFORCEMENT.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall terminate the funding described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) to a State or political subdivision of a State on the date that is 30 days after the date on which a notification described in subsection (d)(2) is made to the State or subdivision, unless the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, determines the State or subdivision is no longer a sanctuary jurisdiction.

(B) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended—

(I) in section 102 (42 U.S.C. 5302), by adding at the end the following:

''(25) The term 'sanctuary jurisdiction' means any State or unit of general local government that—

''(A) has in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that is in violation of subsection (a) or (b) of section 642 of the Illegal

Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373); or

''(B) has in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that prohibits any government entity or official from complying with a detainer that has been lawfully issued or a request to notify about the release of an alien that has been made by the Department of Homeland Security in accordance with section 236 and 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357) and section 287.7 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations.''; and

(II) in section 104 (42 U.S.C. 5304)—

(aa) in subsection (b)—

(AA) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(BB) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(CC) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

''(6) the grantee is not a sanctuary jurisdiction and will not become a sanctuary jurisdiction during the period for which the grantee receives a grant under this title; and''; and

(bb) by adding at the end the following:

''(n) PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS AGAINST CRIMINAL ALIENS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title may be obligated or expended to any State or unit of general local government that is a sanctuary jurisdiction.

''(2) RETURNED AMOUNTS.—

''(A) STATE.—If a State is a sanctuary jurisdiction during the period for which the State receives amounts under this title, the Secretary—

''(i) shall direct the State to immediately return to the Secretary any such amounts that have not been obligated by the State as of the date on which the State became a sanctuary jurisdiction; and

''(ii) may use any returned amounts under clause (i) to make grants to other States that are not sanctuary jurisdictions in accordance with this title.

''(B) UNIT OF GENERAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—If a unit of general local government is a sanctuary jurisdiction during the period for which the unit of general local government receives amounts under this title, any such amounts that have not been obligated by the unit of general local government as of the date on which the unit of general local government became a sanctuary jurisdiction—

''(i) in the case of a unit of general local government that is not in a nonentitlement area, shall be returned to the Secretary to make grants to States and other units of general local government that are not sanctuary jurisdictions in accordance with this title; and

''(ii) in the case of a unit of general local government that is in a nonentitlement area, shall be returned to the Governor of the State to make grants to other units of general local government that are not sanctuary jurisdictions in accordance with this title.

''(o) ENFORCEMENT AGAINST FUNDING FOR SANCTUARY JURISDICTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall verify, on a quarterly basis, the determination of the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General as to whether a State or unit of general local government is a sanctuary jurisdiction and therefore ineligible to receive a grant under this title for purposes of subsections (b)(6) and (n).

''(2) NOTIFICATION.—If the Secretary verifies that a State or unit of general local government is determined to be a sanctuary jurisdiction under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall notify the State or unit of general local government that it is ineligible to receive a grant under this title.''.

(ii) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by clause (i) shall only apply with respect to community development block grants made under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) ALLOCATION.—Any funds that are not allocated to a State or political subdivision of a State pursuant to paragraph (1) and the amendments made by paragraph (1) shall be allocated to States and political subdivisions of States that are not sanctuary jurisdictions.

(3) NOTIFICATION OF CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 days after a determination is made pursuant to paragraph (1) to terminate a grant or to refuse to award a grant, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that fully describes the circumstances and basis for the termination or refusal.

(4) TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and quarterly thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General shall—

(A) determine the States and political subdivisions of States that are sanctuary jurisdictions;

(B) notify each such State or subdivision that it is determined to be a sanctuary jurisdiction; and

(C) publish on the website of the Department of Homeland Security and of the Department of Justice—

(i) a list of each sanctuary jurisdiction;

(ii) the total number of detainers and requests for notification of the release of any alien that has been issued or made to each State or political subdivision of a State; and

(iii) the number of such detainers and requests for notification that have been ignored or otherwise not honored, including the name of the jurisdiction in which each such detainer or request for notification was issued or made.

(5) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to require law enforcement officials of a State or a political subdivision of a State to provide the Secretary of Homeland Security with information related to a victim or a witness to a criminal offense.

(d) STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND INDIVIDUAL COMPLIANCE WITH DETAINERS.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT DETAINERS.—A State, a political subdivision of a State, or an officer, employee, or agent of such State or political subdivision that complies with a detainer issued by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357)—

(A) shall be deemed to be acting as an agent of the Department of Homeland Security; and

(B) shall have the authority available to employees of the Department of Homeland Security with regard to actions taken to comply with the detainer.

(2) LIABILITY.—In any legal proceeding brought against a State, a political subdivision of State, or an officer, employee, or agent of such State or political subdivision, which challenges the legality of the seizure or detention of an individual pursuant to a detainer issued by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357)—

(A) no liability shall lie against the State or political subdivision for actions taken in compliance with the detainer;

(B) if the actions of the officer, employee, or agent of the State or political subdivision were taken in compliance with the detainer—

(i) the officer, employee, or agent shall be deemed to be an employee of the Federal Government and an investigative or law enforcement officer and to have been acting within the scope of his or her employment under section 1346(b) and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code;

(ii) section 1346(b) of title 28, United States Code, shall provide the exclusive remedy for the plaintiff; and

(iii) the United States shall be substituted as defendant in the proceeding.

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

(A) to provide immunity to any person who knowingly violates the civil or constitutional rights of an individual; or

(B) to limit the application of the doctrine of official immunity or of qualified immunity in a civil action brought against a law enforcement officer acting pursuant to a detainer issued by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357).

(e) INCREASED PENALTIES FOR REENTRY OF REMOVED ALIEN.—Section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1326) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(2) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), any alien who—

''(1) has been denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed or has departed the United States while an order of exclusion, deportation, or removal is outstanding; and

''(2) thereafter enters, attempts to enter, or is at any time found in, the United States, unless—

''(A) prior to the alien's reembarkation at a place outside the United States or the alien's application for admission from foreign contiguous territory, the Secretary of Homeland Security has expressly consented to such alien's reapplying for admission; or

''(B) with respect to an alien previously denied admission and removed, such alien shall establish that the alien was not required to obtain such advance consent under this Act or any prior Act;

shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

''(b) CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR REENTRY OF CERTAIN REMOVED ALIENS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the penalty provided in subsection (a), and except as provided in subsection (c), an alien described in subsection (a)—

''(A) who was convicted before such removal or departure of three or more misdemeanors involving drugs, crimes against the person, or both, or a felony (other than an aggravated felony), shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both;

''(B) who has been excluded from the United States pursuant to section 235(c) because the alien was excludable under section 212(a)(3)(B) or who has been removed from the United States pursuant to the provisions of title V, and who thereafter, without the permission of the Secretary of Homeland Security, enters the United States, or attempts to do so, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, and imprisoned for a period of 10 years, which sentence shall not run concurrently with any other sentence;

''(C) who was removed from the United States pursuant to section 241(a)(4)(B) who thereafter, without the permission of the Secretary of Homeland Security, enters, attempts to enter, or is at any time found in, the United States (unless the Secretary of Homeland Security has expressly consented to such alien's reentry) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; and

''(D) who has been denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed 3 or more times and thereafter enters, attempts to enter, crosses the border to, attempts to cross the border to, or is at any time found in the United States, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

''(2) REMOVAL DEFINED.—In this subsection and subsection (c), the term 'removal' includes any agreement in which an alien stipulates to removal during (or not during) a criminal trial under either Federal or State law.

''(c) MANDATORY MINIMUM CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR REENTRY OF CERTAIN REMOVED ALIENS.—Notwithstanding the penalties provided in subsections (a) and (b), an alien described in subsection (a)—

''(1) who was convicted before such removal or departure of an aggravated felony; or

''(2) who was convicted at least two times before such removal or departure of illegal reentry under this section;

shall be imprisoned not less than five years and not more than 20 years, and may, in addition, be fined under title 18, United States Code.''; and

(3) in subsection (d), as redesignated by paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''section 242(h)(2)'' and inserting ''section 241(a)(4)''; and

(B) by striking ''Attorney General'' and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security''.

(f) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid for any reason, the remainder of this section, and the application of such provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances, shall not be affected by such invalidation.

SA 2913. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. EXTENSION OF SPECIAL RULE FOR SENIORS RELATING TO INCOME LEVEL FOR DEDUCTION OF MEDICAL CARE EXPENSES.

Subsection (f) of section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(f) SPECIAL RULE.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2012, and ending before January 1, 2024, subsection (a) shall be applied with respect to a taxpayer by substituting '7.5 percent' for '10 percent' if such taxpayer or such taxpayer's spouse has attained age 65 before the close of such taxable year.''.

SEC. _____. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

''Sec. 59A. Fair share tax.

''SEC. 59A. FAIR SHARE TAX.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—

''(1) IMPOSITITION OF TAX.—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

''(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

''(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

''(I) the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, over

''(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

''(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

''(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

''(B) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year, determined without regard to any tax liability determined under this section,

''(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

''(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

''(b) TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

''(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

''(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

''(2) MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

''(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

''(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

''(B) TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

''(c) HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'high-income taxpayer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of $1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

''(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2016, the $1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $10,000.

''(d) PAYROLL TAX.—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

''(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such tax is attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year or wages or compensation received during such taxable year, over

''(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

''(f) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SA 2914. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DIVISION B—PROTECTING COMMUNITIES AND PRESERVING THE SECOND AMENDMENT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the ''Protecting Communities and Preserving the Second Amendment Act of 2015''.

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

DIVISION B—PROTECTING COMMUNITIES AND PRESERVING THE SECOND AMENDMENT

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—COMBATING GUN CRIME, NICS REAUTHORIZATION, AND NICS IMPROVEMENT

Sec. 101. Reauthorization and improvements to NICS.
Sec. 102. Availability of records to NICS.
Sec. 103. Definitions relating to mental health.
Sec. 104. Clarification that Federal court information is to be made available to the national instant criminal background check system.
Sec. 105. Reports and certifications to Congress.
Sec. 106. Increasing Federal prosecution of gun violence.
Sec. 107. Prosecution of felons and fugitives who attempt to illegally purchase firearms.
Sec. 108. Limitation on operations by the Department of Justice.
Sec. 109. Straw purchasing of firearms.

Sec. 110. Increased penalties for lying and buying.
Sec. 111. Amendments to section 924(a).
Sec. 112. Amendments to section 924(h).
Sec. 113. Amendments to section 924(k).
Sec. 114. Multiple sales reports for rifles and shotguns.
Sec. 115. Study by the National Institutes of Justice and National Academy of Sciences on the causes of mass shootings.
Sec. 116. Reports to Congress regarding ammunition purchases by Federal agencies.
Sec. 117. Incentives for State compliance with NICS mental health record requirements.
Sec. 118. Firearm commerce modernization.
Sec. 119. Firearm dealer access to law enforcement information.
Sec. 120. Interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition.

TITLE II—MENTAL HEALTH

Sec. 201. Reauthorization and additional amendments to the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act.
Sec. 202. Additional purposes for Federal grants.
Sec. 203. Protecting the second amendment rights of veterans.
Sec. 204. Applicability of amendments.

TITLE III—SCHOOL SAFETY

Sec. 301. Short title.
Sec. 302. Grant program for school security.
Sec. 303. Applications.
Sec. 304. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 305. Accountability.
Sec. 306. Preventing duplicative grants.

TITLE IV—SANCTUARY CITIES

Sec. 401. Stop Sanctuary Policies and Protect Americans.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this division—

(1) the term ''agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term ''NICS'' means the National Instant Criminal Background Check System; and

(3) the term ''relevant Federal records'' means any record demonstrating that a person is prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm under subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code.

TITLE I—COMBATING GUN CRIME, NICS REAUTHORIZATION, AND NICS IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 101. REAUTHORIZATION AND IMPROVEMENTS TO NICS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 103 of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and amending such subsection to read as follows:

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.''; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) ACCOUNTABILITY.—All grants awarded by the Attorney General under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

''(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'unresolved audit finding' means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

''(2) AUDITS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

''(3) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.''.

(b) MODIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—The NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) in section 102(b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''subparagraph (C)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (B)'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B);

(2) in section 103(a)(1), by striking ''and subject to section 102(b)(1)(B)''; and

(3) in section 104(d), by striking ''section 102(b)(1)(C)'' and inserting ''section 102(b)(1)(B)''.

SEC. 102. AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS TO NICS.

(a) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall issue guidance regarding—

(1) the identification and sharing of relevant Federal records; and

(2) submission of the relevant Federal records to NICS.

(b) PRIORITIZATION OF RECORDS.—Each agency that possesses relevant Federal records shall prioritize providing the relevant information contained in the relevant Federal records to NICS on a regular and ongoing basis in accordance with the guidance issued by the Attorney General under subsection (a).

(c) REPORTS.—Not later than 60 days after the Attorney General issues guidance under subsection (a), the head of each agency shall submit a report to the Attorney General that—

(1) advises whether the agency possesses relevant Federal records; and

(2) describes the implementation plan of the agency for making the relevant information contained in relevant Federal records available to NICS in a manner consistent with applicable law.

(d) DETERMINATION OF RELEVANCE.—The Attorney General shall resolve any dispute regarding whether—

(1) agency records are relevant Federal records; and

(2) the relevant Federal records of an agency should be made available to NICS.

SEC. 103. DEFINITIONS RELATING TO MENTAL HEALTH.

(a) TITLE 18 DEFINITIONS.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 921(a), by adding at the end the following:

''(36)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the term 'has been adjudicated mentally incompetent or has been committed to a psychiatric hospital', with respect to a person—

''(i) means the person is the subject of an order or finding by a judicial officer, court, board, commission, or other adjudicative body—

''(I) that was issued after—

''(aa) a hearing—

''(AA) of which the person received actual notice; and

''(BB) at which the person had an opportunity to participate with counsel; or

''(bb) the person knowingly and intelligently waived the opportunity for a hearing—

''(AA) of which the person received actual notice; and

''(BB) at which the person would have had an opportunity to participate with counsel; and

''(II) that found that the person, as a result of marked subnormal intelligence, mental impairment, mental illness, incompetency, condition, or disease—

''(aa) was a danger to himself or herself or to others;

''(bb) was guilty but mentally ill in a criminal case, in a jurisdiction that provides for such a verdict;

''(cc) was not guilty in a criminal case by reason of insanity or mental disease or defect;

''(dd) was incompetent to stand trial in a criminal case;

''(ee) was not guilty by reason of lack of mental responsibility under section 850a of title 10 (article 50a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice);

''(ff) required involuntary inpatient treatment by a psychiatric hospital for any reason, including substance abuse; or

''(gg) required involuntary outpatient treatment by a psychiatric hospital based on a finding that the person is a danger to himself or herself or to others; and

''(ii) does not include—

''(I) an admission to a psychiatric hospital for observation; or

''(II) a voluntary admission to a psychiatric hospital.

''(B) In this paragraph, the term 'order or finding' does not include—

''(i) an order or finding that has expired, has been set aside, has been expunged, or is otherwise no longer applicable because a judicial officer, court, board, commission, adjudicative body, or appropriate official has found that the person who is the subject of the order or finding—

''(I) does not present a danger to himself or herself or to others;

''(II) has been restored to sanity or cured of mental disease or defect;

''(III) has been restored to competency; or

''(IV) no longer requires involuntary inpatient or outpatient treatment by a psychiatric hospital, and the person is not a danger to himself, herself, or others; or

''(ii) an order or finding with respect to which the person who is subject to the order or finding has been granted relief from disabilities under section 925(c), under a program described in section 101(c)(2)(A) or 105 of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note), or under any other State-authorized relief from disabilities program of the State in which the original commitment or adjudication occurred.

''(37) The term 'psychiatric hospital' includes a mental health facility, a mental hospital, a sanitarium, a psychiatric facility, and any other facility that provides diagnoses or treatment by licensed professionals of mental retardation or mental illness, including a psychiatric ward in a general hospital.''; and

(2) in section 922—

(A) in subsection (d)(4)—

(i) by striking ''as a mental defective'' and inserting ''mentally incompetent''; and

(ii) by striking ''any mental institution'' and inserting ''a psychiatric hospital''; and

(B) in subsection (g)(4)—

(i) by striking ''as a mental defective or who has'' and inserting ''mentally incompetent or has''; and

(ii) by striking ''mental institution'' and inserting ''psychiatric hospital''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''as a mental defective'' each place that term appears and inserting ''mentally incompetent'';

(2) by striking ''mental institution'' each place that term appears and inserting ''psychiatric hospital'';

(3) in section 101(c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''to the mental health of a person'' and inserting ''to whether a person is mentally incompetent''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking ''to the mental health of a person'' and inserting ''to whether a person is mentally incompetent''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''to the mental health of a person'' and inserting ''to whether a person is mentally incompetent''; and

(4) in section 102(c)(3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''AS A MENTAL DEFECTIVE OR COMMITTED TO A MENTAL INSTITUTION'' and inserting ''MENTALLY INCOMPETENT OR COMMITTED TO A PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL''; and

(B) by striking ''mental institutions'' and inserting ''psychiatric hospitals''.

SEC. 104. CLARIFICATION THAT FEDERAL COURT INFORMATION IS TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.

Section 103(e)(1) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) APPLICATION TO FEDERAL COURTS.—In this paragraph—

''(i) the terms 'department or agency of the United States' and 'Federal department or agency' include a Federal court; and

''(ii) for purposes of any request, submission, or notification, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall perform the functions of the head of the department or agency.''.

SEC. 105. REPORTS AND CERTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS.

(a) NICS REPORTS.—Not later than October 1, 2013, and every year thereafter, the head of each agency that possesses relevant Federal records shall submit a report to Congress that includes—

(1) a description of the relevant Federal records possessed by the agency that can be shared with NICS in a manner consistent with applicable law;

(2) the number of relevant Federal records the agency submitted to NICS during the reporting period;

(3) efforts made to increase the percentage of relevant Federal records possessed by the agency that are submitted to NICS;

(4) any obstacles to increasing the percentage of relevant Federal records possessed by the agency that are submitted to NICS;

(5) measures put in place to provide notice and programs for relief from disabilities as required under the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) if the agency makes qualifying adjudications relating to the mental health of an individual;

(6) measures put in place to correct, modify, or remove records available to NICS when the basis on which the records were made available no longer applies; and

(7) additional steps that will be taken during the 1-year period after the submission of the report to improve the processes by which relevant Federal records are—

(A) identified;

(B) made available to NICS; and

(C) corrected, modified, or removed from NICS.

(b) CERTIFICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The annual report requirement in subsection (a) shall not apply to an agency that, as part of a report required to be submitted under subsection (a), provides certification that the agency has—

(A) made available to NICS relevant Federal records that can be shared in a manner consistent with applicable law;

(B) a plan to make any relevant Federal records available to NICS and a description of that plan; and

(C) a plan to update, modify, or remove records electronically from NICS not less than quarterly as required by the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) and a description of that plan.

(2) FREQUENCY.—Each agency that is not required to submit annual reports under paragraph (1) shall submit an annual certification to Congress attesting that the agency continues to submit relevant Federal records to NICS and has corrected, modified, or removed records available to NICS when the basis on which the records were made available no longer applies.

(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON FIREARMS PROSECUTIONS.—

(1) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Beginning February 1, 2014, and on February 1 of each year thereafter through 2023, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary and Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report of information gathered under this subsection during the fiscal year that ended on September 30 of the preceding year.

(2) SUBJECT OF ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall require each component of the Department of Justice, including each United States Attorney's Office, to furnish for the purposes of the report described in paragraph (1), information relating to any case presented to the Department of Justice for review or prosecution, in which the objective facts of the case provide probable cause to believe that there has been a violation of sections 922 and 924, United States Code, and section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(3) ELEMENTS OF ANNUAL REPORT.—With respect to each case described in paragraph (2), the report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include information indicating—

(A) whether in any such case, a decision has been made not to charge an individual with a violation of sections 922 and 924, United States Code, and section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or any other violation of Federal criminal law;

(B) in any case described in subparagraph (A), a description of why no charge was filed under sections 922 and 924, United States Code, and section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(C) whether in any case described in paragraph (2), an indictment, information, or other charge has been brought against any person, or the matter is pending;

(D) whether, in the case of an indictment, information, or other charge described in subparagraph (C), the charging document contains a count or counts alleging a violation of sections 922 and 924, United States Code, and section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(E) in any case described in subparagraph (D) in which the charging document contains a count or counts alleging a violation of sections 922 and 924, United States Code, and section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, whether a plea agreement of any kind has been entered into with such charged individual;

(F) whether any plea agreement described in subparagraph (E) required that the individual plead guilty, to enter a plea of nolo contendere, or otherwise caused a court to enter a conviction against that individual for a violation of sections 922 and 924, United States Code, and section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(G) in any case described in subparagraph (F) in which the plea agreement did not require that the individual plead guilty, enter a plea of nolo contendere, or otherwise cause a court to enter a conviction against that individual for a violation of sections 922 and 924, United States Code, and section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, identification of the charges to which that individual did plead guilty;

(H) in the case of an indictment, information, or other charge described in subparagraph (C), in which the charging document contains a count or counts alleging a violation of sections 922 and 924, United States Code, and section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the result of any trial of such charges (guilty, not guilty, mistrial);

(I) in the case of an indictment, information, or other charge described in subparagraph (C), in which the charging document did not contain a count or counts alleging a violation of sections 922 and 924, United States Code, and section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the nature of the other charges brought and the result of any trial of such other charges as have been brought (guilty, not guilty, mistrial);

(J) the number of persons who attempted to purchase a firearm but were denied because of a background check conducted in accordance with section 922(t) of title 18, United States Code; and

(K) the number of prosecutions conducted in relation to persons described in subparagraph (J).

SEC. 106. INCREASING FEDERAL PROSECUTION OF GUN VIOLENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish in jurisdictions specified in subsection (c) a program that meets the requirements of subsection (b), to be known as the ''Nationwide Project Exile Expansion''.

(b) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—Each program established under subsection (a) shall, for the jurisdiction concerned—

(1) provide for coordination with State and local law enforcement officials in the identification of violations of Federal firearms laws;

(2) provide for the establishment of agreements with State and local law enforcement officials for the referral to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives and the United States Attorney for prosecution of persons arrested for violations of section 922 or section 924 of title 18, United States Code, or section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, relating to firearms;

(3) provide for the establishment of multijurisdictional task forces, coordinated by the Executive Office of the United States attorneys to investigate and prosecute illegal straw purchasing rings that purchase firearms in one jurisdiction and transfer them to another;

(4) require that the United States attorney designate not less than 1 assistant United States attorney to prosecute violations of Federal firearms laws;

(5) provide for the hiring of agents for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to investigate violations of the provisions referred to in paragraph (2), United States Code, relating to firearms; and

(6) ensure that each person referred to the United States attorney under paragraph (2)

be charged with a violation of the most serious Federal firearm offense consistent with the act committed.

(c) COVERED JURISDICTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the jurisdictions specified in this subsection are—

(A) the 10 jurisdictions with a population equal to or greater than 100,000 persons that had the highest total number of homicides according to the uniform crime report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the most recent year available;

(B) the 5 jurisdictions with such a population, other than the jurisdictions covered by paragraph (1), with the highest per capita rate of homicide according to the uniform crime report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the most recent year available; and

(C) the 3 tribal jurisdictions that have the highest homicide crime rates, as determined by the Attorney General.

(2) LIMITATION.—The 15 jurisdictions described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall not include any jurisdiction other than those within the 50 States.

(d) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, an annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report containing the following information:

(1) The number of individuals indicted for such violations of Federal firearms laws during that year by reason of the program.

(2) The increase or decrease in the number of individuals indicted for such violations of Federal firearms laws during that year by reason of the program when compared with the year preceding that year.

(3) The number of individuals held without bond in anticipation of prosecution by reason of the program.

(4) To the extent the information is available, the average length of prison sentence of the individuals convicted of violations of Federal firearms laws by reason of the program.

(5) The number of multi-jurisdiction task forces established and the number of individuals arrested, indicted, convicted or acquitted of charges for violations of the specific crimes listed in subsection (b)(2).

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the program under this section $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014, 2015, and 2016, which shall be used for salaries and expenses of assistant United States attorneys and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives agents.

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—

(A) ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.—The assistant United States attorneys hired using amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) shall prosecute violations of Federal firearms laws in accordance with subsection (b)(2).

(B) ATF AGENTS.—The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives agents hired using amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, concentrate their investigations on violations of Federal firearms laws in accordance with subsection (b)(2).

SEC. 107. PROSECUTION OF FELONS AND FUGITIVES WHO ATTEMPT TO ILLEGALLY PURCHASE FIREARMS.

(a) TASKFORCE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a task force within the Department of Justice, which shall be known as the Felon and Fugitive Firearm Task Force (referred to in this section as the ''Task Force''), to strengthen the efforts of the Department of Justice to investigate and prosecute cases of convicted felons and fugitives from justice who illegally attempt to purchase a firearm.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The members of the Task Force shall be—

(A) the Deputy Attorney General, who shall serve as the Chairperson of the Task Force;

(B) the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division;

(C) the Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives;

(D) the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

(E) such other officers or employees of the Department of Justice as the Attorney General may designate.

