United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 2016 No. 65

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 27, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EVAN H. JENKINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

REMEMBERING PRINCE

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember somebody of unquestionable talent, somebody who appealed to and spoke to people of all types, ages, and cliques, and somebody who also never stopped finding different ways of expressing coolness.

Of course, I am speaking of Minnesota's native son, Prince, who tragically passed away this last week in Chanhassen, my hometown.

Prince was the personification of limitless ability and creativity, and, even better for Minnesotans, he was one of us.

For me, the music of Prince was intertwined with growing up in Chanhassen. I remember spending time with high school friends after a football game or a soccer game. We would take the time to actually drive up his driveway, which we thought was kind of fascinating. We would head over to his house. We were a little entranced with his simple, purple, split-level house.

The fact that the man responsible for some of our favorite songs and music was living right in our backyard seemed actually too good to be true.

I remember my very first concert I went to was also Prince on his Purple Rain Tour back in 1984 at the St. Paul Civic Center.

To hear his contemporaries tell the story, Prince's guitar playing simply was indescribable. If the best musicians of our day can't find the words to express how talented he really was, I certainly can't find a way to express the skill that he possessed.

Of course, he was much more than his guitar playing. He could also sing and play numerous other instruments and write hit after hit. But what inspires so many is that it shows that greatness lives within us.

Prince grew up in Minneapolis. He didn't have any formal classical musical training at an elite school, but he did rise to the top of the music world and never looked back.

Even with all the stories that we have heard over the past several days and week about the greatness of Prince, more inspiring are the stories of him extending a helping hand to help lift others up in times of need, stories of how he was very active in our community.

Just a few weeks before he passed away, he played a very surprise show with friends at the Chanhassen Dinner Theater, a very popular venue and Minnesota favorite, where I worked as a high school busboy.

Day after day we are hearing stories now of donations to schools, to different causes and, of course, to people. Those are the folks that Prince made happy in terms of their time of need. Prince had a giving heart.

Ultimately, it is for these reasons that we have seen the outpouring of grief from around Minnesota, from around the country, and also from around the world.

As we continue to remember Prince, the man, and his music, it is his words from one of his earliest top hits, ''1999,'' that helps put things in perspective. He says: ''But life is just a party, and parties weren't meant to last.''

While his party has certainly sadly come to an end, these lyrics remind us each and every day to live those days to the fullest and to set out to achieve great things.

We will miss Prince Rogers Nelson. May he rest in peace.

UNGASS REFLECTIONS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to be an official observer at the United Nations as they had a special meeting dealing with the international war on drugs.

Much has happened since President Clinton addressed the Global Drug Summit at the United Nations in 1998, carrying the American war on drugs to the international stage. But this, in my mind, solidified the need for us to reset these failed drug policies.

Printed on recycled paper.

People across the political spectrum now agree that this approach to drug policy is flawed and ineffective. We have spent over $1 trillion on this effort over the years.

We have undermined countries in Latin America and helped unleash an unprecedented wave of violence in Mexico, killing tens of thousands of people in the drug wars.

Yet, despite all the effort, all the money, drugs are still widely available in the United States, actually less expensive than before we started. We seem unable to even keep drugs out of our own prisons.

America's failure to deal with harm reduction, treatment, and prevention has helped lead to the epidemic of opioid addiction and death. In 2013 alone, we lost 20,000 people to prescription drug overdose.

As people get hooked on amazingly over-prescribed prescription drugs, it leads to heroin addiction when they substitute it when they can no longer get access to opioids.

Now, it is interesting that some of the countries that have been most devastated by this war on drugs, in dealing with the international cartels—Mexico, Colombia, Guatemala—were there at the United Nations leading the charge for a different approach.

Many of the presentations that I witnessed were suggestions to the Outcome Document, with the common theme that it did not go far enough in reforming the path forward.

Calls for harm reduction, greater access to treatment, and fighting the barbaric practice of executing drug offenders energized that consensus.

Now, America was on the sidelines. America was not calling for adjustment and change in reform. We were sort of between those more progressive forces, including those countries that have really been in the throes of the drug wars.