(3) DUTIES.—The Task Force shall—

(A) provide direction for the investigation and prosecution of cases of convicted felons and fugitives from justice attempting to illegally purchase a firearm; and

(B) provide recommendations to the Attorney General relating to—

(i) the allocation and reallocation of resources of the Department of Justice for investigation and prosecution of cases of convicted felons and fugitives from justice attempting to illegally purchase a firearm;

(ii) enhancing cooperation among agencies and entities of the Federal Government in the investigation and prosecution of cases of convicted felons and fugitives from justice attempting to illegally purchase a firearm;

(iii) enhancing cooperation among Federal, State, and local authorities responsible for the investigation and prosecution of cases of convicted felons and fugitives from justice attempting to illegally purchase a firearm; and

(iv) changes in rules, regulations, or policy to improve the effective investigation and prosecution of cases of convicted felons and fugitives from justice attempting to illegally purchase a firearm.

(4) MEETINGS.—The Task Force shall meet not less than once a year.

(5) TERMINATION.—The Task Force shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF FUNDS.—Section 524(c)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (I), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following:

''(J) the investigation and prosecution of cases of convicted felons and fugitives from justice who illegally attempt to purchase a firearm, in accordance with section 107 of the Protecting Communities and Preserving the Second Amendment Act of 2015, provided that—

''(i) not more than $10,000,000 shall be available to the Attorney General for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 under this subparagraph; and

''(ii) not more than 5 percent of the amounts made available under this subparagraph may be used for the administrative costs of the task force established under section 107 of the Protecting Communities and Preserving the Second Amendment Act of 2015.''.

SEC. 108. LIMITATION ON OPERATIONS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

The Department of Justice, and any of its law enforcement coordinate agencies, shall not conduct any operation where a Federal firearms licensee is directed, instructed, enticed, or otherwise encouraged by the Department of Justice to sell a firearm to an individual if the Department of Justice, or a coordinate agency, knows or has reasonable cause to believe that such an individual is purchasing on behalf of another for an illegal purpose unless the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, or the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division personally reviews and approves the operation, in writing, and determines that the agency has prepared an operational plan that includes sufficient safeguards to prevent firearms from being transferred to third parties without law enforcement taking reasonable steps to lawfully interdict those firearms.

SEC. 109. STRAW PURCHASING OF FIREARMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 932. Straw purchasing of firearms

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'crime of violence' has the meaning given that term in section 924(c)(3);

''(2) the term 'drug trafficking crime' has the meaning given that term in section 924(c)(2); and

''(3) the term 'Federal crime of terrorism' has the meaning given that term in section 2332b(g).

''(b) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any person to—

''(1) purchase or otherwise obtain a firearm, which has been shipped, transported, or received in interstate or foreign commerce, for or on behalf of any other person who the person purchasing or otherwise obtaining the firearm knows—

''(A) is prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm under subsection (g) or (n) of section 922;

''(B) intends to use, carry, possess, or sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm in furtherance of a crime of violence, a drug trafficking crime, or a Federal crime of terrorism;

''(C) intends to engage in conduct that would constitute a crime of violence, a drug trafficking crime, or a Federal crime of terrorism if the conduct had occurred within the United States; or

''(D) is not a resident of any State and is not a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States; or

''(2) willfully procure another to engage in conduct described in paragraph (1).

''(c) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (b) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

''§ 933. Trafficking in firearms

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'crime of violence' has the meaning given that term in section 924(c)(3);

''(2) the term 'drug trafficking crime' has the meaning given that term in section 924(c)(2); and

''(3) the term 'Federal crime of terrorism' has the meaning given that term in section 2332b(g).

''(b) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any person to—

''(1) ship, transport, transfer, or otherwise dispose of 2 or more firearms to another person in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, if the transferor knows that the use, carrying, or possession of a firearm by the transferee would violate subsection (g) or (n) of section 922, or constitute a crime of violence, a drug trafficking crime, or a Federal crime of terrorism;

''(2) receive from another person 2 or more firearms in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, if the recipient—

''(A) knows that such receipt would violate subsection (g) or (n) of section 922; or

''(B) intends to use the firearm in furtherance of a crime of violence, a drug trafficking crime, or a Federal crime of terrorism; or

''(3) attempt or conspire to commit the conduct described in paragraph (1) or (2).

''(c) PENALTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person who violates subsection (b) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

''(2) ORGANIZER.—If a violation of subsection (b) is committed by a person acting in concert with other persons as an organizer, leader, supervisor, or manager, the person shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 931 the following:

''932. Straw purchasing of firearms.
''933. Trafficking in firearms.''.

(c) DIRECTIVE TO THE SENTENCING COMMISSION.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this section, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and amend its guidelines and policy statements to ensure that persons convicted of an offense under section 932 or 933 of title 18, United States Code, and other offenses applicable to the straw purchases and firearms trafficking of firearms are subject to increased penalties in comparison to those currently provided by the guidelines and policy statements for such straw purchasing and firearms trafficking offenses. In its review, the Commission shall consider, in particular, an appropriate amendment to reflect the intent of Congress that straw purchasers without significant criminal histories receive sentences that are sufficient to deter participation in such activities. The Commission shall also review and amend its guidelines and policy statements to reflect the intent of Congress that a person convicted of an offense under section 932 or 933 of title 18, United States Code, who is affiliated with a gang, cartel, organized crime ring, or other such enterprise should be subject to higher penalties than an otherwise unaffiliated individual.

SEC. 110. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR LYING AND BUYING.

Section 924(a)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the undesignated matter following subparagraph (D) by striking ''five years'' and inserting the following: ''5 years (or, in the case of a violation under subparagraph (A), not more than 10 years)''.

SEC. 111. AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(a).

Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''(d), (g),''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) Whoever knowingly violates subsection (d), (g), or (n) of section 922 shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.''.

SEC. 112. AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(h).

Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

''(h) Whoever knowingly receives or transfers a firearm or ammunition, or attempts or conspires to do so, knowing that such firearm or ammunition will be used to commit a crime of violence (as defined in subsection (c)(3)), a drug trafficking crime (as defined in subsection (c)(2)), a Federal crime of terrorism (as defined in section 2332b(g)), or a crime under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), or the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.), shall be imprisoned not more than 15 years, fined in accordance with this title, or both.''.

SEC. 113. AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(k).

Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (k) and inserting the following:

''(k)(1) A person who, with intent to engage in or promote conduct that—

''(A) is punishable under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), or chapter 705 of title 46;

''(B) violates any law of a State relating to any controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. 802);

''(C) constitutes a crime of violence (as defined in subsection (c)(3)); or

''(D) constitutes a Federal crime of terrorism (as defined in section 2332b(g)),

smuggles or knowingly brings into the United States, a firearm or ammunition, or attempts or conspires to do so, shall be imprisoned not more than 15 years, fined under this title, or both.

''(2) A person who, with intent to engage in or to promote conduct that—

''(A) would be punishable under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), or chapter 705 of title 46, if the conduct had occurred within the United States; or

''(B) would constitute a crime of violence (as defined in subsection (c)(3)) or a Federal crime of terrorism (as defined in section 2332b(g)) for which the person may be prosecuted in a court of the United States, if the conduct had occurred within the United States,

smuggles or knowingly takes out of the United States, a firearm or ammunition, or attempts or conspires to do so, shall be imprisoned not more than 15 years, fined under this title, or both.''.

SEC. 114. MULTIPLE SALES REPORTS FOR RIFLES AND SHOTGUNS.

Section 923(g)(5) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) The Attorney General may not require a licensee to submit ongoing or periodic reporting of the sale or other disposition of 2 or more rifles or shotguns during a specified period of time.''.

SEC. 115. STUDY BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF JUSTICE AND NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES ON THE CAUSES OF MASS SHOOTINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) STUDY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall instruct the Director of the National Institutes of Justice, to conduct a peer-reviewed study to examine various sources and causes of mass shootings including psychological factors, the impact of violent video games, and other factors. The Director shall enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct this study jointly with an independent panel of 5 experts appointed by the Academy.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the study required under paragraph (1) begins, the Directors shall submit to Congress a report detailing the findings of the study.

(b) ISSUES EXAMINED.—The study conducted under subsection (a)(1) shall examine—

(1) mental illness;

(2) the availability of mental health and other resources and strategies to help families detect and counter tendencies toward violence;

(3) the availability of mental health and other resources at schools to help detect and counter tendencies of students towards violence;

(4) the extent to which perpetrators of mass shootings, either alleged, convicted, deceased, or otherwise, played violent or adult-themed video games and whether the perpetrators of mass shootings discussed, planned, or used violent or adult-themed video games in preparation of or to assist in carrying out their violent actions;

(5) familial relationships, including the level of involvement and awareness of parents;

(6) exposure to bullying; and

(7) the extent to which perpetrators of mass shootings were acting in a ''copycat'' manner based upon previous violent events.

SEC. 116. REPORTS TO CONGRESS REGARDING AMMUNITION PURCHASES BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Judiciary, the House Committee on Homeland Security, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, and the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, a report including—

(1) details of all purchases of ammunition by each Federal agency;

(2) a summary of all purchases, solicitations, and expenditures on ammunition by each Federal agency;

(3) a summary of all the rounds of ammunition expended by each Federal agency and a current listing of stockpiled ammunition for each Federal agency; and

(4) an estimate of future ammunition needs and purchases for each Federal agency for the next fiscal year.

SEC. 117. INCENTIVES FOR STATE COMPLIANCE WITH NICS MENTAL HEALTH RECORD REQUIREMENTS.

Section 104(b) of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(3) in paragraph (2), as redesignated, by striking ''of paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''of paragraph (1)''; and

(4) by inserting before paragraph (2), as redesignated, the following:

''(1) INCENTIVES FOR PROVIDING MENTAL HEALTH RECORDS AND FIXING THE BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.—

''(A) DEFINITION OF COMPLIANT STATE.—In this paragraph, the term 'compliant State' means a State that has—

''(i) provided not less than 90 percent of the records required to be provided under sections 102 and 103; or

''(ii) in effect a statute that—

''(I) requires the State to provide the records required to be provided under sections 102 and 103; and

''(II) implements a relief from disabilities program in accordance with section 105.

''(B) INCENTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE.—During the period beginning on the date that is 18 months after the enactment of the Protecting Communities and Preserving the Second Amendment Act of 2015 and ending on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of such Act, the Attorney General—

''(i) shall use funds appropriated to carry out section 103 of this Act, the excess unobligated balances of the Department of Justice and funds withheld under clause (ii), or any combination thereof, to increase the amounts available under section 505 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) for each

compliant State in an amount that is not less than 2 percent nor more than 5 percent of the amount that was allocated to such State under such section 505 in the previous fiscal year; and

''(ii) may withhold an amount not to exceed the amount described in clause (i) that would otherwise be allocated to a State under any section of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) if the State—

''(I) is not a compliant State; and

''(II) does not submit an assurance to the Attorney General that—

''(aa) an amount that is not less than the amount described in clause (i) will be used solely for the purpose of enabling the State to become a compliant State; or

''(bb) the State will hold in abeyance an amount that is not less than the amount described in clause (i) until such State has become a compliant State.

''(C) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the enactment of the Protecting Communities and Preserving the Second Amendment Act of 2015, the Attorney General shall issue regulations implementing this paragraph.''.

SEC. 118. FIREARM COMMERCE MODERNIZATION.

(a) FIREARMS DISPOSITIONS.—Section 922(b)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''located'' and inserting ''located or temporarily located''; and

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''rifle or shotgun'' and inserting ''firearm'';

(B) by striking ''located'' and inserting ''located or temporarily located''; and

(C) by striking ''both such States'' and inserting ''the State in which the transfer is conducted and the State of residence of the transferee''.

(b) DEALER LOCATION.—Section 923 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (j)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking '', and such location is in the State which is specified on the license''; and

(B) in the last sentence—

(i) by inserting ''transfer,'' after ''sell,''; and

(ii) by striking ''Act,'' and all that follows and inserting ''Act.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(m) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prohibit the sale, transfer, delivery, or other disposition of a firearm or ammunition—

''(1) by a person licensed under this chapter to another person so licensed, at any location in any State; or

''(2) by a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer to a person not licensed under this chapter, at a temporary location described in subsection (j) in any State.''.

(c) RESIDENCE OF UNITED STATES OFFICERS.—Section 921 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) For purposes of this chapter:

''(1) A member of the Armed Forces on active duty, or a spouse of such a member, is a resident of—

''(A) the State in which the member or spouse maintains legal residence;

''(B) the State in which the permanent duty station of the member is located; and

''(C) the State in which the member maintains a place of abode from which the member commutes each day to the permanent duty station of the member.

''(2) An officer or employee of the United States (other than a member of the Armed Forces) who is stationed outside the United States for a period of more than 1 year, and a spouse of such an officer or employee, is a resident of the State in which the person maintains legal residence.''.

SEC. 119. FIREARM DEALER ACCESS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note), is amended—

(1) by striking ''Not later than'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) VOLUNTARY BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Protecting Communities and Preserving the Second Amendment Act of 2015, the Attorney General shall promulgate regulations allowing licensees to use the national instant criminal background check system established under this section for purposes of conducting voluntary, no fee employment background checks on current or prospective employees.

''(B) NOTICE.—Before conducting an employment background check relating to an individual under subparagraph (A), a licensee shall—

''(i) provide written notice to the individual that the licensee intends to conduct the background check; and

''(ii) obtain consent to conduct the background check from the individual in writing.

''(C) EXEMPTION.—An employment background check conducted by a licensee under subparagraph (A) shall not governed by the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.).

''(D) APPEAL.—Any individual who is the subject of an employment background check conducted by a licensee under subparagraph (A) the result of which indicates that the individual is a prohibited from possessing a firearm or ammunition pursuant to subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, may appeal the results of the background check in the same manner and to the same extent as if the individual had been the subject of a background check relating to the transfer of a firearm.''.

(b) ACQUISITION, PRESERVATION, AND EXCHANGE OF IDENTIFICATION RECORDS AND INFORMATION.—Section 534 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) provide a person licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18 with information necessary to verify whether firearms offered for sale to such licensees have been stolen.''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting '', except for dissemination authorized under subsection (a)(5) of this section'' before the period.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and without regard to chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, the Attorney General shall promulgate regulations allowing a person licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to receive access to records of stolen firearms maintained by the National Crime Information Center operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, solely for the purpose of voluntarily verifying whether firearms offered for sale to such licensees have been stolen.

(d) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION; EVIDENCE.—

(1) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed—

(A) to create a cause of action against any person licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code or any other person for any civil liability; or

(B) to establish any standard of care.

(2) EVIDENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, evidence regarding the use or non-use by a person licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code of the systems, information, or records made available under this section or the amendments made by this section shall not be admissible as evidence in any proceeding of any court, agency, board, or other entity.

SEC. 120. INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF FIREARMS OR AMMUNITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 926A of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 926A. Interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'transport' includes staying in temporary lodging overnight, stopping for food, fuel, vehicle maintenance, an emergency, medical treatment, and any other activity incidental to the transport.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding any provision of any law (including a rule or regulation) of a State or any political subdivision thereof, a person who is not prohibited by this chapter from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a firearm or ammunition shall be entitled to—

''(1) transport a firearm for any lawful purpose from any place where the person may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the firearm to any other such place if, during the transportation—

''(A) the firearm is unloaded; and

''(B)(i) if the transportation is by motor vehicle—

''(I) the firearm is not directly accessible from the passenger compartment of the motor vehicle; or

''(II) if the motor vehicle is without a compartment separate from the passenger compartment, the firearm is—

''(aa) in a locked container other than the glove compartment or console; or

''(bb) secured by a secure gun storage or safety device; or

''(ii) if the transportation is by other means, the firearm is in a locked container or secured by a secure gun storage or safety device; and

''(2) transport ammunition for any lawful purpose from any place where the person may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the ammunition, to any other such place if, during the transportation—

''(A) the ammunition is not loaded into a firearm; and

''(B)(i) if the transportation is by motor vehicle—

''(I) the ammunition is not directly accessible from the passenger compartment of the motor vehicle; or

''(II) if the motor vehicle is without a compartment separate from the passenger compartment, the ammunition is in a locked container other than the glove compartment or console; or

''(ii) if the transportation is by other means, the ammunition is in a locked container.

''(c) STATE LAW.—

''(1) ARREST AUTHORITY.—A person who is transporting a firearm or ammunition may not be—

''(A) arrested for violation of any law or any rule or regulation of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, relating to the

possession, transportation, or carrying of firearms or ammunition, unless there is probable cause to believe that the transportation is not in accordance with subsection (b); or

''(B) detained for violation of any law or any rule or regulation of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, relating to the possession, transportation, or carrying of firearms or ammunition, unless there is reasonable suspicion that the transportation is not in accordance with subsection (b).

''(2) PROSECUTION.—

''(A) BURDEN OF PROOF.—If a person asserts this section as a defense in a criminal proceeding, the government shall bear the burden of proving, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the conduct of the person was not in accordance with subsection (b).

''(B) PREVAILING DEFENDANT.—If a person successfully asserts this section as a defense in a criminal proceeding, the court shall award the prevailing defendant reasonable attorney's fees.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 926A and inserting the following:

''926A. Interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition.''.

TITLE II—MENTAL HEALTH

SEC. 201. REAUTHORIZATION AND ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS TO THE MENTALLY ILL OFFENDER TREATMENT AND CRIME REDUCTION ACT.

(a) SAFE COMMUNITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2991(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''MENTAL ILLNESS'' and inserting ''MENTAL ILLNESS; MENTAL HEALTH DISORDER''; and

(ii) by striking ''term 'mental illness' means'' and inserting ''terms 'mental illness' and 'mental health disorder' mean''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following:

''(9) PRELIMINARILY QUALIFIED OFFENDER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'preliminarily qualified offender' means an adult or juvenile accused of an offense who—

''(i)(I) previously or currently has been diagnosed by a qualified mental health professional as having a mental illness or co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders;

''(II) manifests obvious signs of mental illness or co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders during arrest or confinement or before any court; or

''(III) in the case of a veterans treatment court provided under subsection (i), has been diagnosed with, or manifests obvious signs of, mental illness or a substance abuse disorder or co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorder; and

''(ii) has been unanimously approved for participation in a program funded under this section by, when appropriate, the relevant—

''(I) prosecuting attorney;

''(II) defense attorney;

''(III) probation or corrections official;

''(IV) judge; and

''(V) a representative from the relevant mental health agency described in subsection (b)(5)(B)(i).

''(B) DETERMINATION.—In determining whether to designate a defendant as a preliminarily qualified offender, the relevant prosecuting attorney, defense attorney, probation or corrections official, judge, and mental health or substance abuse agency representative shall take into account—

''(i) whether the participation of the defendant in the program would pose a substantial risk of violence to the community;

''(ii) the criminal history of the defendant and the nature and severity of the offense for which the defendant is charged;

''(iii) the views of any relevant victims to the offense;

''(iv) the extent to which the defendant would benefit from participation in the program;

''(v) the extent to which the community would realize cost savings because of the defendant's participation in the program; and

''(vi) whether the defendant satisfies the eligibility criteria for program participation unanimously established by the relevant prosecuting attorney, defense attorney, probation or corrections official, judge and mental health or substance abuse agency representative.''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2927(2) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797s–6(2)) is amended by striking ''has the meaning given that term in section 2991(a).'' and inserting ''means an offense that—

''(A) does not have as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person or property of another; or

''(B) is not a felony that by its nature involves a substantial risk that physical force against the person or property of another may be used in the course of committing the offense.''.

(b) EVIDENCE BASED PRACTICES.—Section 2991(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) propose interventions that have been shown by empirical evidence to reduce recidivism;

''(5) when appropriate, use validated assessment tools to target preliminarily qualified offenders with a moderate or high risk of recidivism and a need for treatment and services; or''.

(c) ACADEMY TRAINING.—Section 2991(h) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(h)) is amended—

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

''(F) ACADEMY TRAINING.—To provide support for academy curricula, law enforcement officer orientation programs, continuing education training, and other programs that teach law enforcement personnel how to identify and respond to incidents involving persons with mental health disorders or co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.—The Attorney General, in awarding grants under this subsection, shall give priority to programs that law enforcement personnel and members of the mental health and substance abuse professions develop and administer cooperatively.''.

(d) ASSISTING VETERANS.—

Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (n); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (h) the following:

''(i) ASSISTING VETERANS.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) PEER TO PEER SERVICES OR PROGRAMS.—The term 'peer to peer services or programs' means services or programs that connect qualified veterans with other veterans for the purpose of providing support and mentorship to assist qualified veterans in obtaining treatment, recovery, stabilization, or rehabilitation.

''(B) QUALIFIED VETERAN.—The term 'qualified veteran' means a preliminarily qualified offender who—

''(i) has served on active duty in any branch of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard and reserve components; and

''(ii) was discharged or released from such service under conditions other than dishonorable.

''(C) VETERANS TREATMENT COURT PROGRAM.—The term 'veterans treatment court program' means a court program involving collaboration among criminal justice, veterans, and mental health and substance abuse agencies that provides qualified veterans with—

''(i) intensive judicial supervision and case management, which may include random and frequent drug testing where appropriate;

''(ii) a full continuum of treatment services, including mental health services, substance abuse services, medical services, and services to address trauma;

''(iii) alternatives to incarceration; and

''(iv) other appropriate services, including housing, transportation, mentoring, employment, job training, education, and assistance in applying for and obtaining available benefits.

''(2) VETERANS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, may award grants under this subsection to applicants to establish or expand—

''(i) veterans treatment court programs;

''(ii) peer to peer services or programs for qualified veterans;

''(iii) practices that identify and provide treatment, rehabilitation, legal, transitional, and other appropriate services to qualified veterans who have been incarcerated; and

''(iv) training programs to teach criminal justice, law enforcement, corrections, mental health, and substance abuse personnel how to identify and appropriately respond to incidents involving qualified veterans.

''(B) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this subsection, the Attorney General shall give priority to applications that—

''(i) demonstrate collaboration between and joint investments by criminal justice, mental health, substance abuse, and veterans service agencies;

''(ii) promote effective strategies to identify and reduce the risk of harm to qualified veterans and public safety; and

''(iii) propose interventions with empirical support to improve outcomes for qualified veterans.''.

(e) CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES; HIGH UTILIZERS.—Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by inserting after subsection (i), as so added by subsection (d), the following:

''(j) CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—

''(A) CORRECTIONAL FACILITY.—The term 'correctional facility' means a jail, prison, or other detention facility used to house people who have been arrested, detained, held, or convicted by a criminal justice agency or a court.

''(B) ELIGIBLE INMATE.—The term 'eligible inmate' means an individual who—

''(i) is being held, detained, or incarcerated in a correctional facility; and

''(ii) manifests obvious signs of a mental illness or has been diagnosed by a qualified mental health professional as having a mental illness.

''(2) CORRECTIONAL FACILITY GRANTS.—The Attorney General may award grants to applicants to enhance the capabilities of a correctional facility—

''(A) to identify and screen for eligible inmates;

''(B) to plan and provide—

''(i) initial and periodic assessments of the clinical, medical, and social needs of inmates; and

''(ii) appropriate treatment and services that address the mental health and substance abuse needs of inmates;

''(C) to develop, implement, and enhance—

''(i) post-release transition plans for eligible inmates that, in a comprehensive manner, coordinate health, housing, medical, employment, and other appropriate services and public benefits;

''(ii) the availability of mental health care services and substance abuse treatment services; and

''(iii) alternatives to solitary confinement and segregated housing and mental health screening and treatment for inmates placed in solitary confinement or segregated housing; and

''(D) to train each employee of the correctional facility to identify and appropriately respond to incidents involving inmates with mental health or co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders.

''(k) DEMONSTRATION GRANTS RESPONDING TO HIGH UTILIZERS.—

''(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'high utilizer' means an individual who—

''(A) manifests obvious signs of mental illness or has been diagnosed by a qualified mental health professional as having a mental illness; and

''(B) consumes a significantly disproportionate quantity of public resources, such as emergency, housing, judicial, corrections, and law enforcement services.

''(2) DEMONSTRATION GRANTS RESPONDING TO HIGH UTILIZERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may award not more than 6 grants per year under this subsection to applicants for the purpose of reducing the use of public services by high utilizers.

''(B) USE OF GRANTS.—A recipient of a grant awarded under this subsection may use the grant—

''(i) to develop or support multidisciplinary teams that coordinate, implement, and administer community-based crisis responses and long-term plans for high utilizers;

''(ii) to provide training on how to respond appropriately to the unique issues involving high utilizers for public service personnel, including criminal justice, mental health, substance abuse, emergency room, healthcare, law enforcement, corrections, and housing personnel;

''(iii) to develop or support alternatives to hospital and jail admissions for high utilizers that provide treatment, stabilization, and other appropriate supports in the least restrictive, yet appropriate, environment; or

''(iv) to develop protocols and systems among law enforcement, mental health, substance abuse, housing, corrections, and emergency medical service operations to provide coordinated assistance to high utilizers.

''(C) REPORT.—Not later than the last day of the first year following the fiscal year in which a grant is awarded under this subsection, the recipient of the grant shall submit to the Attorney General a report that—

''(i) measures the performance of the grant recipient in reducing the use of public services by high utilizers; and

''(ii) provides a model set of practices, systems, or procedures that other jurisdictions can adopt to reduce the use of public services by high utilizers.''.

(f) GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.—Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by inserting after subsection (i), as so added by subsection (e), the following:

''(l) ACCOUNTABILITY.—All grants awarded by the Attorney General under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

''(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'unresolved audit finding' means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

''(B) AUDITS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

''(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this section that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this section during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

''(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.

''(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this section during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

''(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

''(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

''(2) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant programs under this part, the term 'nonprofit organization' means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

''(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this part to a section organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under this section and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

''(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

''(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this section may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or entity awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this section, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than $20,000 in funds made available by the Department of Justice, unless the Deputy Attorney General or such Assistant Attorney Generals, Directors, or principal deputies as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference.

''(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

''(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

''(4) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification—

''(A) indicating whether—

''(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

''(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

''(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

''(B) that includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.''.

''(m) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this section, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded under this Act to determine if duplicate grant awards are awarded for the same purpose.

''(2) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards duplicate grants to the same applicant for the same purpose the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

''(A) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate grants awarded; and

''(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicate grants.''.

(g) REAUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2991(n) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as redesignated in subsection (d), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1);

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) $40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) LIMITATION.—Not more than 20 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated

under this section may be used for purposes described in subsection (i) (relating to veterans).''.

SEC. 202. ADDITIONAL PURPOSES FOR FEDERAL GRANTS.

(a) MODIFICATIONS TO THE EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 501(a)(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3751(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(H) Mental health programs and operations by law enforcement or corrections.''.

(b) MODIFICATIONS TO THE COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES PROGRAM.—Section 1701(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (16), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (19);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

''(17) to provide specialized training to law enforcement officers (including village public safety officers (as defined in section 247 of the Indian Arts and Crafts Amendments Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd note))) to recognize individuals who have mental illness and how to properly intervene with individuals with mental illness and to establish programs that enhance the ability of law enforcement agencies to address the mental health, behavioral, and substance abuse problems of individuals encountered in the line of duty;

''(18) to provide specialized training to corrections officers to recognize individuals who have mental illness and to enhance the ability of corrections officers to address the mental health or individuals under the care and custody of jails and prisons; and''; and

(4) in paragraph (19), as redesignated, by striking ''through (16)'' and inserting ''through (18)''.

SEC. 203. PROTECTING THE SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes

''(a) PROTECTING RIGHTS OF VETERANS WITH EXISTING RECORDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Protecting Communities and Preserving the Second Amendment Act of 2015, the Secretary shall provide written notice in accordance with subsection (b) of the opportunity for administrative review under subsection (c) to all persons who, on the date of enactment of the Protecting Communities and Preserving the Second Amendment Act of 2015, are considered to have been adjudicated mentally incompetent or committed to a psychiatric hospital under subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18 as a result of having been found by the Department to be mentally incompetent.

''(b) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall provide notice under this section to a person described in subsection (a) that notifies the person of—

''(1) the determination made by the Secretary;

''(2) a description of the implications of being considered to have been adjudicated mentally incompetent or committed to a psychiatric hospital under subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18; and

''(3) the right of the person to request a review under subsection (c)(1).

''(c) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

''(1) REQUEST.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a person described in subsection (a) receives notice in accordance with subsection (b), such person may request a review by the board designed or established under paragraph (2) or by a court of competent jurisdiction to assess whether the person is a danger to himself or herself or to others. In such assessment, the board may consider the person's honorable discharge or decorations.

''(2) BOARD.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Protecting Communities and Preserving the Second Amendment Act of 2015, the Secretary shall designate or establish a board that shall, upon request of a person under paragraph (1), assess whether the person is a danger to himself or herself or to others.

''(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A person may file a petition with a Federal court of competent jurisdiction for judicial review of an assessment of the person under subsection (c) by the board designated or established under subsection (c)(2).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes.''.

SEC. 204. APPLICABILITY OF AMENDMENTS.

With respect to any record of a person prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm under subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, before the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall remove such a record from the National Instant Criminal Background Check System—

(1) upon being made aware that the person is no longer considered as adjudicated mentally incompetent or committed to a psychiatric hospital according to the criteria under paragraph (36)(A)(i)(II) of section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code (as added by this title), and is therefore no longer prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm;

(2) upon being made aware that any order or finding that the record is based on is an order or finding described in paragraph (36)(B) of section 921(a) of title 18, United State Code (as added by this title); or

(3) upon being made aware that the person has been found competent to possess a firearm after an administrative or judicial review under subsection (c) or (d) of section 5511 of title 38, United States Code (as added by this title).

TITLE III—SCHOOL SAFETY

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''School Safety Enhancements Act of 2015''.

SEC. 302. GRANT PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL SECURITY.

Section 2701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''Placement'' and inserting ''Installation''; and

(ii) by inserting ''surveillance equipment,'' after ''detectors,'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) Establishment of hotlines or tiplines for the reporting of potentially dangerous students and situations.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(g) INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the School Safety Enhancements Act of 2015, the Director and the Secretary of Education, or the designee of the Secretary, shall establish an interagency task force to develop and promulgate a set of advisory school safety guidelines.

''(2) PUBLICATION OF GUIDELINES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the School Safety Enhancements Act of 2015, the advisory school safety guidelines promulgated by the interagency task force shall be published in the Federal Register.

''(3) REQUIRED CONSULTATION.—In developing the final advisory school safety guidelines under this subsection, the interagency task force shall consult with stakeholders and interested parties, including parents, teachers, and agencies.''.

SEC. 303. APPLICATIONS.

Section 2702(a)(2) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797b(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) be accompanied by a report—

''(A) signed by the heads of each law enforcement agency and school district with jurisdiction over the schools where the safety improvements will be implemented; and

''(B) demonstrating that each proposed use of the grant funds will be—

''(i) an effective means for improving the safety of 1 or more schools;

''(ii) consistent with a comprehensive approach to preventing school violence; and

''(iii) individualized to the needs of each school at which those improvements are to be made.''.

SEC. 304. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 2705 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797e) is amended by striking ''2001 through 2009'' and inserting ''2014 through 2023''.

SEC. 305. ACCOUNTABILITY.

Section 2701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797a), as amended by section 202 of this title, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) ACCOUNTABILITY.—All grants awarded by the Attorney General under this part shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

''(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'unresolved audit finding' means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

''(B) AUDITS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this part to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

''(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this part that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this part during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

''(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this part, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this part.

''(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this part during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is barred from receiving grants under

subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

''(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

''(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

''(2) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant programs under this part, the term 'nonprofit organization' means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

''(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this part to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under this part and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

''(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

''(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this part may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or entity awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this part, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than $20,000 in funds made available by the Department of Justice, unless the Deputy Attorney General or such Assistant Attorney Generals, Directors, or principal deputies as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference.

''(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

''(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

''(4) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification—

''(A) indicating whether—

''(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

''(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

''(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

''(B) that includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.''.

SEC. 306. PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.

Section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(1) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this part, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with grants awarded under parts A or T to determine if duplicate grant awards are awarded for the same purpose.

''(2) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards duplicate grants to the same applicant for the same purpose the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

''(A) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate grants awarded; and

''(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicate grants.''.

TITLE IV—SANCTUARY CITIES

SEC. 401. STOP SANCTUARY POLICIES AND PROTECT AMERICANS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Stop Sanctuary Policies and Protect Americans Act''.

(b) SANCTUARY JURISDICTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''sanctuary jurisdiction'' means any State or political subdivision of a State, including any law enforcement entity of a State or of a political subdivision of a State, that—

(1) has in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that is in violation of subsection (a) or (b) of section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373); or

(2) has in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that prohibits any government entity or official from complying with a detainer that has been lawfully issued or a request to notify about the release of an alien that has been made by the Department of Homeland Security in accordance with section 236 and 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357) and section 287.7 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations.

(c) LIMITATION ON GRANTS TO SANCTUARY JURISDICTIONS.—

(1) INELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.—

(A) LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS.—

(i) SCAAP GRANTS.—A sanctuary jurisdiction shall not be eligible to receive funds pursuant to the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program under section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)).

(ii) COPS GRANTS.—No law enforcement entity of a State or of a political subdivision of a State that has a departmental policy or practice that renders it a sanctuary jurisdiction, and such a policy or practice is not required by statute, ordinance, or other codified law, or by order of a chief executive officer of the jurisdiction, or the executive or legislative board of the jurisdiction, shall be eligible to receive funds directly or indirectly under the 'Cops on the Beat' program under part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.).

(iii) ENFORCEMENT.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall terminate the funding described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) to a State or political subdivision of a State on the date that is 30 days after the date on which a notification described in subsection (d)(2) is made to the State or subdivision, unless the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, determines the State or subdivision is no longer a sanctuary jurisdiction.

(B) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended—

(I) in section 102 (42 U.S.C. 5302), by adding at the end the following:

''(25) The term 'sanctuary jurisdiction' means any State or unit of general local government that—

''(A) has in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that is in violation of subsection (a) or (b) of section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373); or

''(B) has in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that prohibits any government entity or official from complying with a detainer that has been lawfully issued or a request to notify about the release of an alien that has been made by the Department of Homeland Security in accordance with section 236 and 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357) and section 287.7 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations.''; and

(II) in section 104 (42 U.S.C. 5304)—

(aa) in subsection (b)—

(AA) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(BB) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(CC) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

''(6) the grantee is not a sanctuary jurisdiction and will not become a sanctuary jurisdiction during the period for which the grantee receives a grant under this title; and''; and

(bb) by adding at the end the following:

''(n) PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS AGAINST CRIMINAL ALIENS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title may be obligated or expended to any State or unit of general local government that is a sanctuary jurisdiction.

''(2) RETURNED AMOUNTS.—

''(A) STATE.—If a State is a sanctuary jurisdiction during the period for which the State receives amounts under this title, the Secretary—

''(i) shall direct the State to immediately return to the Secretary any such amounts that have not been obligated by the State as of the date on which the State became a sanctuary jurisdiction; and

''(ii) may use any returned amounts under clause (i) to make grants to other States that are not sanctuary jurisdictions in accordance with this title.

''(B) UNIT OF GENERAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—If a unit of general local government is a sanctuary jurisdiction during the period for which the unit of general local government receives amounts under this title, any such amounts that have not been obligated by the unit of general local government as of the date on which the unit of general local government became a sanctuary jurisdiction—

''(i) in the case of a unit of general local government that is not in a nonentitlement area, shall be returned to the Secretary to make grants to States and other units of general local government that are not sanctuary jurisdictions in accordance with this title; and

''(ii) in the case of a unit of general local government that is in a nonentitlement area, shall be returned to the Governor of the State to make grants to other units of

general local government that are not sanctuary jurisdictions in accordance with this title.

''(o) ENFORCEMENT AGAINST FUNDING FOR SANCTUARY JURISDICTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall verify, on a quarterly basis, the determination of the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General as to whether a State or unit of general local government is a sanctuary jurisdiction and therefore ineligible to receive a grant under this title for purposes of subsections (b)(6) and (n).

''(2) NOTIFICATION.—If the Secretary verifies that a State or unit of general local government is determined to be a sanctuary jurisdiction under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall notify the State or unit of general local government that it is ineligible to receive a grant under this title.''.

(ii) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by clause (i) shall only apply with respect to community development block grants made under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) ALLOCATION.—Any funds that are not allocated to a State or political subdivision of a State pursuant to paragraph (1) and the amendments made by paragraph (1) shall be allocated to States and political subdivisions of States that are not sanctuary jurisdictions.

(3) NOTIFICATION OF CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 days after a determination is made pursuant to paragraph (1) to terminate a grant or to refuse to award a grant, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that fully describes the circumstances and basis for the termination or refusal.

(4) TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and quarterly thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General shall—

(A) determine the States and political subdivisions of States that are sanctuary jurisdictions;

(B) notify each such State or subdivision that it is determined to be a sanctuary jurisdiction; and

(C) publish on the website of the Department of Homeland Security and of the Department of Justice—

(i) a list of each sanctuary jurisdiction;

(ii) the total number of detainers and requests for notification of the release of any alien that has been issued or made to each State or political subdivision of a State; and

(iii) the number of such detainers and requests for notification that have been ignored or otherwise not honored, including the name of the jurisdiction in which each such detainer or request for notification was issued or made.

(5) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to require law enforcement officials of a State or a political subdivision of a State to provide the Secretary of Homeland Security with information related to a victim or a witness to a criminal offense.

(d) STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND INDIVIDUAL COMPLIANCE WITH DETAINERS.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT DETAINERS.—A State, a political subdivision of a State, or an officer, employee, or agent of such State or political subdivision that complies with a detainer issued by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357)—

(A) shall be deemed to be acting as an agent of the Department of Homeland Security; and

(B) shall have the authority available to employees of the Department of Homeland Security with regard to actions taken to comply with the detainer.

(2) LIABILITY.—In any legal proceeding brought against a State, a political subdivision of State, or an officer, employee, or agent of such State or political subdivision, which challenges the legality of the seizure or detention of an individual pursuant to a detainer issued by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357)—

(A) no liability shall lie against the State or political subdivision for actions taken in compliance with the detainer;

(B) if the actions of the officer, employee, or agent of the State or political subdivision were taken in compliance with the detainer—

(i) the officer, employee, or agent shall be deemed to be an employee of the Federal Government and an investigative or law enforcement officer and to have been acting within the scope of his or her employment under section 1346(b) and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code;

(ii) section 1346(b) of title 28, United States Code, shall provide the exclusive remedy for the plaintiff; and

(iii) the United States shall be substituted as defendant in the proceeding.

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

(A) to provide immunity to any person who knowingly violates the civil or constitutional rights of an individual; or

(B) to limit the application of the doctrine of official immunity or of qualified immunity in a civil action brought against a law enforcement officer acting pursuant to a detainer issued by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357).

(e) INCREASED PENALTIES FOR REENTRY OF REMOVED ALIEN.—Section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1326) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(2) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), any alien who—

''(1) has been denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed or has departed the United States while an order of exclusion, deportation, or removal is outstanding; and

''(2) thereafter enters, attempts to enter, or is at any time found in, the United States, unless—

''(A) prior to the alien's reembarkation at a place outside the United States or the alien's application for admission from foreign contiguous territory, the Secretary of Homeland Security has expressly consented to such alien's reapplying for admission; or

''(B) with respect to an alien previously denied admission and removed, such alien shall establish that the alien was not required to obtain such advance consent under this Act or any prior Act;

shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

''(b) CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR REENTRY OF CERTAIN REMOVED ALIENS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the penalty provided in subsection (a), and except as provided in subsection (c), an alien described in subsection (a)—

''(A) who was convicted before such removal or departure of three or more misdemeanors involving drugs, crimes against the person, or both, or a felony (other than an aggravated felony), shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both;

''(B) who has been excluded from the United States pursuant to section 235(c) because the alien was excludable under section 212(a)(3)(B) or who has been removed from the United States pursuant to the provisions of title V, and who thereafter, without the permission of the Secretary of Homeland Security, enters the United States, or attempts to do so, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, and imprisoned for a period of 10 years, which sentence shall not run concurrently with any other sentence;

''(C) who was removed from the United States pursuant to section 241(a)(4)(B) who thereafter, without the permission of the Secretary of Homeland Security, enters, attempts to enter, or is at any time found in, the United States (unless the Secretary of Homeland Security has expressly consented to such alien's reentry) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; and

''(D) who has been denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed 3 or more times and thereafter enters, attempts to enter, crosses the border to, attempts to cross the border to, or is at any time found in the United States, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

''(2) REMOVAL DEFINED.—In this subsection and subsection (c), the term 'removal' includes any agreement in which an alien stipulates to removal during (or not during) a criminal trial under either Federal or State law.

''(c) MANDATORY MINIMUM CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR REENTRY OF CERTAIN REMOVED ALIENS.—Notwithstanding the penalties provided in subsections (a) and (b), an alien described in subsection (a)—

''(1) who was convicted before such removal or departure of an aggravated felony; or

''(2) who was convicted at least two times before such removal or departure of illegal reentry under this section;

shall be imprisoned not less than five years and not more than 20 years, and may, in addition, be fined under title 18, United States Code.''; and

(3) in subsection (d), as redesignated by paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''section 242(h)(2)'' and inserting ''section 241(a)(4)''; and

(B) by striking ''Attorney General'' and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security''.

(f) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid for any reason, the remainder of this section, and the application of such provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances, shall not be affected by such invalidation.

SA 2915. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE III—DEFEND OUR CAPITAL ACT

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Defend Our Capital Act of 2015''.

SEC. 302. RECOGNIZING THE RIGHT OF LAW-ABIDING INDIVIDUALS TO CARRY AND TRANSPORT FIREARMS FOR LEGITIMATE PURPOSES.

(a) LICENSES TO CARRY FIREARMS.—Section 6 of the Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 650, chapter 465; sec. 22–4506, D.C. Official Code), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. ISSUE OF LICENSES TO CARRY FIREARMS.

''(a) ISSUANCE AND SCOPE OF LICENSE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chief shall issue a license, valid for not less than 5 years, to carry a firearm concealed on or about the person to any individual who—

''(A) is not disqualified under subsection (d); and

''(B) completes the application process specified in subsection (f).

''(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR LICENSE.—A license to carry a firearm issued under this section shall meet the requirements specified in subsection (c).

''(3) PROTECTION FROM OTHER CONDITIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND REQUIREMENTS.—The Chief may not impose conditions, limitations, or requirements that are not expressly provided for in this section on the issuance, scope, effect, or content of a license.

''(4) SCHOOL ZONES.—For purposes of section 922(q)(2)(B)(ii) of title 18, United States Code, an individual who possesses a firearm in a school zone in the District of Columbia and who is licensed under this section or is an out-of-state licensee shall be considered licensed by the District of Columbia.

''(b) CARRYING A FIREARM; POSSESSION AND DISPLAY OF LICENSE DOCUMENT OR AUTHORIZATION.—

''(1) CARRYING A FIREARM.—A licensee or an out-of-state licensee may carry a firearm anywhere in the District of Columbia except as otherwise prohibited by law or by a limitation or prohibition established pursuant to section 11 of this Act (sec. 22–4511, D.C. Official Code).

''(2) POSSESSION AND DISPLAY OF LICENSE DOCUMENT OR AUTHORIZATION.—A licensee shall carry his or her license document and government-issued photographic identification card and an out-of-state licensee shall carry his or her out-of-state license and government-issued photographic identification card at all times during which he or she is carrying a firearm in any location other than on or in real property owned or leased by the licensee or out-of-state licensee.

''(c) LICENSE DOCUMENT; CONTENT OF LICENSE.—

''(1) DESIGN OF LICENSE DOCUMENT.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the Chief shall—

''(A) design a single license document for licenses issued and renewed under this section; and

''(B) complete the design of the license document not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Defend Our Capital Act of 2015.

''(2) REQUIRED CONTENT OF LICENSE.—A license document for a license issued under this section shall contain all of the following on one side:

''(A) The full name, date of birth, and residence address of the licensee.

''(B) A physical description of the licensee, including sex, height, and eye color.

''(C) The date on which the license was issued.

''(D) The date on which the license expires.

''(E) The words 'District of Columbia'.

''(F) A unique identification number for the licensee.

''(3) PROHIBITED CONTENT OF LICENSE.—A license document for a license issued under this section may not contain the licensee's social security number.

''(d) RESTRICTIONS ON ISSUING A LICENSE.—The Chief shall issue a license under this section to an individual who submits an application under subsection (f) unless the individual—

''(1) is less than 21 years of age; or

''(2) is prohibited under Federal law or court order from possessing or receiving a firearm.

''(e) APPLICATION AND RENEWAL FORMS.—

''(1) DESIGN.—The Chief shall design an application form for use by individuals who apply for a license under this section and a renewal form for use by individuals applying for renewal of a license under subsection (n).

''(2) DEADLINES.—The Chief shall complete the design of—

''(A) the application form not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Defend Our Capital Act of 2015; and

''(B) the renewal form not later than 4 years from the date of enactment of the Defend Our Capital Act of 2015.

''(3) CONTENTS.—The forms described in this subsection shall—

''(A) require the applicant to provide only his or her name, address, date of birth, state identification card number, race, sex, height, eye color, and, if the applicant is not a United States citizen, his or her alien or admission number; and

''(B) include—

''(i) a statement that the applicant is ineligible for a license if subsection (d) applies to the applicant;

''(ii) a statement explaining the laws of self-defense and defense of others in the District of Columbia, with a place for the applicant to sign his or her name to indicate that he or she has read and understands the statement;

''(iii) a statement, with a place for the applicant to sign his or her name, to indicate that the applicant has read and understands the requirements of this section;

''(iv) a statement that the applicant may be prosecuted if he or she intentionally gives a false answer to any question on the application or intentionally submits a falsified document with the application;

''(v) a statement of the penalties for intentionally giving a false answer to any question on the application or intentionally submitting a falsified document with the application; and

''(vi) a statement describing the places in which a person may be prohibited from carrying a firearm even with a license, with a place for the applicant to sign his or her name to indicate that he or she has read and understands the statement.

''(4) AVAILABILITY OF FORMS.—The Chief shall make the forms described in this subsection available on the Internet and, upon request, by mail.

''(f) SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION.—An individual may apply to the Chief for a license under this section by submitting to the Chief, by mail or other means made available by the Chief—

''(1) a completed application in the form prescribed under subsection (e);

''(2) a statement that states that the information that the individual is providing in the application submitted under paragraph (1) and any document submitted with the application is true and complete to the best of his or her knowledge;

''(3) a license fee in an amount that is equal to the lesser of—

''(A) the cost of issuing the license; or

''(B) $50; and

''(4) a fee for a background check under subsection (h) that is not greater than $25.

''(g) PROCESSING OF APPLICATION.—

''(1) BACKGROUND CHECK.—If a person submits a complete application under subsection (f) and is not prohibited from obtaining a license under paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (d), the Chief shall conduct a background check in accordance with subsection (h) upon receiving the application.

''(2) DEADLINE.—Not later than 14 days after the date on which the Chief receives a complete application submitted under subsection (f), the Chief shall—

''(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), issue the license and promptly send the licensee his or her license document by first-class mail; or

''(B) if subsection (d) applies to the applicant, deny the application in accordance with paragraph (3).

''(3) DENIAL.—If the Chief denies an application submitted under subsection (f), the Chief shall inform the applicant of the denial in writing, stating the reason and factual basis for the denial and the availability of an appeal under subsections (l) and (m).

''(h) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chief shall conduct a background check on an applicant by contacting the National Instant Criminal Background Check System to determine whether subsection (d)(2) applies to the applicant.

''(2) CONFIRMATION NUMBER.—The Chief shall create a confirmation number associated with each applicant.

''(3) RESULT.—As soon as practicable after conducting a background check under paragraph (1), the Chief shall—

''(A) if the background check indicates that subsection (d)(2) applies to the applicant, create a unique nonapproval number for the applicant; or

''(B) if the background check does not indicate that subsection (d)(2) applies to the applicant, create a unique approval number for the applicant.

''(4) RECORD.—The Chief shall maintain—

''(A) a record of all complete application forms submitted under subsection (f); and

''(B) a record of all approval or nonapproval numbers regarding background checks conducted under this subsection.

''(i) MAINTENANCE, USE, AND PUBLICATION OF RECORDS BY THE CHIEF.—

''(1) MAINTENANCE OF RECORD.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chief shall maintain a computerized record listing the name and application information of each individual who has been issued a license under this section.

''(B) RESTRICTION.—Subject to paragraph (3), the Chief may not store, maintain, format, sort, or access the information described in paragraph (1) in any manner other than by—

''(i) the names, dates of birth, or sex of licensees; or

''(ii) the identification numbers assigned to licensees under subsection (h).

''(2) USE BY LAW ENFORCEMENT.—A law enforcement officer may not request or be provided information maintained in the record under paragraph (1) concerning a specific individual except for 1 of the following purposes:

''(A) To confirm that a license produced by an individual is valid.

''(B) If an individual is carrying a firearm and claims to hold a valid license issued under this section, but does not have his or her license document, to confirm that the individual holds a valid license.

''(C) To investigate whether an individual submitted an intentionally false statement.

''(D) To investigate whether an individual complied with a requirement to surrender his or her license in accordance with this section.

''(3) FREEDOM OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding the Freedom of Information Act of 1976 (sec. 2–531 et seq., D.C. Official Code), information obtained under this section may not be made available to the public except—

''(A) in the context of a prosecution for an offense in which a person's status as a licensee is relevant; or

''(B) through a report created by the Chief that shows the number of licenses issued, revoked, or suspended, but excludes any identifying information about individual licensees.

''(j) LOST OR DESTROYED LICENSE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a license document is lost, a licensee no longer has possession of his or her license document, or a license document is destroyed, unreadable, or unusable, a licensee who wishes to obtain a replacement license document shall submit to the Chief—

''(A) a statement requesting a replacement license document;

''(B) the license document or any portions of the license document that remain; and

''(C) a $10 replacement fee.

''(2) ISSUANCE.—Not later than 7 days after the date on which the Chief receives a statement, license document or portions thereof (if any), and fee submitted by a licensee under paragraph (1), the Chief shall issue a replacement license document to the licensee.

''(3) ABSENCE OF ORIGINAL LICENSE DOCUMENT.—If a licensee does not submit the original license document to the Chief under paragraph (1), the Chief shall terminate the unique approval number of the original request and issue a new unique approval number for the replacement license document.

''(k) LICENSE REVOCATION AND SUSPENSION.—

''(1) REVOCATION.—The Chief shall revoke a license issued under this section if the Chief determines that subsection (d) applies to the licensee.