And then there is Iran and China and Russia, and we were sort of floating in between. It is kind of embarrassing, as an American, to see the United States not leading.

I come back to Washington, D.C., more committed than ever for the new administration and the next Congress to be a voice of reform to change these failed policies.

We need to put an end to the mindless military action and hard-edged policies that fail and replace them with policies that will make a difference, saving lives, and having effective regulations as tools.

Now, the United States is moving ahead at reform at the State and local levels. Forty States now provide some access to medical marijuana. Four States and the District of Columbia deal with adult use, and there will be four or five more States that will join this year.

In 2019, when we go back to the United Nations, hopefully to be able to make some of these reforms, the world is going to look different.

First of all, there are moves in both Canada and Mexico to expand the use of medical marijuana and to legalize adult use.

In 2019, virtually every American will have a legal access to medical marijuana, and we will continue the action at the State level, making those critical changes. Public opinion, once and for all, will be settled in favor of regulation, taxation, and responsible adult use.

We will break the shackles of research on marijuana, where the Federal Government actually gets in the way of being able to have the information that the scientists and doctors can produce to settle the question so we don't have to guess.

I am hopeful that the United States will be on the right side of reform, that we will stop expensive and regressive policies that don't work, and that we will be able to respond to the emerging American consensus of the people at the State and local levels to do it better. This is one effort we can't afford to fail.

RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING WORK OF ILLINIPAC

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding work of IlliniPAC, a group of students on the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign campus who are making a positive and important impact through their pro-Israel advocacy.

IlliniPAC is focused on building bridges throughout the student community and educating fellow students of all backgrounds about Israel.

At a time when there are so many concerted efforts to promote myths and terrible mistruths about Israel, the student leaders of IlliniPAC have stepped forward with a positive message to highlight the importance of a strong and bipartisan U.S.-Israel relationship.

I particularly want to commend IlliniPAC for its proactive and constructive efforts to oppose misguided calls to promote boycotts, divestment, and sanctioning, otherwise known as BDS, against Israel.

As the sponsor of the bipartisan Combating BDS Act of 2016 in Congress, I greatly appreciate the efforts by IlliniPAC to oppose BDS campaigns targeting Israel. These BDS campaigns perpetuate damaging falsehoods against Israel only to serve to divide and separate students on campus.

The truth is that the BDS movement has neither brought Israelis and Palestinians closer to peace nor advanced the laudable goal of improving dialogue between supporters of both sides. Instead, the BDS movement has simply been employed as a hateful weapon to delegitimize Israel and those who stand with her.

Once again I would like to thank IlliniPAC for taking a leadership role on campus and for the work that they do to spread the positive message about Israel, an oasis of freedom, democracy, and tolerance in one of the world's most volatile regions.

GREAT LAKES RESTORATION INITIATIVE ACT OF 2016

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we in the House of Representatives passed the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act of 2016.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important bipartisan effort to protect our Great Lakes. I believe that, when it comes to our environment, we must all work together to strengthen conservation programs and other policies that protect our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate to represent Illinois' 10th Congressional District, which borders one of our Nation's greatest treasures, Lake Michigan. Lake Michigan offers miles of beachfronts, natural habitats, recreational space for all of those that visit her, as well as drinking water for millions.

As a scoutmaster, I teach my Scouts that we should always leave or strive to leave areas better than when we found them. Reauthorizing the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative for the next 5 years will help us fulfill this goal with Lake Michigan.

I now urge the United States Senate to immediately take up and pass this legislation. The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative was introduced in the Senate by my friend and colleague, Senator MARK KIRK, who has been a fierce advocate for protecting Lake Michigan throughout his 15-year career representing the people of Illinois.

Working together, we can protect our country's greater natural resources for future generations to enjoy.

CONGRATULATING SHERRI RUKES

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sherri Rukes, who was awarded the Golden Apple Award for Excellence in Teaching by the Golden Apple Foundation.

Ms. Rukes has been an AP chemistry teacher at Libertyville High School for 19 years. She also was the coach of the robotics team and volunteers with the science Olympiad and math team.