''(2) SUSPENSION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chief shall suspend a license issued under this section if a court prohibits the licensee from possessing a firearm.

''(B) RESTORATION.—The Chief shall restore a suspended license not later than 5 business days after the date on which the Chief is notified that the licensee is no longer subject to the prohibition described in subparagraph (A) if—

''(i) subsection (d) does not apply to the individual; and

''(ii) the suspended license has not expired under subsection (n).

''(3) PROCEDURES.—

''(A) NOTICE.—If the Chief suspends or revokes a license under this subsection, the Chief shall send by mail to the individual whose license has been suspended or revoked notice of the suspension or revocation not later than 1 day after the suspension or revocation.

''(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—If the Chief suspends or revokes a license under this subsection, the suspension or revocation shall take effect on the date on which the individual whose license has been suspended or revoked receives the notice under subparagraph (A).

''(C) DELIVERY OF LICENSE DOCUMENT TO CHIEF.—Not later than 7 days after the date on which an individual whose license has been suspended or revoked receives the notice under subparagraph (A), the individual shall—

''(i) deliver the license document personally or by certified mail to the Chief; or

''(ii) mail a signed statement to the Chief stating—

''(I) that the individual no longer has possession of his or her license document; and

''(II) the reasons why the individual no longer has possession of the license document.

''(l) DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW.—The Chief shall promulgate rules providing for the review of any action by the Chief denying an application for, or suspending or revoking, a license under this section.

''(m) APPEALS TO THE SUPERIOR COURT.—

''(1) RIGHT TO APPEAL.—An individual aggrieved by any action by the Chief denying an application for, or suspending or revoking, a license under this section, may appeal directly to the Superior Court of the District of Columbia without regard to whether the individual has sought review under the process established under subsection (l).

''(2) COMMENCEMENT OF APPEAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—To begin an appeal under this subsection, the aggrieved individual shall file a petition for review with the clerk of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia not later than 30 days after the date on which the individual receives notice of denial of an application for a license or of suspension or revocation of a license.

''(B) CONTENTS; SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.—A petition filed under subparagraph (A)—

''(i) shall state the substance of the Chief's action from which the individual is appealing and the grounds upon which the individual believes the Chief's action to be improper; and

''(ii) may include a copy of any records or documents that are relevant to the grounds upon which the individual believes the Chief's action to be improper.

''(3) SERVICE UPON CHIEF.—A copy of a petition filed under paragraph (2) shall be served upon the Chief either personally or by registered or certified mail not later than 5 days after the date on which the individual files the petition.

''(4) ANSWER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chief shall file an answer to a petition filed under paragraph (2) not later than 15 days after the date on which the Chief is served with the petition under paragraph (3).

''(B) CONTENTS; SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.—An answer filed under subparagraph (A) shall include—

''(i) a brief statement of the actions taken by the Chief; and

''(ii) a copy of any documents or records on which the Chief based his or her action.

''(5) REVIEW BY COURT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The court shall review the petition, the answer, and any records or documents submitted with the petition or the answer.

''(B) CONDUCT OF REVIEW.—The court shall conduct the review under this paragraph without a jury but may schedule a hearing and take testimony.

''(6) REVERSAL.—The court shall reverse the Chief's action if the court finds—

''(A) that the Chief failed to follow any procedure, or take any action, prescribed under this section;

''(B) that the Chief erroneously interpreted a provision of law and a correct interpretation compels a different action;

''(C) that the Chief's action depends on a finding of fact that is not supported by substantial evidence in the record;

''(D) if the appeal is regarding a denial, that the denial was based on factors other than the factors under subsection (d); or

''(E) if the appeal is regarding a suspension or revocation, that the suspension or revocation was based on criteria other than the criteria under subsection (k).

''(7) RELIEF.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The court shall provide whatever relief is appropriate regardless of the original form of the petition.

''(B) COSTS AND FEES.—If the court reverses the Chief's action, the court shall order the Chief to pay the aggrieved individual all court costs and reasonable attorney fees.

''(n) LICENSE EXPIRATION AND RENEWAL.—

''(1) PERIOD OF VALIDITY.—A license issued under this section shall be valid for the 5-year period beginning on the date on which the license is issued unless the license is suspended or revoked under subsection (k).

''(2) NOTICE OF EXPIRATION.—

''(A) FORM.—The Chief shall design a notice of expiration form.

''(B) MAILING OF NOTICE.—Not later than 90 days before the expiration date of a license issued under this section, the Chief shall mail to the licensee—

''(i) the notice of expiration form; and

''(ii) a form for renewing the license.

''(3) RENEWAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chief shall renew the license of a licensee if—

''(i) not later than 90 days after the expiration date of the license, the licensee submits the renewal application, statement, and fees required under subparagraph (B); and

''(ii) the background check required under subparagraph (C) indicates that subsection (d) does not apply to the licensee.

''(B) RENEWAL APPLICATION; STATEMENT; FEES.—A licensee seeking to renew his or her license shall submit to the Chief—

''(i) a renewal application on the form provided by the Chief;

''(ii) a statement reporting that—

''(I) the information provided under clause (i) is true and complete to the best of the licensee's knowledge; and

''(II) the licensee is not disqualified under subsection (d); and

''(iii) payment of—

''(I) a renewal fee in an amount that is equal to the lesser of—

''(aa) the cost of renewing the license; or

''(bb) $25; and

''(II) a fee for a background check that does not exceed $25.

''(C) BACKGROUND CHECK.—The chief shall conduct a background check of a licensee as provided under subsection (h) before renewing the licensee's license.

''(D) ISSUANCE OF RENEWAL LICENSE.—Unless a renewal applicant is ineligible under subsection (d), not later than 10 days after the date on which the Chief receives a renewal application, statement, and fees from the applicant under subparagraph (B), the Chief shall issue a renewal license and send it to the applicant by first-class mail.

''(E) MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the license of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, including the National Guard and reserve components, who is deployed overseas while on active duty shall not expire before the date that is 90 days after the end of the licensee's overseas deployment unless the license is suspended or revoked under subsection (k).

''(o) RECIPROCITY AGREEMENTS.—The Chief shall enter into reciprocity agreements with each other state that requires such an agreement to grant recognition to a license to carry a concealed firearm issued by another state.

''(p) IMMUNITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chief and any designee or employee who carries out the provisions of this section shall be immune from liability arising from any act or omission under this section, if the act or omission is in good faith.

''(2) PROVIDERS OF TRAINING COURSES.—A person providing a firearms training course in good faith shall be immune from liability arising from any act or omission related to the course.''.

(b) AUTHORITY TO CARRY FIREARM IN CERTAIN PLACES AND FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES; LAWFUL TRANSPORTATION OF FIREARMS.—The Act of July 8, 1932 (sec. 22–4501 et seq., D.C. Official Code), is amended by inserting after section 4 the following:

"SEC. 4A. AUTHORITY TO CARRY FIREARM IN CERTAIN PLACES AND FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.

''Notwithstanding any other law, a person not otherwise prohibited by law from shipping, transporting, possessing, or receiving a firearm may carry such firearm, whether loaded or unloaded—

''(1) in the person's dwelling house or place of business or on land owned or lawfully possessed by the person;

''(2) on land owned or lawfully possessed by another person unless the other person has notified the person by posting or individual notice that firearms are not permitted on the premises;

''(3) while it is being used for lawful recreational, sporting, educational, or training purposes; or

''(4) while it is being transported for a lawful purpose as expressly authorized by District or Federal law and in accordance with the requirements of that law.

"SEC. 4B. LAWFUL TRANSPORTATION OF FIREARMS.

''(a) Any person who is not otherwise prohibited by law from shipping, transporting, possessing, or receiving a firearm shall be permitted to transport a firearm for any lawful purpose from any place where he may lawfully possess the firearm to any other place where he may lawfully possess the firearm if the firearm is transported in accordance with this section.

''(b)(1) If the transportation of the firearm is by a vehicle, the firearm shall be unloaded, and neither the firearm nor any ammunition being transported shall be readily accessible or directly accessible from the passenger compartment of the transporting vehicle.

''(2) If the transporting vehicle does not have a compartment separate from the driver's compartment, the firearm or ammunition shall be contained in a locked container other than the glove compartment or console, and the firearm shall be unloaded.

''(c) If the transportation of the firearm is in a manner other than in a vehicle, the firearm shall be—

''(1) unloaded;

''(2) inside a locked container; and

''(3) separate from any ammunition.''.

(c) EXCEPTIONS TO RESTRICTIONS ON CARRYING CONCEALED WEAPONS.—Section 5(a) of the Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 650, chapter 465; sec. 22–4505(a), D.C. Official Code), is amended—

(1) by striking ''pistol unloaded and in a secure wrapper from'' and inserting ''firearm, transported in accordance with section 4B, from'';

(2) by striking ''pistol'' each place it appears and inserting ''firearm''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) Any person carrying a firearm who holds—

''(A) a valid license issued under section 6; or

''(B) any out-of-state license, as defined in section 1.''.

SEC. 303. RECIPROCITY FOR THE CARRYING OF CERTAIN CONCEALED FIREARMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 926C the following:

"§ 926D. Reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the law of any State or political subdivision thereof to the contrary—

''(1) an individual who is not prohibited by Federal law from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a firearm, and who is carrying a government-issued photographic identification document and a valid license or permit which is issued pursuant to the law of a State and which permits the individual to carry a concealed firearm, may possess or carry a concealed handgun (other than a machinegun or destructive device) that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce in any State other than the State of residence of the individual that—

''(A) has a statute that allows residents of the State to obtain licenses or permits to carry concealed firearms; or

''(B) does not prohibit the carrying of concealed firearms by residents of the State for lawful purposes; and

''(2) an individual who is not prohibited by Federal law from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a firearm, and who is carrying a government-issued photographic identification document and is entitled and not prohibited from carrying a concealed firearm in the State in which the individual resides otherwise than as described in paragraph (1), may possess or carry a concealed handgun (other than a machinegun or destructive device) that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce in any State other than the State of residence of the individual that—

''(A) has a statute that allows residents of the State to obtain licenses or permits to carry concealed firearms; or

''(B) does not prohibit the carrying of concealed firearms by residents of the State for lawful purposes.

''(b) CONDITIONS AND LIMITATIONS.—The possession or carrying of a concealed handgun in a State under this section shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations, except as to eligibility to possess or carry, imposed by or under Federal or State law or the law of a political subdivision of a State, that apply to the possession or carrying of a concealed handgun by residents of the State or political subdivision who are licensed by the State or political subdivision to do so, or not prohibited by the State from doing so.

''(c) UNRESTRICTED LICENSE OR PERMIT.—In a State that allows the issuing authority for licenses or permits to carry concealed firearms to impose restrictions on the carrying of firearms by individual holders of such licenses or permits, an individual carrying a concealed handgun under this section shall be permitted to carry a concealed handgun according to the same terms authorized by an unrestricted license of or permit issued to a resident of the State.

''(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt any provision of State law with respect to the issuance of licenses or permits to carry concealed firearms.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 926C the following:

''Sec. 926D. Reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. FIREARMS PERMITTED ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROPERTY.

Section 930(g)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''The term 'Federal facility' means'' and inserting the following: ''The term 'Federal facility'—

''(A) means'';

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) with respect to a qualified member of the Armed Forces, as defined in section 926E(a), does not include any land, a building, or any part thereof owned or leased by the Department of Defense.''.

SEC. 305. LAWFUL POSSESSION OF FIREARMS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) MODIFICATION OF GENERAL ARTICLE.—Section 934 of title 10, United States Code (article 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''Though not specifically mentioned''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) POSSESSION OF A FIREARM.—The possession of a concealed or open carry firearm by a member of the armed forces subject to this chapter on a military installation, if lawful under the laws of the State in which the installation is located, is not an offense under this section.''.

(b) MODIFICATION OF REGULATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall amend Department of Defense Directive number 5210.56 to provide that members of the Armed Forces may possess firearms for defensive purposes on facilities and installations of the Department of Defense in a manner consistent with the laws of the State in which the facility or installation concerned is located.

SEC. 306. CARRYING OF CONCEALED FIREARMS BY QUALIFIED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this title, is amended by inserting after section 926D the following:

"§ 926E. Carrying of concealed firearms by qualified members of the Armed Forces

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

''(1) the term 'firearm'—

''(A) except as provided in this paragraph, has the same meaning as in section 921;

''(B) includes ammunition not expressly prohibited by Federal law or subject to the provisions of the National Firearms Act; and

''(C) does not include—

''(i) any machinegun (as defined in section 5845 of the National Firearms Act);

''(ii) any firearm silencer; or

''(iii) any destructive device; and

''(2) the term 'qualified member of the Armed Forces' means an individual who—

''(A) is a member of the Armed Forces on active duty status, as defined in section 101(d)(1) of title 10;

''(B) is not the subject of disciplinary action under the Uniform Code of Military Justice;

''(C) is not under the influence of alcohol or another intoxicating or hallucinatory drug or substance; and

''(D) is not prohibited by Federal law from receiving a firearm.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding any provision of the law of any State or any political subdivision thereof, an individual who is a qualified member of the Armed Forces and who is carry identification required by subsection (d) may carry a concealed firearm that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce, subject to subsection (c).

''(c) LIMITATIONS.—This section shall not be construed to superseded or limit the laws of any State that—

''(1) permit private persons or entities to prohibit or restrict the possession of concealed firearms on their property; or

''(2) prohibit or restrict the possession of firearms on any State or local government property, installation, building, base, or park.

''(d) IDENTIFICATION.—The identification required by this subsection is the photographic identification issued by the Department of Defense for the qualified member of the Armed Forces.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this title, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 926D the following:

''926E. Carrying of concealed firearms by qualified members of the Armed Forces.''.

SEC. 307. REFORMING D.C. COUNCIL'S AUTHORITY TO RESTRICT FIREARMS.

Section 4 of the Act entitled ''An Act to prohibit the killing of wild birds and wild animals in the District of Columbia'' , approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 809; sec. 1–303.43, D.C. Official Code), is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Nothing in this section or any other provision of law shall authorize, or shall be construed to permit, the Council, the Mayor, or any governmental or regulatory authority of the District of Columbia to prohibit, constructively prohibit, or unduly burden the ability of persons not prohibited from possessing firearms under Federal law from acquiring, possessing in their homes or businesses, carrying, transporting, or using for sporting, self-protection, or other lawful purposes, any firearm neither prohibited by Federal law nor subject to chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (commonly referred to as the 'National Firearms Act'). The District of Columbia shall not have authority to enact laws or regulations that discourage or eliminate the private ownership or use of firearms for legitimate purposes.''.

SEC. __308. REPEAL OF D.C. SEMIAUTOMATIC BAN.

Section 101(10) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2501.01(10), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

''(10) 'Machine gun' means any firearm which shoots, is designed to shoot, or can be readily restored to shoot, automatically more than one shot, without manual reloading, by a single function of the trigger. The term 'machine gun' shall also include the frame or receiver of any such firearm, any part designed and intended solely and exclusively, or combination of parts designed and intended, for use in converting a firearm into a machine gun, and any combination of parts from which a machine gun can be assembled if such parts are in the possession or under the control of a person.''.

SEC. 309. REPEAL OF REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT AND AUTHORIZATION OF AMMUNITION SALES.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 201(a) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2502.01(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''any firearm, unless'' and all that follows through paragraph (3) and inserting the following: ''any firearm described in subsection (c).''.

(2) DESCRIPTION OF FIREARMS REMAINING ILLEGAL.—Section 201 of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2502.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) A firearm described in this subsection is any of the following:

''(1) A sawed-off shotgun.

''(2) A machine gun.

''(3) A short-barreled rifle.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of section 201 of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2502.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''**REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS**'' and inserting ''**FIREARM POSSESSION**''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO FIREARMS CONTROL REGULATIONS ACT.—The Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 is amended—

(1) in section 101 (sec. 7–2501.01, D.C. Official Code), by striking paragraph (13); and

(2) by repealing sections 202 through 211 (secs. 7–2502.02 through 7–2502.11, D.C. Official Code).

SEC. 310. REPEAL OF REDUNDANT DEALER LICENSING REQUIREMENT AND PROVISION FOR THE LAWFUL SALE OF FIREARMS BY FEDERALLY LICENSED DEALERS.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 401 of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2504.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''(a) No person'' and all that follows and inserting the following:

''(a) No person or organization shall engage in the business of dealing, importing, or manufacturing firearms without complying with the requirements of Federal law.

''(b) Any dealer who is in compliance with Federal law may sell or otherwise transfer a firearm to any person or organization not otherwise prohibited from possessing or receiving such firearm under Federal law. In the case of a sale or transfer of a handgun to a resident of the District of Columbia, a federally licensed importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms in Maryland or Virginia shall be treated as a dealer licensed under the provisions of this Act for purposes of the previous sentence, notwithstanding section 922(b)(3) of title 18, United States Code, if the transferee meets in person with the transferor to accomplish the transfer, and the sale, delivery, and receipt fully comply with the legal conditions of sale in both the District of Columbia and the jurisdiction in which the transfer occurs.''.

(2) PROVIDING FOR THE LAWFUL SALE OF FIREARMS.—Section 501 of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2505.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking '', destructive device or ammunition'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''or ammunition to any person if the seller or transferor knows or has reasonable cause to believe that such person is prohibited by Federal law from possessing or receiving a firearm.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO FIREARMS CONTROL REGULATIONS ACT.—The Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 is amended—

(1) by repealing sections 402 through 409 (secs. 7–2504.02 through 7–2504.09, D.C. Official Code);

(2) by repealing section 502 (sec. 7–2505.02, D.C. Official Code);

(3) in section 701 (sec. 7–2507.01, D.C. Official Code)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''firearm, destructive device, or ammunition'' and inserting ''destructive device''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking '', any firearm, destructive device, or ammunition.'' and inserting ''any destructive device.''; and

(4) by repealing section 704 (sec. 7–2507.04, D.C. Official Code).

(c) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 650, chapter 465; sec. 22–4501 et seq., D.C. Official Code), is amended—

(1) in section 3 (sec. 22–4503, D.C. Official Code)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''if the person'' and all that follows and inserting ''if the person is prohibited from possessing a firearm under Federal law.'';

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''subsection (a)(1)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)''; and

(C) by repealing subsections (c) and (d); and

(2) by repealing sections 7 through 10 (secs. 22–4507 through 22–4510, D.C. Official Code).

SEC. 311. HARMONIZATION OF D.C. LAW AND FEDERAL LAW REGARDING THE POSSESSION OF AMMUNITION AND AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.

Section 601 of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2506.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''(a) No person'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''No person who is prohibited by Federal law from possessing a firearm shall possess ammunition in the District of Columbia.''.

SEC. 312. RESTORATION OF RIGHT OF SELF DEFENSE IN THE HOME.

Section 702 of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2507.02, D.C. Official Code) is repealed.

SEC. __313. REMOVAL OF CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR POSSESSION OF UNREGISTERED FIREARMS AND CERTAIN AMMUNITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 706 of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2507.06, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by striking ''except that'' and all that follows through ''A person who knowingly'' and inserting the following: ''except that a person who knowingly''; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any violation that occurs after the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 314. REGULATING INOPERABLE PISTOLS AND HARMONIZING DEFINITIONS FOR CERTAIN TYPES OF FIREARMS.

Section 1 of the Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 650, chapter 465; sec. 22–4501, D.C. Official Code), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (1) as paragraph (1)(A);

(2) by inserting before paragraph (1)(A), as redesignated, the following:

''(1) 'Chief' shall have the same meaning as provided in section 101(4) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2501.01(4), D.C. Official Code).'';

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

''(2A) 'Firearm'—

''(A) means any weapon, regardless of operability, which will, or is designed or redesigned, made or remade, readily converted, restored, or repaired, or is intended to, expel a projectile or projectiles by the action of an explosive; and

''(B) does not include—

''(i) a destructive device, as defined in section 101(7) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2501.01(7), D.C. Official Code);

''(ii) a device used exclusively for line throwing, signaling, or safety, and required or recommended by the Coast Guard or Interstate Commerce Commission; or

''(iii) a device used exclusively for firing explosive rivets, stud cartridges, or similar industrial ammunition and incapable for use as a weapon.'';

(4) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(3A) 'Licensee' means an individual holding a valid license issued under the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 8, 1932 (sec. 22–4506, D.C. Official Code).'';

(5) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(4) 'Machine gun' shall have the same meaning as provided in section 101(10) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2501.01(10), D.C. Official Code).'';

(6) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(4A) 'Motor vehicle' shall have the meaning provided in section 101(4) of the Department of Motor Vehicles Reform Amendment Act of 2004 (sec. 50–1331.01(4), D.C. Official Code).

''(4B) 'Out-of-state license' means a valid permit, license, approval, or other authorization issued by a state or territory of the United States that authorizes the licensee to carry a firearm concealed on or about the person.

''(4C) 'Out-of-state licensee' means an individual who is 21 years of age or over, who is not a District resident, and who has been issued an out-of-state license.'';

(7) by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

''(6) 'Pistol' shall have the same meaning as provided in section 101(12) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2501.01(12), D.C. Official Code).'';

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

''(6A) 'Place of business' shall have the same meaning as provided in section 101(12A) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2501.01(12A), D.C. Official Code).'';

(9) by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

''(8) 'Sawed-off shotgun' shall have the same meaning as provided in section 101(15) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2501.01(15), D.C. Official Code).''; and

(10) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

''(9A) 'Shotgun' shall have the same meaning as provided in section 101(16) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2501.01(16), D.C. Official Code).''.

SEC. 315. PROHIBITIONS OF FIREARMS FROM PRIVATE AND SENSITIVE PUBLIC PROPERTY.

The Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 650, chapter 465; sec. 22–4501 et seq., D.C. Official Code), is amended by inserting after section 3 the following:

''SEC. 3A. PROHIBITIONS OF FIREARMS FROM PRIVATE AND SENSITIVE PUBLIC PROPERTY.

''(a) Private persons or entities owning property in the District of Columbia may prohibit or restrict the possession of firearms on their property by any persons, other than law enforcement personnel when lawfully authorized to enter onto the property or lessees occupying residential or business premises.

''(b) The District of Columbia may prohibit or restrict the possession of firearms within any building or structure under its control, or in any area of such building or structure, that has implemented security measures (including guard posts, metal detection devices, x-ray or other scanning devices, or card-based or biometric access devices) to identify and exclude unauthorized or hazardous persons or articles, except that no such prohibition or restriction may apply to lessees occupying residential or business premises.''.

SEC. 316. INCLUDING TOY AND ANTIQUE PISTOLS IN PROHIBITION AGAINST USING AN IMITATION FIREARM TO COMMIT A VIOLENT OR DANGEROUS CRIME.

Section 13 of the Act of July 8, 1932 (sec. 22–4513, D.C. Official Code), is amended by striking ''section 2 and section 14(b)'' and inserting ''sections 2, 4(b), and 14(b)''.

SEC. 317. REPEAL OF GUN OFFENDER REGISTRY.

Title VIII of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2508.01 et seq., D.C. Official Code), as added by section 205 of the Omnibus Public Safety and Justice Amendment Act of 2009 (D.C. Law 18–88), is repealed.

SEC. 318. REPEALS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ACTS.

Effective on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, each of the following Acts is repealed, and any provision of law amended or repealed by any of such Acts is restored or revived as if such Act had not been enacted into law:

(1) The Assault Weapon Manufacturing Strict Liability Act of 1990 (D.C. Law 8–263).

(2) The Illegal Firearm Sale and Distribution Strict Liability Act of 1992 (D.C. Law 9–115).

(3) The Firearms Registration Amendment Act of 2008 (D.C. Law 17–372).

(4) The Inoperable Pistol Amendment Act of 2008 (D.C. Law 17–388).

(5) The Firearms Amendment Act of 2012 (D.C. Law 19–170).

(6) The Administrative Disposition for Weapons Offenses Amendment Act of 2012 (D.C. Law 19–295).

(7) The License to Carry a Pistol Second Emergency Amendment Act of 2014 (D.C. Act A20–564).

(8) The License to Carry a Pistol Temporary Amendment Act of 2014 (D.C. Law 20–169).

(9) The License to Carry a Pistol Amendment Act of 2014 (D.C. Act A20–0621).

SEC. 319. REPEAL OF FEDERAL INTERSTATE HANDGUN TRANSFER BAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''and subsection (b)(3)'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (3) and (5);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3);

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (6) through (9) as paragraphs (4) through (7), respectively; and

(E) in paragraph (6), as redesignated, by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4); and

(C) in the flush text following paragraph (4), as redesignated—

(i) by striking ''(3), and (4)'' and inserting ''and (3)''; and

(ii) by striking ''(4)'' and inserting ''(3)''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 924—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''(a)(4)'' and inserting ''(a)(3)''; and

(II) in paragraph (2), by striking ''(a)(6)'' and inserting ''(a)(4)''; and

(ii) in subsection (d)—

(I) in paragraph (1), by striking ''(a)(4), (a)(6)'' and inserting ''(a)(3), (a)(4)''; and

(II) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking ''section 922(a)(1), 922(a)(3), 922(a)(5), or 922(b)(3)'' each place that term appears and inserting ''section 922(a)(1)''; and

(B) in section 1028A(c)(3), by striking ''section 922(a)(6)'' and inserting ''section 922(a)(4)''.

(2) Section 4182(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''922(b)(5)'' and inserting ''922(b)(4)''.

(3) Section 40733 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Section 922(a)(1)–(3) and (5) of title 18 does not'' and inserting ''Paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 922(a) of title 18 shall not''.

(4) Section 161A(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2201a(b)) is amended by striking ''subsections (a)(4), (a)(5), (b)(2), (b)(4), and (o) of section 922'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(3), (b)(2), (b)(3), and (o) of section 922''.

SEC. 320. FIREARMS PERMITTED ON FEDERAL PROPERTY.

Section 930 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) the lawful storage or possession of a firearm or other dangerous weapon within a publically accessible, non-sensitive area of real property owned or leased by the Federal Government.''; and

(2) in subsection (g), by adding at the end the following:

''(4) The term 'publically accessible, non-sensitive area' means an area in which the Federal Government has not implemented security measures, including metal detection devices, x-ray or other scanning devices, or card-based or biometric access devices, at a point of entry.''.

SEC. 321. SEVERABILITY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, if any provision of this title, or any amendment made by this title, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the other provisions of this title and any other amendments made by this title, and the application of such provision or amendment to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SA 2916. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

I—HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

SEC. 101. THE PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–11) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2015''; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (3) through (5).

(b) RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Of the funds made available by such section 4002, the unobligated balance is rescinded.

SEC. 102. COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER PROGRAM.

Effective as if included in the enactment of the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–10, 129 Stat. 87), paragraph (1) of section 221(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after ''Section 10503(b)(1)(E) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 254b–2(b)(1)(E)) is amended'' the following: ''by striking '$3,600,000,000' and inserting '$3,835,000,000' and''.

SEC. 104. TERRITORIES.

Section 1323(c) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18043(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) NO FORCE AND EFFECT.—Effective January 1, 2018, this subsection shall have no force or effect.''.

SEC. 105. REINSURANCE, RISK CORRIDOR, AND RISK ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) TRANSITIONAL REINSURANCE PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUAL MARKET.—Section 1341 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18061) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) NO FORCE AND EFFECT.—Effective January 1, 2016, the Secretary shall not collect fees and shall not make payments under this section.''.

(b) RISK CORRIDORS FOR PLANS IN INDIVIDUAL AND SMALL GROUP MARKETS.—Section 1342 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18062) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) NO FORCE AND EFFECT.—Effective January 1, 2016, this section shall have no force or effect.''.

SEC. 106. SUPPORT FOR STATE RESPONSE TO SUBSTANCE ABUSE PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS AND URGENT MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated, and are appropriated, out of monies in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, $750,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017, to the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') to award grants to States to address the substance abuse public health crisis or to respond to urgent mental health needs within the State. In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary may give preference to States with an incidence or prevalence of substance use disorders that is substantial relative to other States or to States that identify mental health needs within their communities that are urgent relative to such needs of other States. Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded to a State under subsection (a) shall be used for one or more of the following public health-related activities:

(1) Improving State prescription drug monitoring programs.

(2) Implementing prevention activities, and evaluating such activities to identify effective strategies to prevent substance abuse.

(3) Training for health care practitioners, such as best practices for prescribing opioids, pain management, recognizing potential cases of substance abuse, referral of patients to treatment programs, and overdose prevention.

(4) Supporting access to health care services provided by federally certified opioid treatment programs or other appropriate health care providers to treat substance use disorders or mental health needs.

(5) Other public health-related activities, as the State determines appropriate, related to addressing the substance abuse public health crisis or responding to urgent mental health needs within the State.

TITLE II—FINANCE

SEC. 201. RECAPTURE EXCESS ADVANCE PAYMENTS OF PREMIUM TAX CREDITS.

Subparagraph (B) of section 36B(f)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) NONAPPLICABILITY OF LIMITATION.—This subparagraph shall not apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2015, and before January 1, 2018.''.

SEC. 202. PREMIUM TAX CREDIT AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES.

(a) REPEAL OF PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—Subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking section 36B.

(b) REPEAL OF COST-SHARING SUBSIDY.—Section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is repealed.

(c) REPEAL OF ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS.—The following sections of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act are repealed:

(1) Section 1411 (other than subsection (i), the last sentence of subsection (e)(4)(A)(ii), and such provisions of such section solely to the extent related to the application of the last sentence of subsection (e)(4)(A)(ii)).

(2) Section 1412.

(d) PROTECTING AMERICANS BY REPEAL OF DISCLOSURE AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (21) of section 6103(l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) TERMINATION.—No disclosure may be made under this paragraph after December 31, 2017.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017.

(2) COST SHARING-SUBSIDIES AND ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS.—The repeals in subsection (b) and (c) shall take effect on December 31, 2017.

(3) PROTECTING AMERICANS BY RESCINDING DISCLOSURE AUTHORITY.—The amendments made by subsection (d) shall take effect on December 31, 2017.

SEC. 203. SMALL BUSINESS TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 45R of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) SHALL NOT APPLY.—This section shall not apply with respect to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017.

SEC. 204. INDIVIDUAL MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5000A(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B) by striking clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting the following:

''(ii) Zero percent for taxable years beginning after 2014.'', and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''$695'' in subparagraph (A) and inserting ''$0'',

(B) by striking ''and $325 for 2015'' in subparagraph (B), and

(C) by striking subparagraph (D).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 205. EMPLOYER MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''($0 in the case of months beginning after December 31, 2014)'' after ''$2,000''.

(2) Paragraph (1) of section 4980H(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''($0 in the case of months beginning after December 31, 2014)'' after ''$3,000''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 206. FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 504(a), 1902(a)(23), 1903(a), 2002, 2005(a)(4), 2102(a)(7), or 2105(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 704(a), 1396a(a)(23), 1396b(a), 1397a, 1397d(a)(4), 1397bb(a)(7), 1397ee(a)(1)), or the terms of any Medicaid waiver in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is approved under section 1115 or 1915 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315, 1396n), for the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, no Federal funds provided from a program referred to in this subsection that is considered direct spending for any year may be made available to a State for payments to a prohibited entity, whether made directly to the prohibited entity or through a managed care organization under contract with the State.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PROHIBITED ENTITY.—The term ''prohibited entity'' means an entity, including its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, and clinics—

(A) that, as of the date of enactment of this Act—

(i) is an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code;

(ii) is an essential community provider described in section 156.235 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), that is primarily engaged in family planning services, reproductive health, and related medical care; and

(iii) provides for abortions, other than an abortion—

(I) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

(II) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself; and

(B) for which the total amount of Federal and State expenditures under the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act in fiscal year 2014 made directly to the entity and to any affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, or clinics of the entity, or made to the entity and to any affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, or clinics of the entity as part of a nationwide health care provider network, exceeded $350,000,000.

(2) DIRECT SPENDING.—The term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given that term under section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)).

SEC. 207. MEDICAID.

The Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1108(g)(5), by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2017'';

(2) in section 1902—

(A) in subsection (a)(10)(A), in each of clauses (i)(VIII) and (ii)(XX), by inserting ''and ending December 31, 2017,'' after ''January 1, 2014,'';

(B) in subsection (a)(47)(B), by inserting ''and provided that any such election shall cease to be effective on January 1, 2018, and no such election shall be made after that date'' before the semicolon at the end; and

(C) in subsection (l)(2)(C), by inserting ''and ending December 31, 2017,'' after ''January 1, 2014,'';

(3) in each of sections 1902(gg)(2) and 2105(d)(3)(A), by striking ''September 30, 2019'' and inserting ''September 30, 2017'';

(4) in section 1905—

(A) in the first sentence of subsection (b), by inserting ''(50 percent on or after January 1, 2018)'' after ''55 percent'';

(B) in subsection (y)(1), by striking the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B) and all that follows through ''thereafter''; and

(C) in subsection (z)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''each year thereafter'' and inserting ''through 2017''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking the semicolon at the end of subclause (IV) and all that follows through ''100 percent'';

(5) in section 1915(k)(2), by striking ''during the period described in paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''on or after the date referred to in paragraph (1) and before January 1, 2018'';

(6) in section 1920(e), by adding at the end the following: ''This subsection shall not apply after December 31, 2017.'';

(7) in section 1937(b)(5), by adding at the end the following: ''This paragraph shall not apply after December 31, 2017.''; and

(8) in section 1943(a), by inserting ''and before January 1, 2018,'' after ''January 1, 2014,''.

SEC. 208. REPEAL OF DSH ALLOTMENT REDUCTIONS.

Section 1923(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r–4(f)) is amended by striking paragraphs (7) and (8).

SEC. 209. REPEAL OF THE TAX ON EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS AND HEALTH PLAN BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 43 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking section 4980I.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017.

(c) SUBSEQUENT EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2024, and chapter 43 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as such chapter would read if such subsection had never been enacted.

SEC. 210. REPEAL OF TAX ON OVER-THE-COUNTER MEDICATIONS.

(a) HSAS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 223(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''Such term'' and all that follows through the period.

(b) ARCHER MSAS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 220(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''Such term'' and all that follows through the period.

(c) HEALTH FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS AND HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.—Section 106 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subsection (f).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) DISTRIBUTIONS FROM SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to amounts paid with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(2) REIMBURSEMENTS.—The amendment made by subsection (c) shall apply to expenses incurred with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 211. REPEAL OF TAX ON HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

(a) HSAS.—Section 223(f)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''20 percent'' and inserting ''10 percent''.

(b) ARCHER MSAS.—Section 220(f)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''20 percent'' and inserting ''15 percent''.

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

SEC. 212. REPEAL OF LIMITATIONS ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO FLEXIBLE SPENDING ACCOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subsection (i).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 213. REPEAL OF TAX ON PRESCRIPTION MEDICATIONS.

Subsection (j) of section 9008 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended to read as follows:

''(j) REPEAL.—This section shall apply to calendar years beginning after December 31, 2010, and ending before January 1, 2016.''.

SEC. 214. REPEAL OF MEDICAL DEVICE EXCISE TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subchapter E.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to sales in calendar quarters beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 215. REPEAL OF HEALTH INSURANCE TAX.

Subsection (j) of section 9010 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended to read as follows:

''(j) REPEAL.—This section shall apply to calendar years beginning after December 31, 2013, and ending before January 1, 2016.''.

SEC. 216. REPEAL OF ELIMINATION OF DEDUCTION FOR EXPENSES ALLOCABLE TO MEDICARE PART D SUBSIDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 139A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''This section shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining whether any deduction is allowable with respect to any cost taken into account in determining such payment.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 217. REPEAL OF CHRONIC CARE TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''10 percent'' and inserting ''7.5 percent''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 218. REPEAL OF MEDICARE TAX INCREASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 3101 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) HOSPITAL INSURANCE.—In addition to the tax imposed by the preceding subsection, there is hereby imposed on the income of every individual a tax equal to 1.45 percent of the wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) received by such individual with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b).''.

(b) SECA.—Subsection (b) of section 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) HOSPITAL INSURANCE.—In addition to the tax imposed by the preceding subsection, there shall be imposed for each taxable year, on the self-employment income of every individual, a tax equal to 2.9 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to remuneration received after, and taxable years beginning after, December 31, 2015.

SEC. 219. REPEAL OF TANNING TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking chapter 49.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to services performed on or after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 220. REPEAL OF NET INVESTMENT TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking chapter 2A.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 221. REMUNERATION.

Paragraph (6) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(I) TERMINATION.—This paragraph shall not apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.''.

SEC. 222. ECONOMIC SUBSTANCE DOCTRINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (o) of section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed.

(b) PENALTY FOR UNDERPAYMENTS.—Paragraph (6) of section 6662(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed.

(c) INCREASED PENALTY FOR NONDISCLOSED TRANSACTIONS.—Subsection (i) of section 6662 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed.

(d) REASONABLE CAUSE EXCEPTION FOR UNDERPAYMENTS.—Paragraph (2) of section 6664(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed.

(e) REASONABLE CAUSE EXCEPTION FOR NONDISCLOSED TRANSACTIONS.—Paragraph (2) of section 6664(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed.

(f) ERRONEOUS CLAIM FOR REFUND OR CREDIT.—Subsection (c) of section 6676 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeals made by this section shall apply to transactions entered into, and to underpayments, understatements, or refunds and credits attributable to transactions entered into, after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 223. BUDGETARY SAVINGS FOR EXTENDING MEDICARE SOLVENCY.

As a result of policies contained in this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund under section 1817 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i) $379,300,000,000 (which represents the full amount of on-budget savings during the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025) for extending Medicare solvency, to remain available until expended.

SA 2917. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2916 submitted by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

In section 209, strike subsection (c).

SA 2918. Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2916 submitted by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

At the end of section 202, add the following:

(f) NONAPPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall not take effect if such amendments would result in an increase of Federal tax liability of any individual described in paragraph (2).

(2) INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.—The individuals described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Individuals who are victims of violent crime, including domestic violence.

(B) Individuals who are victims of cancer, heart disease, Alzheimer's disease, hepatitis C, HIV/AIDS , or other deadly diseases.

(C) Individuals who are veterans, including disabled veterans.

(D) Individuals who lost their health insurance when they lost their jobs, including those who lost their job because their employer moved their job overseas.

(E) Individuals who are survivors of cancer, strokes, or other chronic diseases.

(F) Pregnant women.

SEC. 202A. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

''Sec. 59A. Fair share tax.

''SEC. 59A. FAIR SHARE TAX.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—

''(1) IMPOSITITION OF TAX.—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

''(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

''(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

''(I) the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, over

''(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

''(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

''(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

''(B) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year, determined without regard to any tax liability determined under this section,

''(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

''(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

''(b) TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

''(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

''(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

''(2) MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

''(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

''(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

''(B) TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

''(c) HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'high-income taxpayer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of $1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

''(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2016, the $1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $10,000.

''(d) PAYROLL TAX.—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

''(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such tax is attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year or wages or compensation received during such taxable year, over

''(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

''(f) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 202B. MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON EXCESSIVE REMUNERATION.

(a) REPEAL OF PERFORMANCE-BASED COMPENSATION AND COMMISSION EXCEPTIONS FOR LIMITATION ON EXCESSIVE REMUNERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (B) through (E), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 162(m)(5) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof'' in subparagraph (E) and inserting ''subparagraph (B) thereof'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraphs (F) and (G)'' in subparagraph (G) and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)''.

(B) Section 162(m)(6) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof'' in subparagraph (D) and inserting ''subparagraph (B) thereof'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraphs (F) and (G)'' in subparagraph (G) and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)''.

(b) EXPANSION OF APPLICABLE EMPLOYER.—Paragraph (2) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) PUBLICLY HELD CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'publicly held corporation' means any corporation which is an issuer (as defined in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c))—

''(A) the securities of which are registered under section 12 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 781), or

''(B) that is required to file reports under section 15(d) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78o(d)).''.

(c) APPLICATION TO ALL CURRENT AND FORMER OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, AND EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by striking ''covered employee'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (4) and inserting ''covered individual'', and

(B) by striking ''such employee'' each place it appears in subparagraphs (A) and (E) of paragraph (4) and inserting ''such individual''.

(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(3) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered individual' means any individual who is an officer, director, or employee of the taxpayer or a former officer, director, or employee of the taxpayer.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 48D(b)(3)(A) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(as in effect for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2016)'' after ''section 162(m)(3)''.

(B) Section 409A(b)(3)(D)(ii) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(as in effect for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2016)'' after ''section 162(m)(3)''.

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(m), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) SPECIAL RULE FOR REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Remuneration shall not fail to be applicable employee remuneration merely because it is includible in the income of, or paid to, a person other than the covered individual, including after the death of the covered individual.''.

(e) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such guidance, rules, or regulations, including with respect to reporting, as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (6) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (H).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 202C. MODIFICATIONS TO RULES RELATING TO INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if—

''(A) such corporation would be a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting '80 percent' for '60 percent', or

''(B) such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation.

''(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes after November 30, 2015, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

''(B) after the acquisition, more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(i) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

''(ii) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership.

''(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN

COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) and the preceding sentence, the term 'substantial business activities' shall have the meaning given such term under regulations in effect on November 30, 2015, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 7874(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''after March 4, 2003,'' and inserting ''after March 4, 2003, and before December 1, 2015,''.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 7874 of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(ii) by inserting ''or (b)(2)(A)'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(i)'' in subparagraph (B),

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''or (b)(2)(B), as the case may be,'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(ii)'',

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(D) in paragraph (6), by inserting ''or inverted domestic corporation, as the case may be,'' after ''surrogate foreign corporation''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after November 30, 2015.

SA 2919. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2916 submitted by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2874 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. __. FREEDOM TO KEEP HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.

(a) ADVANCE PREMIUM TAX CREDITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments and repeals made by section 202 shall not apply to any individual who—

(A) receives an advanced payment under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of the premium tax credit under section 36B of the Internal Revenue of 1986 for the month of December 2017, and

(B) makes an election under this subsection at such time and in such manner as determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury.

(2) LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an individual for any month after which it is determined that such individual is not eligible to receive such an advanced payment (determined after the application of paragraph (1)).

(b) MEDICAID.—Any State that chooses to make medical assistance available under section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII)) to individuals described in that section may elect on or before December 31, 2017, to have the amendments made by section 207 not apply to the State and for the State to continue to make medical assistance available under its State Medicaid plan to all individuals as if such amendments had not taken effect.

SEC. __. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

"PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

''Sec. 59A. Fair share tax.

"SEC. 59A. FAIR SHARE TAX.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—

''(1) IMPOSITITION OF TAX.—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

''(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

''(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

''(I) the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, over

''(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

''(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

''(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

''(B) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year, determined without regard to any tax liability determined under this section,

''(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

''(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

''(b) TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

''(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

''(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

''(2) MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

''(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

''(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

''(B) TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

''(c) HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'high-income taxpayer' means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of $1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

''(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2016, the $1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $10,000.

''(d) PAYROLL TAX.—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

''(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such tax is attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year or wages or compensation received during such taxable year, over

''(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

''(f) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. __. MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON EXCESSIVE REMUNERATION.

(a) REPEAL OF PERFORMANCE-BASED COMPENSATION AND COMMISSION EXCEPTIONS FOR LIMITATION ON EXCESSIVE REMUNERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (B) through (E), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 162(m)(5) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof'' in subparagraph (E) and inserting ''subparagraph (B) thereof'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraphs (F) and (G)'' in subparagraph (G) and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)''.

(B) Section 162(m)(6) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof'' in subparagraph (D) and inserting ''subparagraph (B) thereof'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraphs (F) and (G)'' in subparagraph (G) and inserting ''subparagraphs (D) and (E)''.

(b) EXPANSION OF APPLICABLE EMPLOYER.—Paragraph (2) of section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) PUBLICLY HELD CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'publicly held corporation' means any corporation which is an issuer (as defined in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c))—

''(A) the securities of which are registered under section 12 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78l), or

''(B) that is required to file reports under section 15(d) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78o(d)).''.

(c) APPLICATION TO ALL CURRENT AND FORMER OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, AND EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by striking ''covered employee'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (4) and inserting ''covered individual'', and

(B) by striking ''such employee'' each place it appears in subparagraphs (A) and (E) of paragraph (4) and inserting ''such individual''.

(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(3) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered individual' means any individual who is an officer, director, or employee of the taxpayer or a former officer, director, or employee of the taxpayer.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 48D(b)(3)(A) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(as in effect for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2016)'' after ''section 162(m)(3)''.

(B) Section 409A(b)(3)(D)(ii) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(as in effect for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2016)'' after ''section 162(m)(3)''.

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(m), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) SPECIAL RULE FOR REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Remuneration shall not fail to be applicable employee remuneration merely because it is includible in the income of, or paid to, a person other than the covered individual, including after the death of the covered individual.''.

(e) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such guidance, rules, or regulations, including with respect to reporting, as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (6) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (H).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. ___. MODIFICATIONS TO RULES RELATING TO INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if—

''(A) such corporation would be a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting '80 percent' for '60 percent', or

''(B) such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation.

''(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes after November 30, 2015, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

''(B) after the acquisition, more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(i) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

''(ii) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership.

''(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) and the preceding sentence, the term 'substantial business activities' shall have the meaning given such term under regulations in effect on November 30, 2015, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 7874(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''after March 4, 2003,'' and inserting ''after March 4, 2003, and before December 1, 2015,''.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 7874 of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(ii) by inserting ''or (b)(2)(A)'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(i)'' in subparagraph (B),

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''or (b)(2)(B), as the case may be,'' after ''(a)(2)(B)(ii)'',

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ''subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)'', and

(D) in paragraph (6), by inserting ''or inverted domestic corporation, as the case may be,'' after ''surrogate foreign corporation''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after November 30, 2015.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 3, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MCCAIN. 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 December 3, 2015, at 10 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. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 3, 2015, at 9 a.m., to conduct a closed briefing entitled ''The U.S. Role in the Middle East.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCAIN. 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 December 3, 2015, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STUDENT SUCCESS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the conference report accompanying S. 1177.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report to accompany S. 1177, which will be stated by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1177), to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves, having met, have agreed that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment and the House agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the Record of November 30, 2015.)

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany S. 1177, an act to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, Mike Rounds, Deb Fischer, Dan Sullivan, Lisa Murkowski, Orrin G. Hatch, Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, Cory

Gardner, John Hoeven, John Cornyn, David Perdue, Johnny Isakson, Daniel Coats.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum be waived with respect to the cloture motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2359

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2359) to restore Second Amendment rights in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

NATIONAL BISON LEGACY ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 2032 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2032) to adopt the bison as the national mammal of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2032) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2032

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 ''National Bison Legacy Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) bison are considered a historical symbol of the United States;

(2) bison were integrally linked with the economic and spiritual lives of many Indian tribes through trade and sacred ceremonies;

(3) there are more than 60 Indian tribes participating in the Intertribal Buffalo Council;

(4) numerous members of Indian tribes are involved in bison restoration on tribal land;

(5) members of Indian tribes have a combined herd on more than 1,000,000 acres of tribal land;

(6) the Intertribal Buffalo Council is a tribal organization incorporated pursuant to section 17 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the ''Indian Reorganization Act'') (25 U.S.C. 477);

(7) bison can play an important role in improving the types of grasses found in landscapes to the benefit of grasslands;

(8) a small group of ranchers helped save bison from extinction in the late 1800s by gathering the remnants of the decimated herds;

(9) bison hold significant economic value for private producers and rural communities;

(10) according to the 2012 Census of Agriculture of the Department of Agriculture, as of 2012, 162,110 head of bison were under the stewardship of private producers, creating jobs and providing a sustainable and healthy meat source contributing to the food security of the United States;

(11) on December 8, 1905, William Hornaday, Theodore Roosevelt, and others formed the American Bison Society in response to the near extinction of bison in the United States;

(12) on October 11, 1907, the American Bison Society sent 15 captive-bred bison from the New York Zoological Park, now known as the ''Bronx Zoo'', to the first wildlife refuge in the United States, which was known as the ''Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge'', resulting in the first successful reintroduction of a mammal species on the brink of extinction back into the natural habitat of the species;

(13) in 2005, the American Bison Society was reestablished, bringing together bison ranchers, managers from Indian tribes, Federal and State agencies, conservation organizations, and natural and social scientists from the United States, Canada, and Mexico to create a vision for the North American bison in the 21st century;

(14) there are bison herds in National Wildlife Refuges and National Parks;

(15) there are bison in State-managed herds across 11 States;

(16) there is a growing effort to celebrate and officially recognize the historical, cultural, and economic significance of the North American bison to the heritage of the United States;

(17) a bison is portrayed on 2 State flags;

(18) the bison has been adopted by 3 States as the official mammal or animal of those States;

(19) a bison has been depicted on the official seal of the Department of the Interior since 1912;

(20) the buffalo nickel played an important role in modernizing the currency of the United States;

(21) several sports teams have the bison as a mascot, which highlights the iconic significance of bison in the United States;

(22) in the 2nd session of the 113th Congress, 22 Senators led a successful effort to enact a resolution to designate November 1, 2014, as the second annual National Bison Day; and

(23) members of Indian tribes, bison producers, conservationists, sportsmen, educators, and other public and private partners have participated in the annual National Bison Day celebration at several events across the United States and are committed to continuing this tradition annually on the first Saturday of November.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT AND ADOPTION OF THE NORTH AMERICAN BISON AS THE NATIONAL MAMMAL.

The mammal commonly known as the ''North American bison'' is adopted as the national mammal of the United States.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. on Monday, December 7, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 214; that there then be 30 minutes of debate on the nomination, and that following the use or yielding of time, the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; 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.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., Monday, December 7; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; finally, that at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

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 9:53 p.m., adjourned until Monday, December 7, 2015, at 2 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING ERIC ATKINSON, PRESIDENT OF ATKINSON CANDY COMPANY

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to recognize today an east Texas man and an east Texas family who have realized the American dream the old-fashioned way—through a lifetime of hard work with complete dedication to his family, to his community, and to his craft.

Eric Atkinson is President of the company founded by his grandfather B.E. Atkinson Sr. in 1932. Atkinson Candy Company of Lufkin, Texas is not only a beloved landmark in Angelina County, it is a Texas tradition with a loyal following of candy lovers all over the world. The company still uses the original family recipes and machinery to make its iconic signature Chick-O-Stick, Peanut Butter Bar, Long Boy, and other legendary candies. In fact, his peppermint recipe uses ingredients of such phenomenal quality that exceptional strategic work was required in order to manufacture it in a way that keeps the costs from being astronomical.

Eric is an active leader in the candy industry who has held a position on the board of the Convenience Distribution Association for more than fifteen years. For his commitment to the industry, Eric has received accolades from numerous trade groups, including the 1990 Candy Man of the Year from Southern Tobacco & Candy Association, the 1998 Dean Award and a 2013 Hall of Fame recognition from the Convenience Distribution Association, and the Doc Reed Silver Candy Dish Award from the National Confectioners' Association in 2008. He also received a 2010 nomination for the Kettle Award, which is the highest recognition an individual working within the U.S. confectionery industry can attain. Most recently, Eric Atkinson was honored by being inducted into the prestigious 2015 National Confectionery Sales Association's Candy Hall of Fame following in the footsteps of his father Dr. Basil E. Atkinson Jr., who was named to the Candy Hall of Fame in 2011.

Away from the confection industry, Eric is an avid supporter of area athletic programs as well as our nation's military and regularly makes product donations to charitable events all over the region. His organization also extends its goodwill worldwide, shipping sweets from the legendary candy kitchen to American military personnel serving overseas.

It is a distinct privilege to honor this remarkable man along with his organization, his family and their cumulative legacy of excellence, extraordinary leadership, exemplary character, boundless enthusiasm, and a work ethic that never ever quits. Eric Atkinson's commitment to time honored quality and the preservation of family values is now recorded in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

RECOGNIZING MR. CHARLES THOMAS HEAD FOR HIS LIFETIME OF SERVICE

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a distinguished citizen in my district, Mr. Charles Thomas Head. Later this month, Tommy will be retiring from banking after 38 years of tremendous service to the Mills County community.

Tommy began his career at Mills State Bank as a loan officer on October 1, 1977. He served in this position for nearly ten years before being elected President of Mills County State Bank. As president, his leadership helped the bank grow from $30 million in assets to over $290 million in assets. Tommy's hard work also helped the bank expand from one location to five throughout the area.

Although his professional accomplishments are impressive, Tommy's work within the community is even more extraordinary. He has been an active leader in countless community initiatives, including Goldthwaite's Texas Botanical Gardens & Native American Interpretive Center. The Native American Interpretive Center allows many residents of Mills County the opportunity to learn firsthand how generations of Native Americans in Texas have utilized the abundant resources Texas has to offer. The Texas Botanical Gardens is a living museum that offers visitors a look at the native plant species that were utilized by civilizations dating back 10–12,000 years ago. Many of these community initiatives would not be possible had it not been for the hard work, time, and dedication of Tommy Head.

In addition, Tommy has also been instrumental in assisting local high school students who have won the Congressional Art Competition. This event is a districtwide art contest where students submit entries to their representative's office. The winner of the competition is recognized with their artwork here in Washington, D.C. Many of these winners have come from Mills County, and Tommy has always voluntarily taken care of the costs associated with this trip for these students and their guardians. For many of these students, this is a trip of a lifetime and it is all possible because of Tommy's generosity.

We are blessed to have individuals in our country like Tommy. His selfless qualities exemplify every aspect of the American spirit and make our communities stronger. Tommy's lifetime of service will forever be an example of how people can make their home a better place.

On behalf of the 11th District, I am honored to recognize Tommy's distinguished career in serving Mills County. I wish nothing but the best for him and his wife, Wynona, as they embark on a new chapter in their life.

IN HONOR OF THE LATE SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the late Shirley Chisholm whose courage helped pave the way, for a little black girl from Selma to walk the hallowed halls of Congress as the Representative from Alabama's 7th Congressional District.

I strongly believe that in order to be a Congresswoman, I had to first see myself as a Congresswoman. The person who most embodied that was Shirley Chisholm. Through her—I was able to see that I too could be in Congress. I too could represent my community and work towards positive change for people who were denied a seat at the table.

I am fortunate to have met Ms. Chisholm before she passed away. I took a train to Mount Holyoke my senior year at Princeton to interview Ms. Chisholm for my senior thesis, "Black Women in Politics: Our Time Has Come." As luck would have it, it started to snow just as soon as I sat down in the chair across from her. My thirty minute interview turned into a four hour interview, and Ms. Chisholm shared the challenges and struggles she encountered as the first African-American woman ever elected to Congress.

Whenever I feel the weight of the world resting on my shoulder . . . I walk by her portrait hanging in the Capitol to remind myself of her strength, courage, and conviction. I know that whatever challenges I have encountered pale in comparison to the trials she faced. It was not easy for her to walk the halls of Congress as the only black woman. She opened the door for Barbara Jordan, and everyone else who followed including me.

Even though many barriers have been broken since her tenure here, there is still much work to do. Ms. Chisholm once said that "service is the rent we pay for the privilege of living on this earth." I can only hope that my service in this august body will one day inspire others to work for a better, more just society in the same manner that Shirley Chisholm has inspired me.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND ACHIEVEMENT OF RONALD MATHEWS

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary service of Mr. Ronald Mathews. Ronald, a lifelong resident of the City of Struthers, Ohio, has recently retired from a remarkable career as an elected councilman for 26 years spanning 13 election cycles—the longest tenure of service in the

town's history. As a union member for the Teamsters local 377, Ron always felt he was representing the middle class and working families. He was most proud when he could vote in favor of projects that would put union members to work and make the City of Struthers a better place to live and raise a family. Public servants like Ronald are what makes the civic fabric of the United States so strong. He will be missed in public life, but can enjoy retirement knowing he contributed greatly to Struthers. Ron loves Struthers, he loves his family, and has earned the respect of the citizens of our region. We were lucky to have him as a leader in our community, and I wish him a wonderful retirement with his wife, Pat, and 6 children.

TRIBUTE TO DETECTIVE FIRST GRADE DENNIS C. DeRIENZO

HON. DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize Detective First Grade Dennis DeRienzo of the New York City Police Department, Aviation Unit, for his dedication to the citizens of New York City and this Nation.

After 22½ years of service in the NYPD—the last ten years as Chief Pilot for the Aviation Unit—he retired on November 30th, 2015. He was appointed to the NYPD in August 1993 and subsequently entered Military Extended Leave from the NYPD. He served with distinction in the United States Marine Corps. Commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in June 1993, he graduated Naval Flight School in August 1996 and served as an AH–1W Super Cobra Pilot. In February 1999, while serving with Marine Light Attack Squadron 269 (HMLA–269), then-Captain DeRienzo suffered serious injuries in a crash. After the mishap, he was medically retired from the Marines as a result of his injuries after the Class A Mishap. Following extensive medical treatment and rehabilitation, he returned to active service with the New York City Police Department.

Detective DeRienzo was transferred to the NYPD Aviation Unit on September 10th, 2001, and was appointed Chief Pilot in July 2005. He has served as Chief Pilot for 10 years. During his years of service in the Aviation Unit, he guided and executed countless rescues of civilians and mariners. He likewise conducted countless support operations for his NYPD brothers and sisters on the ground. Additionally, Det. DeRienzo carried out multiple support operations for the President of the United States and distinguished visitors to the City of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Detective DeRienzo on his retirement from the NYPD and thank him for his dedication and service to this Nation and the People of the City of New York. I wish him and his family well in all future endeavors.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

HON. MARCIA L. FUDGE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor one of my personal heroes, former Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, who posthumously received the Presidential Medal of Freedom last week.

Congresswoman Chisholm was the first Black woman elected to the U.S. Congress and the first woman (and African American) to run for a major party's presidential nomination. The Congresswoman was also one of the 12 founders of the Congressional Black Caucus. She was a catalyst for change.

To quote Congresswoman Chisholm, "You don't make progress by standing on the sidelines, whimpering and complaining. You make progress by implementing ideas."

Let us remember her words during the remainder of our legislative session. The Members of this House have the opportunity to implement ideas that can transform this nation.

Just yesterday, we approved the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and address some of our nation's most pressing public education issues. The bill protects Title I funding, ensures equitable allocation of resources to schools, recognizes the importance of after-school education, and maintains subgroup disaggregation of data for reporting. The ESSA also gives states and local school districts more flexibility, while preserving the federal role in education and ensuring that states and districts honor the civil rights legacy of ESEA.

I am pleased my colleagues came together to pass this important bill. While not perfect, the ESSA is a step forward for public education in this country.

As Congresswoman Chisholm also said, "I don't measure America by its achievement but by its potential." Yesterday's actions showed the nation this Congress has great potential to put politics aside and serve the best interests of the American people.

May we continue in this spirit, and let us honor Congresswoman Chisholm by working together to improve the lives of all Americans.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PAUL T. O'DOWD, JR.

HON. AMI BERA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Lieutenant Colonel Paul T. O'Dowd, Jr.

Colonel O'Dowd was a father, husband, teacher, and American hero whose life was dedicated to service. After graduating high school in San Francisco, he joined the Marine Corps, fighting for his country in the Pacific Theater of World War II as a tail gunner on B–52 aircraft. Upon his return, he attended the University of San Francisco and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the United States Army Reserve.

In 1949, Paul volunteered for active duty and was stationed in Washington. When fighting in Korea broke out, he was assigned as forward observer in the 2nd Infantry Division. In 1951, Paul was captured by North Korean forces. Declared killed in action, he was held and tortured for 938 days. After nearly three years, he was released. For his meritorious conduct in captivity, Paul was awarded the Bronze Star.

His service in the Army did not end after his ordeal. Paul continued to work for his country throughout the Cold War. He was stationed in Germany for three years and advised the Republic of China and the Chinese National Army, earning the recognitions of "Good Man of Good Deeds" and the Medal of Army Brilliance. For his service to his country, Paul O'Dowd was awarded two Bronze Stars, a Purple Heart, the National Defense Service Medal, the Korean Service Medal, the UN Service Medal, the Air Medal, and the Legion of Merit.

Paul was a dad, a teacher, a husband, and an inspiration to many. He was a man who served his country and his family faithfully and fearlessly, and he will be missed.

"AMERICAN HERO, FORMER POW, REMEMBERED"

[From the Seoul Times]

For those who knew him he was Paul, "Digger," "The Old Man," "Dad," and "Friend" but others have said "he was an inspiration to keep the faith between brothers in arms." A True American Hero.

Dateline: Arlington National Cemetery. Dec. 3, 3:00 p.m. Full Military Honors. An honor guard marches, the band plays, as the caisson passes with flagged draped coffin to grave side.

Laid to rest and Flag folded, the volley fired, that let all present know that a hero has died, Taps plays the last time. He will receive the Medal of Army Brilliance, A Class from the Republic of China (Taiwan) for service to their defense.

His life was one of service to his country and community. As an educator with two master's degrees," he said. "He and Judy broke the norm with a marriage lasting 67 years." A Vets Veteran always helping others who had served. Making sure they received the benefits of their service both in the United States and overseas.

Paul T. O'Dowd Jr. was born in San Francisco Oct. 18, 1924, the son of Paul O'Dowd Sr. and Charlotta Belle Boudreaux O'Dowd. Grew up there and graduated from Lowell High School.

After graduation Paul enlisted in the Marine Corps for the duration, plus six months, during WWII and as a heavy machine gunner in the Marine Air Wing as tail gunner on B25's, he participated in four combat operations in the Pacific (Solomons, Leyte, Bismarck Archipelago, and Treasury Bougainville).

After the war, he attended the University of San Francisco under the G.I. Bill. In June of 1948 he was commissioned as an Army Reserve Second Lieutenant in the Coast Artillery.

When the Soviets denied Americans access to Berlin in early 1949, Paul volunteered for active duty and was assigned to the 37th Field Artillery Battalion, 2nd Infantry Division (ID), at Fort Lewis, Washington.

Shortly after the Korean War started, the 2nd Division was alerted for movement to Korea. Paul was transferred to "C" Battery, 15th Field Artillery as a forward observer.

From Pusan parameter to the breakout and all the way north and back south again supporting the Division and the units they supported.

In mid-February 1951 he was captured and held POW for 938 days. All the while the US Army had him declared KIA without a body. Over and over again he was isolated and beaten and put in solitary confinement for defying them.

The last to cross the bridge of no return, officially repatriated on 6 September 1953 two days after they closed down the POW reception station from operation ''Big Switch.''

At 5′10″ and only 89 lbs. he was truly at deaths door. Arrested, as he was not on any POW rosters, Paul was taken to Tokyo for interrogation, he proved himself and was recognized by Officers.

He went to school with other POW's having stood up against the torture and indoctrination of the Red Chinese and North Korean communist propaganda.

He was released, transferred stateside and spent more than six months at Letterman Army Hospital as a patient recuperating. He was then assigned as an assistant professor of military science in a ROTC program at the University of San Francisco.

While in this position, 1st Lt. O'Dowd was decorated by Major General William F. Dean with the Bronze Star for his meritorious achievements and conduct while a prisoner of war. Very rarely are POWS decorated for their actions while a prisoner.

On the Speakers Bureau; Paul would speak to groups about the brainwashing that occurred in the communists POW camps.

During the Cold War Captain O'Dowd was stationed in Germany for three and a half years as a Nuclear Weapons Employment Officer, working in an Honest John Missile Battalion and later with a 280mm Gun Battalion.

He also spent three years as an advisor to the Chinese National Army on the island of Taiwan. (MAAG) While in Taiwan in 1966, Major O'Dowd also received an award from the Republic of China for ''Good Man of Good Deeds,'' the highest honor in that country.

He stopped and rescued victims trapped in a burning building without considering his own safety and assisted in putting out the fire.

LTC O'Dowd received many medals and commendations for his military and civilian service; some are: two Bronze Stars with V device for Valor, a Purple Heart, the National Defense Service Medal, Korean Service Medal, UN Service Medal (Korea), The Air Medal, Army Commendation Medal, and The Legion of Merit. Chinese: Good Man of Good Deeds.

Teacher and educator, a scholar, a soldier, a good representative of the American way of life, and a family man; Paul was the real deal, a straight shooter and a True American Hero.

Having lived a long life, most of it in service to our country, to his fellow service members, and veterans, Paul O'Dowd died July 27, 2015 in his home in California at the age of 90.

The Defense Attaché: RADM Yang from the Republic of China (Taiwan) will present Paul at the funeral the Medal of Army Brilliance, A Class, signed by their Minister of National Defense to honor LTC O'Dowd's contribution to their defense.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S BELOVED F.M. ''BUBBA'' FISHER

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of Northwest Florida's beloved F.M. ''Bubba'' Fisher. A native son of Northwest Florida, Bubba's contributions to his community are unparalleled, and all of Northwest Florida mourns his passing.

Bubba was born and raised in Santa Rosa County, Florida. The youngest of nine children, he learned the value of hard work from his parents and siblings, while developing a lifelong love of the outdoors. After graduating from Milton High School in 1941, Bubba went to work in the family business until the tragic attack on Pearl Harbor, when he answered the call of duty, enlisting to serve in the U.S. Navy. During World War II, Bubba served with honor and distinction in the Pacific Theatre until the end of the war, when he returned home to Northwest Florida. Back home, Bubba took over the family business from his father and married his wife of nearly 70 years, Mildred.

Bubba's commitment to service and his dedication to his community were exemplified by his many years of public service, including two terms on the Milton City Council, two terms on the Santa Rosa County Board of Commissioners, four and a half terms as the Santa Rosa County Property Appraiser, and two terms as Chairman of the Florida Property Appraiser's Association. In addition to his public service and business success, Bubba was deeply committed to serving the Lord and his church community. A life-long member of First Baptist Church of Milton, Bubba taught Sunday School for 25 years, and he and Mildred raised their children in a strong faith-based home.

Throughout his life, Bubba worked tirelessly to serve his Nation and community, to carry on the family business, and to help raise a family. To some Bubba will be remembered as a veteran, who joined with so many in the Greatest Generation to defeat fascism; to others he will be remembered as a long-time public servant, who went above and beyond to help better the community that he loved; to his friends and family, he will be most fondly remembered as a loving husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I am honored to recognize the life and legacy of my friend, Bubba Fisher. My wife Vicki and I extend our heartfelt prayers and deepest condolences to his wife, Mildred; son, F.M. ''Dusty''; grandchildren, Jason, Brandon, and Candice; great-grandchildren, Sarah, Ben, Grayson, Macey and Noah; and the entire Fisher family.

HONORING NAZARETH ACADEMY ON WINNING THEIR SECOND CONSECUTIVE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Nazareth Academy and the Roadrunners football team. On November 26, the Nazareth Academy Roadrunners won their second consecutive Illinois High School Association football championship with an impressive 42–21 victory over Lincoln-Way West. I want to congratulate Coach Tim Racki, the faculty and staff of Nazareth Academy, and the young men on this team whose dedication led to this achievement.

The Nazareth Academy varsity football team finished the season with a distinguished 12–2 record. In the championship game, Nazareth held an extraordinary 35–0 lead at halftime. Football is a demanding sport that requires teamwork, enthusiasm and perseverance. The Roadrunners demonstrated these qualities with true distinction.

But Nazareth is about more than football for the players. As Nazareth's principal Deborah Tracy said following the championship game, ''More important than any one victory, Nazareth strives to develop more respectful, kind, faith-filled and service-oriented student-athletes.'' That was clear to me when I visited Nazareth after last year's championship.

This impressive victory was the sixth state championship win for Coach Tim Racki. Coach Racki's strong leadership and dedication propelled the Nazareth football team to success. The talents of Coach Racki have been evident throughout his career, and his commitment to sportsmanship is recognized throughout the state of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this truly impressive achievement made by the Nazareth Academy Roadrunners football team and to congratulate them on their state championship. Additionally, I wish each player continued success as he moves forward.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call 657, I voted no but I intended to vote yes.

HONORING JOSHUA KEITH DUTCHER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Joshua Keith Dutcher. Joshua is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 714, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Joshua has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Joshua has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Joshua has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Joshua replaced the old wooden street signs with new metal signs in his hometown of Camden Point, Missouri. Thirty-four years prior, his father's Eagle Service Project was to build and install the wooden street signs that Joshua updated.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Joshua Keith Dutcher for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING HARRY SERAYDARIAN

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Harry Seraydarian, who is retiring this year from his position as the Executive Director of the North Bay Watershed Association (NBWA) in Corte Madera, California. Mr. Seraydarian has worked tirelessly throughout his long and productive career to protect watershed resources and natural spaces in our region, both with the NBWA and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

A lifelong advocate for the environment, Mr. Seraydarian spent most of his working years in government. In his decades of service with the EPA, Mr. Seraydarian distinguished himself as a Director of the Water Management Division, Director of Toxics & Waste Management, and an Associate Regional Administrator in the EPA's Region 9. In his final role, he served as an in-house ''neutral,'' using his extensive problem solving skills and technical knowledge to resolve disputes.

If there's a challenge unsuited to Mr. Seraydarian, it may be retirement. Following a 33-year federal career, he retired in 2002, but quickly reentered the workforce in 2004 as the NBWA's Executive Director. Under his leadership, the NBWA has funded 36 projects the North Bay, totaling nearly one million dollars. The Association, a consortium of 16 regional and local public agencies in Marin, Sonoma, and Napa counties, has encouraged collaboration across different levels of government, and, in no small part to Mr. Seraydarian's efforts, has enhanced stewardship efforts in the North Bay watershed.

Mr. Seraydarian's varied and significant talents, particularly in environmental mediation and conflict resolution, will not soon be forgotten. Our local environment is a better place today thanks to his technical abilities, managerial experience, and dedication to results-driven conservation.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Seraydarian's enduring commitment to improving our watersheds and environment is admirable and worthy of our recognition. I urge my colleagues to join me in extending our congratulations to him on his retirement and our best wishes to him on his next adventure.

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 2, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8) to modernize energy infrastructure, build a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce, bolster America's energy security and diplomacy, and promote energy efficiency and government accountability, and for other purposes:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the crude oil export amendment.

In the past 10 years, the United States has undergone an energy revolution.

But due to our success in places like Texas, North Dakota and Colorado the price of oil has fallen from $100 per barrel to $40.

Gasoline prices have fallen from almost $4 per gallon to less than $2.

All of this has benefitted our economy and the consumer.

I support crude oil exports.

But I want to protect our domestic manufacturing jobs, including refining.

We have the resource, we should use as much as possible here at home and sell what is left.

The crude oil export ban has been in place since 1975.

In the 1970s, the United States put the ban in place to protect our national interests.

That's more than 40 years of legislative history.

Before we do away with that history, we should make sure we have a policy that will make sense for the next 40 years and perhaps beyond.

Crude oil is a valuable national resource and the government should have some oversight as to where and when we send crude overseas.

I was hoping we could craft language that would create a process at the Bureau of Industry and Security, within the Department of Commerce, that would establish an authorization and reporting requirements for crude oil.

We should have some basic requirements at the Department of Commerce to oversee crude.

Unlike LNG, crude is a raw commodity and raw crude doesn't have value added.

If exporting crude is the right policy, then let's do it correctly.

Let's maximize the benefits for the United States.

Let's make sure U.S. crude doesn't end up in the hands of North Korea or any of our other foes.

The Department of Commerce has approved every application to export oil in the last five years.

Now, I agree that the Department could approve permits more efficiently but that's something we can legislate.

That's a ''fix'' I can support and believe would help our upstream producers.

Unfortunately, we were unable to find that compromise.

I do not want to oppose this language but without changes it is not in the best interest of our country.

The time to address exports is now but we cannot just open the tap and hope for the best.

I do not want the United States to become a resource nation.

I look forward to working on this issue again and hope that a reasonable, commonsense approach can be reached.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1177, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 2, 2015

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which seeks to replace the broken No Child Left Behind law. While I still have concerns with some provisions in this legislation, I believe this bill will serve our children better than the status quo. For example, the current waiver system has allowed states to ignore schools that are failing students. That is unacceptable and cannot continue.

I am concerned by the lack of federal oversight in implementing and enforcing many provisions of this bill. For example, states are left to determine how and when to intervene in schools that are failing children. We must guarantee that there is substantial federal role in ensuring states meet their obligations. Further, we must guarantee state and district implementation boards are inclusive, diverse, and adequately represent students of all needs and circumstances.

Despite shortcomings in the bill, I was pleased to see that states will now be required to collect and report data on incidences of bullying and harassment in school—an issue I have been working on for many years. It is a small, but powerful step in ensuring all children feel safe at school.

I voted for this bill because No Child Left Behind is simply not working. In four years, I look forward to revisiting reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to achieve an even more effective long-term policy.

IN HONOR OF THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE IMMIGRANT WELCOME CENTER

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. I rise today to honor the Immigrant Welcome Center, whose tireless work over the past ten years has blessed countless Hoosiers in my hometown of Indianapolis.

The Immigrant Welcome Center was founded in 2005 by Mayor Bart Peterson and First Lady Amy Minick Peterson who sought to discover ways the City of Indianapolis could be more welcoming to its newest residents. Serving as a trusted liaison between newcomers and the community at large, the Immigrant Welcome Center provides a strong and positive voice for the foreign-born newcomers who represent 120 different nationalities and speak more than 90 languages. Today the organization continues to build connections between immigrants and the city's social, cultural and business communities, making Indianapolis a more diverse and innovative place for all residents.

The Immigrant Welcome Center is built on a model of empowerment that trains immigrants

and refugees as Natural Helpers in understanding the resources and opportunities available in our community. These Natural Helpers then help their fellow foreign-born brothers and sisters navigate the maze of available services and connect them to people, places and resources necessary to build successful lives. The organization has also helped make Indianapolis a leader among welcoming cities across the United States as part of the national Welcoming America Initiative's programs and outreach.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Immigrant Welcome Center for its efforts to strengthen and integrate our growing foreign-born community, helping make Indianapolis a more welcoming and vibrant international city.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK TAKAI

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, December 2, I was absent from the House due to illness. Due to my absence, I am not recorded on any legislative measures for the day. I would like to reflect how I would have voted had I been present for legislative business.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on Roll Call 653, the previous question providing for consideration of the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''no'' on Roll Call 654, the rule providing for consideration of the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''yea'' on Roll Call 655, the Democratic Motion to Instruct Conferees on the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''no'' on Roll Call 656, the Upton of Michigan Amendment No. 1 to the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''yea'' on Roll Call 657, the Tonko of New York Amendment No. 2 to the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''no'' on Roll Call 658, the Gene Green of Texas Amendment No. 14 to the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''yea'' on Roll Call 659, the Beyer of Virginia Amendment No. 17 to the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''yea'' on Roll Call 660, the Schakowsky of Illinois Amendment No. 19 to the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''yea'' on Roll Call 661, the Tonko of New York Amendment No. 22 to the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''yea'' on Roll Call 662, the Schakowsky of Illinois Amendment No. 19 to the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''yea'' on Roll Call 663, the Castor of Florida Amendment No. 23 to the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''no'' on Roll Call 664, the Barton of Texas Amendment No. 25 to the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I would have voted ''yea'' on Roll Call 665, agreeing to the Conference Report to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

CONGRATULATING TURKEY FOR HOSTING THE ANNUAL G20 LEADERS SUMMIT IN ANTALYA, NOVEMBER 15–16, 2015

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Republic of Turkey for hosting the successful annual G20 Leader's Summit in Antalya, November 15–16, 2015.

While Syria and the fight against terrorists was already on the agenda, the Paris terrorist attacks by ISIS ensured that these issues remained in the forefront. Ultimately, the G20 countries issued a strong statement condemning the heinous terrorist attacks, uniting to combat them, remain committed to fighting the financial tools used, and supporting a comprehensive approach to one of the international community's greatest challenges in this century.

The G20 was established on September 26, 1999 when the Finance Ministers of the G7 countries (Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States) came together after the Asian financial crisis. The inaugural meeting was held in Berlin in December 1999.

The G20 countries are Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the European Union. The economies of the countries combined account for 85% of the global economic output, 80% of world trade, and 65% of the world's population.

When the group met for the first time in Washington, DC represented by world leaders in 2008, they discussed ways to respond collectively to the 2008–09 crisis to restore growth, strengthen the global financial system, and reform international financial institutions.

Turkey officially took over the presidency of the G20 from Australia in December 1, 2014 and China will preside over the organization in 2016.

The other three key objectives of the 2015 G20 Leader's Summit in Antalya were strengthening the global recovery, enhancing resilience, and buttressing sustainability.

Turkey's growing economy is significant because Turkey's companies are expanding and trading with not only traditional markets such as neighboring countries or the European Union, but Turkish firms are also increasingly looking to invest in the United States, including Indian country.

I am proud to have sponsored legislation which facilitated the investment from not only Turkey, but all WTO countries in native lands.

As a member of Congress who has long championed US-Turkish relations and economic integration, I congratulate Turkey on hosting this important summit at a challenging time.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF CHARLES W. MARSH

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Charles W. Marsh, who celebrates his 100th birthday on December 6th in Hanson, Massachusetts.

Mr. Marsh embodies the quintessential American story. Born in Massachusetts in 1915 to a mother who came to the United States from Ireland with his older sister, Olive, Mr. Marsh lived in the town of Weymouth with his family until he joined the U.S. Army.

After serving overseas in Germany, he returned to the United States and continued to support his country through the critical work of the Quincy Shipyard. Following this time, Mr. Marsh remained in Quincy and began his long and dedicated career as an auto body worker.

A gifted marksman with rifle and bow, Mr. Marsh was an outdoorsman at heart. He was so renowned for his knowledge of New England's beaches and coastline that, during the blizzard of 1978, he was called upon by the U.S. Coast Guard to assist in search and rescue operations.

During his time working in Quincy, Mr. Marsh and his wife, Miriam, built a house on Gurnet Point in Plymouth, Massachusetts. For 16 years, they were the first year-round residents on this small historic peninsula, named by the Pilgrims in the 1600s for its resemblance to headlands in the English Channel where gurnett fish were plentiful. Deciding that a change of scenery was in order, the Marshes then moved north to the picturesque shores of Lake Winnipesaukee in Alton, New Hampshire.

Mr. Marsh will be celebrating his centennial birthday surrounded by four generations of loving family, which has grown to include three children, eight grandchildren, eleven great grandchildren and three great, great grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Charles W. Marsh on his 100th birthday. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing him many more years of health and happiness.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, December 2, 2015 I was inadvertently detained on roll call vote 656, the Manager's Amendment. I was on a very important phone call with my constituents. Had I been present to vote I would have voted 'aye.'

TRIBUTE TO YOUNG STAFF MEMBERS FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS AND THE UNITED STATES

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress we know well, perhaps better than most, how blessed our nation is to have in reserve such exceptional young men and women who will go on to become leaders in their local communities, states, and the nation in the areas of business, education, government, philanthropy, the arts and culture, and the military.

We know this because we see them and benefit from their contributions every day. Many of them work for us in our offices as junior staff members, congressional fellows, or interns and they do amazing work for and on behalf of the constituents we are privileged to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no higher calling than the call to serve a cause larger than ourselves. That is why I ran for public office. I was inspired to serve by President Kennedy who said, ''Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country,'' and by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. who said: ''Everybody can be great because anybody can serve. . . . You only need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love.''

By this measure, there are several other great young men and women who served as volunteers this year in my offices. They may toil in obscurity but their contributions to the constituents we serve are deeply appreciated. That is why today I rise to pay tribute to six extraordinary young persons for their service to my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas and to the American people. They are: Erin Wallace from Texas Tech University; Tyler Ford from North Carolina State University; Brandon Jester from Georgia Southern University; Benjamin Warheit from University of California at Santa Barbara; Talha Jilani from Sidwell Friends School; and Asad Moten from Harvard University and the F. Edward Hébert School of Medicine at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

Mr. Speaker, the energy, intelligence, and idealism these wonderful young people brought to my office and those interning in the offices of my colleagues help keep our democracy vibrant. The insights, skills, and knowledge of the governmental process they gain from their experiences will last a lifetime and prove invaluable to them as they go about making their mark in this world.

Because of persons like them the future of our country is bright and its best days lie ahead. I wish them all well.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that such thoughtful committed young men and women can be found working in my office, those of my colleagues, and in every community in America. Their good works will keep America great, good, and forever young.

PROMOTING HEALTHY CHILDREN

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Harmony Science Academy in Katy, Texas for winning the It's Time Texas (ITT) Growing Healthy Schools campaign.

The Growing Healthy Schools campaign helps organize and fundraise for projects to improve health and wellness in the school's community. For their project, Harmony Science Academy chose to construct a new soccer field to encourage everybody to get outside and get moving. Of the 17 participating schools, Harmony Science was selected to receive $10,000 to complete their project. What an incredible accomplishment for the entire school community.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Harmony Science Academy for promoting healthy living. We're ready to get out on the field and play.

CONGRATULATING MISS ERICKA WHEELER ON HER SELECTION AS A RHODES SCHOLAR

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary young scholar, Miss Ericka Wheeler. Ericka is currently a senior at Millsap College majoring in English and History with plans to become a physician after watching her grandfather suffer from Alzheimer's disease.

Ericka wrote a thesis tracking how police brutality and race have been treated in fiction since the 1930s. She attended Greenwood High School for two years, followed by her junior and senior year at the Mississippi School of Math and Science in Columbus.

Her journeys so far have taken her from Mississippi to Cambodia and Cuba. Her next stop will be England, as a Rhodes Scholar. She is the first African-American woman from Mississippi to claim the prestigious honor and has been chosen as one of 32 U.S. men and women who will enter Oxford University next fall for postgraduate study. Ericka, who plans to attend medical school later, said she will study medical anthropology.

Millsap's President Robert Pearigen said Wheeler's devotion to Mississippi's Delta region is part of what makes her special. ''She encountered some of the greatest poverty and starkest racial divisions found in the developed world,'' Pearigen said in a statement. ''She is bound to the place by a sense of duty but is motivated to care for it by a love for its people.''

Ericka said she was inspired to become a physician after watching her grandfather suffer from Alzheimer's disease. Since his death, she's worked with other Alzheimer's patients to record their life stories, producing documents for their families.

Wheeler credited the impetus for her application to history Professor Robert McElvaine. As a student of McElvaine, Wheeler traveled to Vietnam and Cambodia after her freshman year and to Cuba after her sophomore year. ''I remember him saying the chances weren't very great at all, but it would be a good process to go through,'' Wheeler said. ''They didn't want to get my hopes up.''

I urge Miss Wheeler to continue to break barriers and strive for academic excellence.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Miss Ericka Wheeler for her dedication to serving others and scholastic achievement.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CAREER AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF ISMAEL AHMED

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ismael Ahmed for his extraordinary career in service to our community. Ish, as he is known by friends, family and colleagues, has enriched the lives of so many in our region through his tireless, collaborative efforts for understanding and civil rights.

Born in 1947 in New York, Ish and his family moved to the Detroit area when he was six. After graduating from Dearborn's Fordson High School, he set off to explore the world, working as a deck hand on freighters. Eventually Ish returned to Dearborn, where he gained employment at the Ford Rouge plant and worked his way through college, first at Henry Ford Community College, then graduating from University of Michigan Dearborn. After his graduation, Ish became involved in his community, organizing workers and seeking justice in his community.

In 1971, along with a dedicated group of volunteers and activists, Ish co-founded ACCESS the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services in a storefront in Dearborn's south end, to help assist the Arab immigrant population as they adapted to life in the U.S. In 1983, he was appointed as Executive Director of ACCESS and worked diligently on its programming and growth. Today, ACCESS is the largest Arab American human services nonprofit in the country, serving nearly 900,000 people through more than 100 programs aimed at supporting economic, health, social, and educational needs. For this reason among others, Ish is recognized as a national Arab American and civil rights leader committed to ending hatred and bigotry and seeking justice for all Americans.

In 2007, Governor Jennifer Granholm appointed Ish as the director of the Michigan Department of Human Services, where he successfully led the state's second largest department for three years. As Department of Human Services' director, he served on the Michigan State Housing Development Authority board and the Early Childhood Investment Corporation executive committee. In 2011, Ish returned to the University of Michigan Dearborn and has served as the Senior Advisor to the Chancellor and Associate Provost for Metropolitan Impact. In this role, Ish has built bridges and made major positive impacts in our region.

Ish has also generously given his time and support to a wide array of Southeast Michigan

organizations further establishing him as a critical leader in a wide array of community, political, non-profit and cultural institutions such as: the Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan, United Way, Reading Works, the Arab American National Museum, Eastern Michigan University's Board of Regents, Arab American Institute, Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit Symphony Orchestra, Association of Performing Arts Presenters, University of Michigan Citizens Advisory Board, Fair Food Network, and the New Detroit Coalition.

Most remarkably, Ish's family has graciously shared his talents and time with our community. He is a loving husband to his wife Margaret, father to his five children, and grandfather to two. I know in his retirement he is looking forward to spending more time with them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring Ismael Ahmed for his lifetime of service and lasting impact on our region and country. We thank him for his leadership, and wish him many years of happiness and success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call 650 on final passage of S.J. Res. 24, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the EPA's CO_2 rule for existing power plants, I would have voted Aye, which is consistent with my position on this legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 658 I mistakenly pressed NAY when I intended to vote YEA.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, on December 2, 2015, I was unable to vote on the Conference Report to accompany S. 1177, the Every Student Succeeds Act (Roll Call Number 655). Had I been present, I would have voted Yes.

''BILLIONAIRE BONANZA''—WEALTH INEQUALITY IN AMERICA

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring my colleagues' attention to a recent report from the Institute for Policy Studies, ''Billionaire Bonanza: the Forbes 400 and the Rest of Us.''

This report exposes just how drastic wealth inequality in America has become. As a whole, America is now wealthier than it has ever been before. But that wealth is concentrated in the hands of just a few Americans. The 20 wealthiest individual Americans have more wealth than the lowest 50% combined—that is, 20 Americans with more wealth than 152 million Americans.

The report ''Billionaire Bonanza'' found that the wealthiest 186 members of the Forbes 400 own as much wealth as the entire Latino population in America. The wealthiest 100 households in America own about as much wealth as the entire African American population in the United States. Economic inequality is also racial inequality.

Congress needs to enact common-sense policies to close the loopholes that have allowed for this extreme wealth inequality. It is time to raise revenue so we can increase opportunities for those at the lowest rung of the economic ladder to climb toward the top. I thank Chuck Collins and Josh Hoxie, the authors of this critical report, and I urge my colleagues to consider their proposals and to take action against the unsustainable concentration of wealth in America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 659, I was unavoidably detained off the House Floor and was unable to cast a vote. Had I been present, I would have voted no.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote Numbers 660, 661, 663, and 664, I was unavoidably detained and unable to cast my votes. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on Roll Call Numbers 660, 661, and 663 and I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call vote number 664.

RECOGNIZING HAROLD GRIFFITH

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Harold Griffith on being selected for induction into the Farm Credit Colorado Agriculture Hall of Fame. This honor is reserved for those who have made a significant contribution to the agricultural industry of Colorado and the United States.

Currently, Mr. Griffith resides in Fort Morgan where he has been a leader in the dairy industry. He has been a pioneer by developing programs through the Dairy Catch It Program, which helps youth pursue careers in agriculture. Mr. Griffith clearly understands the importance of giving back to his community.

In addition, Mr. Griffith has extensive knowledge of Colorado water rights. This ultimately led to him being asked to serve on Governor Ritter's Water Task Force. Griffith has shown true leadership in his industry and community.

On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes as Mr. Griffith pursues his future endeavors. His passion and dedication to the agricultural industry makes him more than worthy of this distinct recognition. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Mr. Harold Griffith for his accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. LUTHER CONYERS

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend an outstanding public servant and champion of education, Mr. Luther Conyers. Mr. Conyers will be retiring this month after serving 37 years on the Bainbridge City Council in Bainbridge, Georgia. He was first elected to the Bainbridge City Council in 1977 but his passion as an educator began long before then.

Mr. Conyers earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Agriculture in 1948 from Georgia State Industrial College, now Savannah State University, where he met his wife, Gwendolyn. Their daughters, Audrey and Luthenya, and their granddaughter, Leslie also attended Savannah State University so it is no wonder that the Conyers family was chosen as ''SSU Family of the Year'' in 2009. Mr. and Mrs. Conyers, co-sponsors of the Conyers-Kirbo Endowed Scholarship Fund for the school, were inducted into the 2015 Hall of Fame at Savannah State University.

Mr. Conyers first taught in the Institutional On-Farm Training Program designed for World War II veterans before joining the U.S. Army. He completed basic training at Fort Jackson, South Carolina and advanced training at Fort Bliss, Texas, before deploying to Korea, where he served 16 months and 27 days. He earned three Bronze Stars as a member of the transportation crew and he taught education classes while deployed.

After returning home to Bainbridge in 1942, he served as a substitute teacher and enrolled at Fort Valley State College, now University. He was employed at Randolph County High School for six months, and beginning in 1954, he taught at Bainbridge Elementary School. He earned a Master's in Education from Florida A&M University in 1961. In 1965, he transferred to Hutto High School in Bainbridge to teach social studies before transferring to Hutto Junior High School in 1970, where he taught eighth and ninth grade.

Throughout his tenure of service on the Bainbridge City Council, Mr. Conyers has been a champion of education but most importantly, he has given his all to improving the community he serves. In recognition of his efforts, in 2008, Mr. Conyers was inducted into

the Georgia Municipal Government Hall of Fame, which "recognizes current and former city officials who have made extraordinary contributions to their communities and actively participated in the Association." In 2012, he was one of four city officials to receive the prestigious Certificate of Distinction from the Georgia Municipal Training Institute at the Georgia Municipal Association's (GMA) Annual Mayors' Day Conference. He has actively served on GMA committees that oversee employee retirement benefits and training courses for leaders of cities across Georgia.

Mr. Conyers is heavily involved in the community and is a member of the Rotary Club, American Legion Post No. 502, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Bainbridge-Decatur County Chamber of Commerce. He is also the City Council's liaison to the city's Planning Commission and teaches about planning and zoning issues during Bainbridge's annual Student Government Days.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays often said: "You make your living by what you get, you make your life by what you give." Throughout his life, Mr. Conyers has done so much for so many for so long. He is an example of public service at its finest and his advocacy on behalf of students of all ages has been invaluable throughout the state of Georgia. His service to his country and his community are but a small testimony to the high caliber of character that he embodies.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me and my wife Vivian, and the more than 730,000 people of Georgia's Second Congressional District, in recognizing and commending Mr. Luther Conyers for his leadership in education and service to his community.

INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION HONORING BERRY GORDY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution honoring the achievements of Berry Gordy, Jr. and his musical legacy, Motown Records. By establishing the Motown record label in 1959 in Detroit, MI, Mr. Gordy cultivated the careers of musical legends such as Smokey Robinson, Michael Jackson, Diana Ross, Stevie Wonder, and many, many more. Not only did the music of Motown advance its way to the top of the charts and the front of the music scene with timeless hits such as "Please Mr. Postman" and "Ain't No Mountain High Enough," but it also communicated across race barriers and touched people regardless of the color of their skin. In a racially divided and politically charged time, Motown Records, under the leadership of Mr. Gordy, was the first to integrate an all-white sales department and produce music beloved by all.

Mr. Gordy's accomplishments are reflected in his numerous awards and recognitions including his induction into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, his autobiography "To Be Loved: The Music, the Magic, the Memories of Motown," and the Broadway success of "Motown The Musical."

Decades after its inception, Motown is remembered as one of the most significant creative outlets of the 20th century, and the music it fostered continues to entertain and inspire us all. Thanks to Mr. Gordy, Motown created a uniquely American sound and defined the American experience for generations. Through this resolution, we recognize and thank Mr. Gordy for creating a timeless musical sound, for being a force of positive social change, and for his countless contributions to American culture.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I was not present in the House chamber for the following roll call votes. Had I been present on November 16th, 17th, 19th and 30th, I would have voted "yea" on roll calls 627, 628, 632, 640, 642, 644 and 645 and "nay" on roll calls 626, 629, 630, 631, 633, 638, 639, 641 and 643.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JERRY McNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, on December 2, 2015, the House took roll call vote 644. I am recorded as voting "aye" on this amendment, but I want to reflect that I intended to vote "no" and oppose the Barton of Texas Amendment No. 25 to H.R. 8.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF MAGGIE LOUISE KNIGHT KNOX

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a terrific educator and beloved mother, grandmother and cousin, Mrs. Maggie Louise Knight Knox of Martin County, North Carolina. Sadly, Mrs. Knox passed away on Saturday, November 28, 2015. A Homegoing Celebration will be held on Friday, December 4, 2015 at 11:00 a.m. at the Michigan Park Christian Church in Washington, D.C.

Born on February 3, 1928 to the late Annie Slade Knight and Eddie Knight, Maggie Louise Knight Knox, known as Louise or Lou to family and friends, grew up on the family farm in Martin County, North Carolina. She developed a passion for education early on and immediately upon graduation from Winston Salem State University, she began her teaching career within the Charles County Public School System.

Her abiding commitment to education was reflected in her personal academic achievements, as she pursued a higher level of education with her enrollment at the D.C. Teachers' College. She participated in the Teachers' Program at Columbia University, culminating in her receipt of a Master's Degree in Education at Trinity College. Ultimately, Maggie Louise accepted a tenured position as a third grade teacher at J.C. Nalle Elementary School in Southeast Washington, D.C.

After nurturing and educating three generations of students, Maggie Louise retired with more than thirty years of service as an educator. She was considered to be one of the most respected Reading Specialists in District of Columbia Public Schools. Even after her retirement and to this day, she is fondly remembered by many of her students.

Her passion for education mirrored her everlasting faith as a woman of God. Accepting Christ as her Savior at an early age, Maggie Louise began her Christian life in Martin County, North Carolina and continued her Christian journey in Washington, D.C. where she became an active member in Michigan Park Christian Church in 1960. She brought her God-given teaching talents into the church, teaching Vacation Bible School and Sunday school. She was a chairperson of the Diaconate and a member the Christian Women's Fellowship. As is the church's tradition, in her eightieth year of life, Maggie Louise Knight Knox was humbly inducted into the Diamond Club.

To Maggie Louise, family was everything. It was on May 5, 1950, in Washington, D.C., that Maggie Louise married her loving husband, Mr. Reese Conway Knox. Devoted and committed to each other, the union of Maggie Louise and Reese produced three beautiful daughters: Regina Louise, Denise Yvette and Edna Teresa.

On a more personal note, Maggie Louise and I are born of the same lineage—the Slades of North Carolina. The union of Simon and Anna Slade produced thirteen children. Of those children, Walter Columbus Slade (grandfather of Maggie Louise) and Robert Slade (my grandfather), were born. Maggie retained many valuable lessons from her youth, but the most important one came from her grandfather, Walter Columbus Slade: "Always stick together." Maggie fervently adopted this as a guiding force throughout her life and passed that same value to her daughters and grandchildren. The concept of "staying together" is extremely important in our family. We annually gather for reunions throughout the nation and remain close with one another throughout our lives.

George Washington Carver once said, "How far you go in life depends on your being tender with the young, compassionate with the aged, sympathetic with the striving and tolerant of the weak and strong because someday in your life you will have been all of these." Maggie Louise was a gentle and loving woman who treated all people with respect. She loved her God. Her wisdom and kindness goes unmatched, and her gentle soul served humanity in a special way. Each day she graced the people around her with an enthusiastic sincerity of presence. The impression she leaves on earth extends beyond herself to those whom she inspired and supported, and for it she will be remembered for time to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me and my wife, Vivian, in paying tribute to Mrs. Maggie

Louise Knight Knox for her outstanding achievements, service, and public distinction. We pray that her children, grandchildren and loved ones will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE RECOGNIZED FOR EXCELLENCE IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION WITH SENATOR PAUL SIMON AWARD

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to recognize Mount Holyoke College and its accomplishments in international education. On November 17, Mount Holyoke College President Lynn Pasquerella accepted the 2015 Senator Paul Simon Award for excellence in international education at a ceremony in Washington, D.C. The week of November 16 marked the 16th anniversary of International Education Week.

Mount Holyoke College, located in South Hadley, Massachusetts, was among five institutions selected to receive this prestigious honor from NAFSA: Association of International Educators. The designation is given to institutions that demonstrate significant progress in expanding the reach and fostering collaboration among students, faculty, and staff in the interest of internationalization.

Twenty-five percent of Mount Holyoke students are international citizens and the college boasts a rich tradition of leadership in international education. Mount Holyoke was among the first institutions to send women abroad for scholarly study. Additionally, the McCulloch Center for Global Initiatives was established in 2004 to serve as a catalyst for comprehensive international education.

According to Eva Paus, Carol Hoffmann Collins Director of the McCulloch Center for Global Initiatives and professor of economics, international education became a strategic priority at Mount Holyoke in 2003, following on a legacy of international engagement reaching back to the early days of the college's founding. The McCulloch Center, which Professor Paus helped found, brought greater cohesion and visibility to international education; and its many initiatives across Mount Holyoke have increased students' understanding of the global world and their engagement with other cultures.

In classes and through off-campus experiences, students and faculty analyze questions from cross-disciplinary or cross-cultural perspectives, making connections between the local and the global, and harnessing classroom learning to solve concrete problems. The many forms of integrative and cross-cultural teaching and learning at Mount Holyoke and abroad support the college's goal of educating women to be the global leaders of tomorrow.

Today, Mount Holyoke is committed to giving all students access to the life-changing experiences that learning abroad often provides. Over the past few years, it has funded nearly all students who apply for a Laurel Fellowship in support of study abroad. Additionally, a 2013 pledge to fund one summer internship or research experience for every student now makes it possible for all interested students to have an internship abroad.

Mount Holyoke was joined in receiving the 2015 Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization by North Central College of Naperville, Illinois, the University of Delaware, the University of San Diego, and the University of Virginia. President Pasquerella participated in a panel discussion on internationalization in higher education with presidents of the other award-winning institutions to promote this vital pursuit. The award is named for noted Illinois Senator Paul Simon.

Mr. Speaker, through courses, conferences, research, international internships, study abroad, collaborations with external partners, and the unique learning opportunities offered by international student and faculty diversity, Mount Holyoke College students acquire the skills they will need for citizenship and careers in today's global world. At a time when the ability to work across national borders is crucial to addressing global problems, I wish Mount Holyoke College and the McCulloch Center for Global Initiatives continued success in their future endeavors.

WELCOME LUCY GRACE STIPICEVIC

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to congratulate Deputy Chief of Staff for Floor and Member Services John Stipicevic and his wife, Kristin Stipicevic, Executive Assistant in the Office of the Majority Leader, on the birth of their new baby girl. Lucy Grace Stipicevic was born at 11:15 a.m. on Saturday, November 28, 2015. Born at Sibley Memorial Hospital in Washington, D.C., Lucy weighed seven pounds and two ounces and measured 19 and ¾ inches long. She is the first child for the happy couple and I have no doubt her talented parents will be dedicated to her well-being and bright future.

I would also like to congratulate Lucy's grandparents, James and Katherine Stipicevic of Yonkers, New York, and Tim and Jan Thomson of Buttonwillow, California. Congratulations to the entire Stipicevic and Thomson families as they welcome their newest addition of pure pride and joy.

RECOGNIZING DR. KELCEY SWYERS

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Kelcey Swyers on being selected as the 2016 Rising Star in Colorado Agriculture. This honor is reserved for those who have made a significant contribution to the agricultural industry of Colorado and the United States.

Dr. Swyers has an extensive background in Colorado agriculture. She received a Bachelor of Science in Animal Science and Agricultural Business from Colorado State University, where she also worked two internships that taught her about the feed and nutrition industry. She later went on to receive a Master of Science in Equine/Monogastric nutrition at the University of Maryland. She then returned to Colorado where she received her Doctorate in Ruminant Nutrition.

In addition, Dr. Swyers started Grassland Nutrition Consulting where she offers nutritional work for cow-calf, feed yard, and equine among other services. Dr. Swyers has shown true leadership in her industry and community.

On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes as Dr. Swyers pursues her future endeavors. Her passion and dedication to the agricultural industry makes her more than worthy of this distinct recognition. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Dr. Kelcey Swyers for her accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF ROBERTA SANDLER

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Roberta Sandler a New Jersey native who is celebrating her 100th birthday on December 7, 2015.

Roberta was born on December 7, 1915, and was one of nine children. She was born and raised in Camden, New Jersey and moved to Brooklyn to raise her three children, Marvin, Paul and Lynn, along with her husband Max. After her husband's death Roberta went to work to support her family. After her time in New York, she moved back to the state she loved and has been a resident of Cherry Hill for the last 35 years.

Age does not seem to affect Ms. Sandler, she still exercises every day; does all her own cooking and cleaning; and as a loving matriarch, insists on cooking at all family gatherings. She stays very active in the lives of her family including her 4 granddaughters Meridith, Jodi, Julie, and Jillian and her two great granddaughters Isabel and Andrea. She loves to sing, dance, and continues to keep up with current events.

Mr. Speaker, on this momentous occasion, please join me in wishing Roberta Sandler a happy and joyous 100th birthday.

VOTE EXPLANATION ON H.R. 8, THE NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to clarify my position on a vote cast on December 3, 2015. The vote was on passage of H.R. 8, the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act.

H.R. 8 contains a number of provisions that would negatively impact the environment and undermine our nation's ability to move away from fossil fuels and proactively combat climate change. It would undermine previously

enacted initiatives to modernize our energy infrastructure and increase our energy efficiency capacity.

Furthermore, H.R. 8 includes unnecessary provisions that would expand FERC's authority to approve natural gas pipeline applications within 90 days—effectively stifling public comment opportunities, regardless of the complexity of the pipeline project.

This legislation would provide unnecessary handouts to the fossil fuel industry at a time when we should be focusing on expanding our nation's clean, renewable energy portfolio.

On Roll Call Vote Number 672, I voted 'aye.' It was my intention to vote "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call 651 on final passage of S.J. Res. 23, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the EPA's CO_2 rule for new power plants, I would have voted aye, which is consistent with my position on this legislation.

IN RECOGNITION OF SERGEANT MICHAEL FOX

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with Representative KENNEDY to recognize the distinguished career of Police Sergeant Michael Fox on the occasion of his retirement. Sergeant Fox has served in law enforcement for 42 years—35 years of which were spent with the Easton Police Department in Massachusetts.

It was while attending Massasoit Community College and interning at the Brockton Police department that Sergeant Fox first began working at the Massachusetts Correctional Institution—Cedar Junction in Walpole, Massachusetts as the youngest corrections officer in the prison. During his seven years of service there, he interacted with and bore witness to life within prison walls. These experiences imparted on him a desire to serve on the front lines of community protection, and directly assist and mentor the men and women he had met serving in correctional institutions.

In 1974, Sergeant Fox and his wife, Liz, returned to Easton—a picturesque farm town. He became a special police officer in 1978 and, within two years, a full time patrolman. Among his many proud achievements, Sergeant Fox speaks most passionately about his role as one of the first officers in Massachusetts to be part of the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) program. For decades, he has educated students and the youth in his community about the reality and dangers of drug abuse, encouraging them to make responsible and informed decisions. As testament to this dedication, Sergeant Fox became part of the team that trained new D.A.R.E officers across more than 10 states, and served as the president of Massachusetts' D.A.R.E. Officers Association.

Over the years, Sergeant Fox's hard work, commitment, and positive demeanor earned him the title of Detective. Through it all, despite the tenuous and at times saddening cases that crossed his desk, Sergeant Fox remained a dedicated officer who is revered and respected by all in the Easton Police Department and the Town.

Mr. Speaker, it brings us great pride to recognize the retirement of Sergeant Michael Fox. While we are sure that his colleagues at the Easton Police Department will miss him dearly, we wish him nothing but the very best in his future plans. We ask that our colleagues join us in thanking Sergeant Fox for over four decades of service and the tremendous ways in which he has benefited and served our community.

HONORING MR. ROBERT YOUNG

HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Robert Joseph Young of New Jersey's Third Congressional District, and to express my deepest appreciation to him and his family.

Mr. Young served our country in the United States Navy. He defended our freedom in Okinawa and the Philippines during World War II. His service to our nation secures his spot as a member of our country's Greatest Generation.

Mr. Young was awarded the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with two Bronze Service Stars, a WWII Victory Medal, the Philippine Liberation Ribbon with one Bronze Star, the Honorable Service Lapel Button WWII, and a Certificate of Recognition for serving the United States during the Cold War.

Mr. Speaker, the people of New Jersey's Third Congressional District are tremendously grateful for Mr. Robert Joseph Young's service to our nation. It is my honor to recognize his achievements before the United States House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING ONE OF MINNESOTA'S FINEST FAMILIES

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor all Minnesotans, and all Americans, who served in World War II, and I would like to recognize the service of one Minnesota family in particular.

In 1885, Carl Nolte moved to Martin County, Minnesota with his wife Louise. They had twelve children and numerous grandchildren.

Many years after the Nolte family first came to Minnesota; an impressive thirty-six members of the family joined the armed forces and served in World War II.

Fortunately, all thirty-six family members survived the war. However, both Earle Nolte, son of Fred Nolte, and Reinhardt Wessel, son of Amanda Nolte Wessel, were wounded during their service.

It is often said that those who served in World War II belong to the "Greatest Generation." I believe that the heroism and the dedication that this family demonstrated prove this to be true.

I would like to thank this family for their service to our nation and I would also like to wish one of them a very happy birthday. This week, Loren Wessel of Truman, Minnesota, turned ninety-six years old. Happy Birthday Loren.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF THE LATE NAUSEAD LYVELLE STEWART, ESQ

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of an extraordinary public servant, the late Nausead Lyvelle Stewart.

Nausead was born August 15, 1931 in Starkville, Mississippi to Tommy James Stewart and Rosa Rogers Stewart. Upon graduation from Oktibbeha County Training High School, she chose to attend Tougaloo College where she graduated with honors in History and Home Economics. Afterwards, she taught high school history for thirteen years in West Point, Mississippi, while acquiring her M.A. degree from Atlanta University.

Nausead entered the University of Mississippi School Of Law in 1967 and graduated with honors in May, 1970, where she was the first African American law student to serve on the law journal. In law school, she roomed with Constance Slaughter Harvey, who finished the law school a semester earlier, as the first African American female graduate. Nausead contributed immensely to the legal profession and the pursuit of equal justice for all.

Upon graduation, she, along with her classmate Geraldine Harrington Carnes, was hired by the Lawyers Constitutional Defense Committee (LCDC) to assist the then director, Armand Derfner and Jim Lewis with civil rights litigation.

A year later, when LCDC closed its Mississippi Office, Nausead was hired to work across the street at Anderson, Banks, Nichols and Leventhal to assist with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund (LDF) civil rights litigation. That work consisted primarily of dealing with the post desegregation discriminatory practices in teacher and administrator hiring and retention. Nausead played a primary role in litigating several cases to assure the enforcement of the Uniform Singleton Decree. That Decree provided for the utilization of objective non-racial standards in determining which education professionals would be retained should desegregation result in a loss of positions due to duplication. It also provided a first right of refusal for subsequent new openings to any professionals who were not rehired because of such duplication. Additionally, Nausead worked on other successful employment class actions against large employers in our state. A case law query will reveal some of the great work that she did during this era and continuing in to the 1980s.

In 1975, Nausead became a partner and the firm name was changed to Anderson, Banks, Nichols and Stewart.

Three years later, Nausead left the firm to assume the position as head of the Jackson Office for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, thus completing the circle of having been a lawyer for the three foremost civil rights legal offices in the 1960s and 70s, the Lawyers Committee, NAACP LDF, and LCDC.

In the 1980s, the Lawyers Committee closed its Jackson Office, whereupon, Nausead joined the Walker and Walker firm in Jackson, headed by John L. Walker and William Walker, Jr. While working there, Nausead handled the firm's appellate work and motion practice and was a mentor for James E. Graves, Jr. and Regina Quinn who also worked there during her tenure. In 1982, Nausead offered her services to the citizens of Hinds County for the County Court Judge position thus becoming the first African American female judicial candidate.

After practicing law with the Walker and Walker firm for several years, Nausead assumed a position with Minact Inc. where she engaged in grant writing and compliance until her retirement.

On July 18, 2000 and during her retirement, Nausead served as a Jackson Civil Service Commissioner after having been appointed by Jackson Mayor Harvey Johnson and served until May 2, 2006.

Nausead took great pride in community services on numerous boards of community organizations and received awards for her work with those organizations. She was a member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. which she joined while at Tougaloo College.

Nausead was preceded in death by her aforementioned parents. She is survived by her sister, Doris Anderson; brother, and Thomas J. Stewart, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, on November 10, 2015, we lost a treasure in Nausead. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing a diligent advocate, a conscientious worker, and a selfless servant leader whose life was dedicated to the cause of humanity, Nausead Lyvelle Stewart.

RECOGNIZING PARKLAND HEALTH AND HOSPITAL SYSTEM

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Parkland Health and Hospital System for being named a Top Hospital by the Leapfrog Group in 2015. Based on the Leapfrog Group's annual hospital survey measuring three significant areas of hospital care, Parkland earned honors for the first time as one of 62 top urban hospitals across the country.

Parkland Health and Hospital System opened in 1894 and is now one of the largest public hospital systems in the country. Averaging at one million patient visits annually, Parkland recently expanded to a brand new, state-of-the-art 2.8 million-square-foot campus with 862 single-patient rooms Constantly growing, Parkland includes a Level I Trauma Center, the second largest civilian burn center in the U.S., a Level III Neonatal Intensive Care Unit, 20 community-based clinics, 12 school-based clinics, and numerous outreach and education programs Parkland is also the primary teaching hospital for the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center.

The Leapfrog Group is a national nonprofit group that advocates transparency in quality and safety of care in U.S. hospitals. The Leapfrog Hospital Survey collects and reports hospital performance so that patients can make informed decisions regarding where they receive care. The survey measures three areas of hospital care: how patients fare, resource use, and management structures established to prevent errors. Earning this honor means that Parkland has lower infection rates, better health outcomes, decreased length of stay, and fewer hospital readmissions.

Given Parkland's track record, especially their recent transfer of 626 patients from their old facility to the new Parkland Memorial Hospital without incident or interruption in patient care, I believe Parkland deserves to be named a top hospital. The move was conducted on foot via the Mike Myers Sky Bridge that connects the facilities and was planned with precision for months prior. This is just one prime example of Parkland's many contributions to Dallas County.

Congratulations to Parkland on this well-deserved recognition. I am proud to have Parkland in my district and I congratulate the board, clinicians, and staff on this hard-earned honor.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on December 2, 2015, during rollcall vote No. 665 on the passage of S. 1177, the Every Child Achieves Act of 2015, I was recorded as not voting. Although I was present on the floor at the time, my vote was misreported, and I fully intended to vote 'no' on rollcall vote No. 665. Therefore, I would like to state that I did not support the passage of S. 1177, the Every Child Achieves Act of 2015.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed H.R. 3762, Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act, as amended.

Senate agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 22, Developing a Reliable and Innovative Vision for the Economy Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S8323–S8426

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2347–2359, S.J. Res. 26, and S. Res. 326–328. **Pages S8378–79**

Measures Reported:

S. 1704, to amend the Indian Tribal Justice Act to secure urgent resources vital to Indian victims of crime, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–172)

H.R. 2820, to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 2136, to establish the Regional SBIR State Collaborative Initiative Pilot Program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S8378**

Measures Passed:

Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act: By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 329), Senate passed H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S8326–57**

Adopted:

By 90 yeas to 10 nays (Vote No. 316), Heller Amendment No. 2882 (to Amendment No. 2874), to strike the reinstatement of the tax on employee health insurance premiums and health plan benefits. **Pages S8344–45**

By 60 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. 324), Coats Amendment No. 2888 (to Amendment No. 2874), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the special rule for seniors relating to the income level for deduction of medical care expenses. **Pages S8352–53**

Reid Amendment No. 2917 (to Amendment No. 2916), to strike the reinstatement of the tax on employee health insurance premiums and health plan benefits. **Page S8354**

Enzi (for McConnell) Amendment No. 2916 (to Amendment No. 2874), in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S8353–54, S8356**

McConnell Amendment No. 2874, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S8326**

Rejected:

Murray/Wyden Amendment No. 2876 (to Amendment No. 2874), to ensure that this Act does not increase the number of uninsured women or increase the number of unintended pregnancies by establishing a women's health care and clinic security and safety fund. (By 54 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 311), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S8326, S8341–42**

By 56 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 312), Johnson Amendment No. 2875 (to Amendment No. 2874), to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to ensure that individuals can keep their health insurance coverage. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S8326, S8342**

By 48 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 314), Collins Amendment No. 2885 (to Amendment No. 2874), relating to the repeal of the prevention and public health fund. **Page S8343**

By 10 yeas to 89 nays (Votes No. 323), Paul Amendment No. 2899 (to Amendment No. 2874), to prevent the entry of extremists into the United States under the refugee program. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment would violate section 313(b)(1)(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 was withdrawn. (A unanimous-consent

agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Page S8350**

Cardin Amendment No. 2913 (to Amendment No. 2874), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the special rule for seniors relating to the income level for deduction of medical care expenses and to require high-income taxpayers to pay a fair share of taxes. **Pages S8351–52**

By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 325), Paul Amendment No. 2915 (to Amendment No. 2874), to restore Second Amendment rights in the District of Columbia. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Page S8353**

Withdrawn:

McCain/Klobuchar Amendment No. 2884 (to Amendment No. 2874), to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the personal importation of safe and affordable drugs from approved pharmacies in Canada. **Pages S8350–51**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 45 yeas to 55 nays (Vote No. 313), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to consideration of Brown Amendment No. 2883 (to Amendment No. 2874), to maintain the 100 percent FMAP for the Medicaid expansion population. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the authorizing committee's 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S8342–43**

By 46 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 315), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to consideration of Casey/Baldwin Amendment No. 2893 (to Amendment No. 2874), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a credit for married couples who are both employed and have young children. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the authorizing committee's 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S8343–44**

By 47 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 317), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to consideration of Shaheen Amendment No. 2892 (to Amendment No. 2874), to improve mental health and substance use prevention and treatment. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the authorizing committee's 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Page S8345**

By 55 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 318), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and applicable budget resolutions with respect to consideration of Cornyn Amendment No. 2912 (to Amendment No. 2874), relating to the Protect America Act. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment would violate section 313(b)(1)(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S8345–46**

By 45 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 319), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to consideration of Feinstein Amendment No. 2910 (to Amendment No. 2874), to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of firearms or the issuance of firearms and explosives licenses to known or suspected dangerous terrorists. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment would violate section 313(b)(1)(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S8346–47**

By 53 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 320), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and applicable budget resolutions with respect to consideration of Grassley Amendment No. 2914 (to Amendment No. 2874), to address gun violence, improve the availability of records to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, address mental illness in the criminal justice system, and end straw purchases and trafficking of illegal firearms. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment would violate section 313(b)(1)(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S8347–48**

By 48 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 321), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and applicable budget resolutions with respect to consideration of Manchin/

Toomey Amendment No. 2908 (to Amendment No. 2874), 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. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment would violate section 313(b)(1)(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Page S8348**

By 47 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 322), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and applicable budget resolutions with respect to consideration of Bennet/Sanders Amendment No. 2907 (to Amendment No. 2874), to provide additional amounts to the Department of Veterans Affairs to increase the access of veterans to care and improve the physical infrastructure of the Department of Veterans Affairs and to impose a fair share tax on high-income taxpayers. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the authorizing committee's 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S8348–50**

By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 326), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and applicable budget resolutions with respect to consideration of Enzi (for McConnell) Amendment No. 2916 (to Amendment No. 2874), in the nature of a substitute. Subsequently, a point of order that section 105(b) of the amendment would violate section 313(b)(1)(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 was sustained, and section 105(b) was stricken. **Pages S8353–54, S8356**

By 45 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 327), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and applicable budget resolutions with respect to consideration of Baldwin Amendment No. 2919 (to Amendment No. 2916), to ensure that individuals can keep their health insurance coverage. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the authorizing committee's 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S8354–55**

By 46 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 328), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and applicable budget resolutions with respect to consideration of Murphy/Stabenow Amendment No. 2918 (to Amendment No. 2916), to protect victims of violence or disease, veterans, workers who have lost their health insurance and their jobs, and other vulnerable populations from the repeal of the advance premium tax credit. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the authorizing committee's 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S8355–56**

National Bison Legacy Act: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. 2032, to adopt the bison as the national mammal of the United States, and the bill was then passed. **Page S8426**

Conference Reports:

Developing a Reliable and Innovative Vision for the Economy Act: By 83 yeas to 16 nays (Vote No. 331), Senate agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 22, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs. **Pages S8357–66**

By 77 yeas to 22 nays (Vote No. 330) three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to waive Rule XXVIII relative to section 32205 with respect to the conference report. Subsequently, the point of order under Rule XXVIII that section 32205, exceeds the scope of conference report to accompany the bill, was not sustained. **Page S8364**

Every Child Achieves Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 1177, to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves. **Pages S8425–26**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the conference report to accompany the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Tuesday, December 8, 2015. **Pages S8425–26**

McDonough Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 5 p.m., on Monday, December 7, 2015, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Travis Randall McDonough, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee; that there then be 30 minutes of debate on the nomination, and that following the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination,

without intervening action or debate; and that no further motions be in order to the nomination.

Page S8426

Messages from the House: Page S8376

Measures Read the First Time: Pages S8376, S8426

Enrolled Bills Presented: Pages S8376–77

Executive Communications: Pages S8377–78

Petitions and Memorials: Page S8378

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S8379–80

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S8380–82

Additional Statements: Pages S8374–76

Amendments Submitted: Pages S8382–S8425

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S8425

Record Votes: Twenty-one record votes were taken today. (Total—331) Pages S8341–50, S8352–57, S8364

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 9:53 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, December 7, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S8426.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SUPPORTING THE WARFIGHTER

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine supporting the warfighter of today and tomorrow, after receiving testimony from Michael B. Donley, former Secretary of the Air Force, Lieutenant General Michael T. Flynn, USA (Ret.), former Director, Defense Intelligence Agency, and General James L. Jones, USMC (Ret.), former National Security Advisor to the President, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, and Commander, United States European Command, and 32nd Commandant of the Marine Corps, all of the Department of Defense.

ALASKA NATIONAL INTEREST LANDS CONSERVATION ACT

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine implementation of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980, including perspectives on the Act's impacts in Alaska and suggestions for improvements to the Act, after receiving testimony from Alaska Governor Bill Walker, Juneau; Alaska State Senator John Coghill, Fairbanks, on behalf of the Citizens' Advisory Commission on Federal Areas in Alaska; Anna M. Seidman, Safari Club International, Washington, D.C.; and Rod Arno, Alaska Outdoor Council, Valerie Brown, Trustees for Alaska, Joshua M. Kindred, Alaska Oil and Gas Association, and J.P. Tangen, all of Anchorage, Alaska.

U.S. ROLE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee received a closed briefing on the United States role in the Middle East from Madeleine K. Albright, former Secretary of State, and Stephen J. Hadley, former National Security Advisor, both of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Robert A. Salerno, and Darlene Michele Soltys, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years, and Carol Waller Pope, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years expiring July 1, 2019 (Reappointment), after the nominees, who were introduced by Representative Norton, testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 4165–4183; and 6 resolutions, H. Res. 548–553 were introduced. Pages H9010–12

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H9012–13

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 195, to terminate the Election Assistance Commission (H. Rept. 114–361);

H.R. 412, to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns (H. Rept. 114–362, Part 1);

H.R. 3869, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require State and local coordination on cybersecurity with the national cybersecurity and

communications integration center, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–363);

H.R. 3106, to authorize Department major medical facility construction projects for fiscal year 2015, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the administration of Department medical facility construction projects, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–364);

H.R. 2915, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to identify mental health care and suicide prevention programs and metrics that are effective in treating women veterans as part of the evaluation of such programs by the Secretary, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–365);

H.R. 1107, to require the Secretary of the Interior to submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to manage its infrastructure assets, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–366);

S. 1580, to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates (H. Rept. 114–367); and

S. 1629, to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–368). **Page H9010**

North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 8, to modernize energy infrastructure, build a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce, bolster America's energy security and diplomacy, and promote energy efficiency and government accountability, by a recorded vote of 249 ayes to 174 noes, Roll No. 672. **Pages H8983–88**

Rejected the Cartwright motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 180 ayes to 243 noes, Roll No. 671. **Pages H8986–87**

Agreed to:

Cramer amendment (No. 26 printed in H. Rept. 114–359) that was debated on December 2nd that authorizes voluntary vegetation management within 150 feet of the exterior boundary of the right-of-way near structures; prevents sale of vegetation and limits legal liability (by a recorded vote of 252 ayes to 170 noes, Roll No. 668); and **Pages H8983–84**

Rouzer amendment (No. 30 printed in H. Rept. 114–359) that was debated on December 2nd that repeals the March 2015 EPA final rule establishing federal standards for residential wood heaters (by a recorded vote of 247 ayes to 177 noes, Roll No. 669). **Pages H8984–85**

Rejected:

Pallone amendment (No. 37 printed in H. Rept. 114–359) that was debated on December 2nd that sought to prohibit the Act from taking effect until after the Energy Information Administration analyzed and published a report on the carbon impacts of the Act's provisions (by a recorded vote of 181 ayes to 243 noes, Roll No. 670). **Page H8985**

Agreed that the Clerk be authorized to make technical and conforming changes to reflect the actions of the House. **Page H8988**

H. Res. 542, the rule providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) and the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1177) was agreed to yesterday, December 2nd.

Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2015: The House agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 22, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, by a yea-and-nay vote of 359 yeas to 65 nays, Roll No. 673. **Pages H8975–83, H8988–H9000**

H. Res. 546, the rule providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 22) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 384 ayes to 40 noes, Roll No. 667, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 243 yeas to 179 nays, Roll No. 666. **Pages H8982–93**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, December 7th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H9009**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and six recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H8982–83, H8983, H8984, H8984–85, H8985, H8986–87, H8987–88 and H8999–H9000. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 3:22 p.m.

Committee Meetings

EFFECTS OF REDUCED INFRASTRUCTURE AND BASE OPERATING SUPPORT INVESTMENTS ON READINESS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled "Effects of Reduced Infrastructure and Base Operating Support Investments on Readiness". Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General David D. Halverson, USA, Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management, U.S. Army; Major General Robert P. White, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, G–3/5/7, U.S. Army Forces Command;

Colonel Andrew Cole, Jr., USA, Garrison Commander, Fort Riley, Kansas; Major General Charles L. Hudson, USMC, Commander, Marine Corps Installations Command and Assistant Deputy Commandant, Installations and Logistics, U.S. Marine Corps; Major General Brian D. Beaudreault, USMC, Commanding General, 2nd Marine Division, U.S. Marine Corps; and Colonel Chris Pappas III, USMC, Commander, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, U.S. Marine Corps.

STAKEHOLDER VIEWS ON MILITARY HEALTH CARE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled ''Stakeholder Views on Military Health Care''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE NUCLEAR WASTE FUND: BUDGETARY, FUNDING, AND SCORING ISSUES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing entitled ''The Nuclear Waste Fund: Budgetary, Funding, and Scoring Issues''. Testimony was heard from David Bearden, Specialist in Environmental Policy, Congressional Research Service; Kim P. Cawley, Chief of Natural and Physical Resources Cost Estimates Unit, Congressional Budget Office; and a public witness.

BROADCASTING OWNERSHIP IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology reconvened a hearing entitled ''Broadcasting Ownership in the 21st Century''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DRIVING AWAY WITH TAXPAYER DOLLARS: DHS'S FAILURE TO EFFECTIVELY MANAGE THE FPS VEHICLE FLEET

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency held a hearing entitled ''Driving Away with Taxpayer Dollars: DHS's Failure to Effectively Manage the FPS Vehicle Fleet''. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Homeland Security officials: John Roth, Inspector General, Office of Inspector General; L. Eric Patterson, Director, Federal Protective Service; and Thomas Chaleki, Deputy Chief Readiness Support Officer, Management Directorate.

OVERSIGHT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Executive Office for Immigration Review''. Testimony was heard from Juan P. Osuna, Director, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing on H.R. 4084, the ''Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act''. Testimony was heard from John Kotek, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Nuclear Energy, Department of Energy; and public witnesses.

EMPLOYERS OF CHOICE: HOW THE TAX EXTENDER DEBATE WILL AFFECT SMALL BUSINESS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access held a hearing entitled ''Employers of Choice: How the Tax Extender Debate Will Affect Small Business''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the economic outlook, after receiving testimony from Janet L. Yellen, Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, December 7

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 5 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Travis Randall McDonough, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, December 7

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bera, Ami, Calif., E1702
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1707, E1708
Buck, Ken, Colo., E1707, E1709
Carson, André, Ind., E1704
Cole, Tom, Okla., E1705, E1707
Conaway, K. Michael, Tex., E1701
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1708
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E1706
Donovan, Daniel M., Jr, N.Y., E1702
Emmer, Tom, Minn., E1710
Fudge, Marcia L., Ohio, E1702
Garrett, Scott, N.J., E1711
Gohmert, Louie, Tex., E1701
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1703
Green, Gene, Tex., E1704
Hinojosa, Rubén, Tex., E1708
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E1704
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1706
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1711
Keating, William R., Mass., E1705, E1710
Kuster, Ann M., N.H., E1709
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E1703
MacArthur, Thomas, N.J., E1710
McCaul, Michael T., Tex., E1707
McNerney, Jerry, Calif., E1708
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1703
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E1709
Norcross, Donald, N.J., E1709
Olson, Pete, Tex., E1706
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E1701
Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E1707
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E1704
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1707
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E1701
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E1705
Takai, Mark, Hawaii, E1705
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E1706, E1710
Tsongas, Niki, Mass., E1703
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E1707
Williams, Roger, Tex., E1707, E1710
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E1709

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.