The Golden Apple is awarded to the best teachers in the entire country, and Ms. Rukes is very deserving of this prestigious recognition. Her innovation and passion for teaching have made her an outstanding teacher who has bettered the lives of every student who entered her classroom.

Ms. Rukes plays an important role in educating and preparing our future leaders for success. I am happy to know that our students are getting the outstanding education they need and deserve when they step into her class.

I offer my congratulations to Ms. Rukes and to Libertyville High School for this well-deserved recognition.

□ 1015

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 101st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Over the years in Rhode Island, I have spoken with many Armenian Americans who have recounted the stories their parents or grandparents told them about living through the horror of the Armenian genocide. Even after 100 years, there is still a deep wound in the heart of the Armenian people, particularly as genocide and atrocious human rights violations continue to be used as weapons of war in the 21st century.

Today, hardly a week goes by without news of horrific human rights violations somewhere around the world. The first step to stop these abuses is to acknowledge them for what they are and then to confront them. That is why it is important that the United States Government finally recognize and call the Armenian genocide what it is and what it was: a systematic attempt by the Ottoman Empire to annihilate the Armenian people.

The challenges, of course, continue today for the people of Armenia. All of us know that earlier this month, violence once again erupted in Nagorno-Karabakh. President Serzh Sargsyan called it ''the most wide-scale military action that Azerbaijan has tried to carry out since the establishment of the 1994 ceasefire regime.''

It is critical that the United States remain deeply engaged in resolving this conflict. I recently met with the Armenian Ambassador to the United States, Ambassador Grigor Hovhannissian, to discuss relations between our two countries and what role the United States must play to help promote a resolution of this longstanding conflict. I have received briefings on the current situation, and I will continue to advocate for critical American leadership to protect the innocent men, women, and children who are living in Nagorno-Karabakh.

But as we address this current crisis, it is also critical that we continue to push for recognition of the Armenian genocide. History is clear: 101 years ago, 1½ million Armenian men, women, and children were brutally and systematically murdered while living under the Ottoman Empire. That is not an opinion, it is not an interpretation, and it is not an allegation. It is a fact.

In a cable sent to the U.S. Secretary of State on July 10, 1915, the U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire confirmed the persecution of Armenians by ''systematic attempts to uproot peaceful Armenian populations, and through arbitrary arrests, terrible tortures, wholesale expulsions, and deportations from one end of the empire to other accompanied by frequent instances of rape, pillage, and murder, turning into massacre, to bring destruction and destitution on them.''

After 101 years of waiting, it is time for our President and the United States Government to recognize this fact and to acknowledge this atrocity as the first genocide of the 21st century. Armenia is an important friend and ally of the United States, and it is critical that we stand with our friends and honestly acknowledge the evil of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to leave you with the words of Pope Francis who last year reminded all of us that ''whenever memory fades, it means that evil allows wounds to fester. Concealing or denying evil is like allowing a wound to keep bleeding without bandaging it.''

After more than 100 years of waiting, it is time for the United States Government to finally recognize the Armenian genocide as the first genocide of the 21st century.

CONFRONTING HEROIN AND OPIOID ABUSE CRISIS

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, the rapid rise in drug abuse across America, specifically the sharp increase in heroin and prescription opioid abuse, has severely impacted our local communities and has become a major issue across our country.

Tragically, 78 people each day will lose their battle with addiction and their life as a result of an opioid or heroin overdose. Sadly, with the trends moving the way they are, this number will only continue to increase. According to the CDC, in 2014, over 28,000 people lost their lives due to prescription opioid pain relievers or heroin. This was the highest recorded number of overdose deaths of any year. Newsday on Long Island just reported an increase in overdose deaths in our region, stating that 442 people died of a heroin or opiate overdose in 2014, a number that has increased from 403 overdose deaths the prior year.

Addiction is a devastating disease that takes hold of our loved ones and impacts everyone around that person. This is a lonely and heartbreaking disease that is taking lives, tearing families apart, and destroying our communities. It must be stopped.

In a report that highlights the growing drug abuse epidemic sweeping across our Nation, the CDC found that over the past decade, heroin use has doubled among young adults ages 18 to 25, and heroin-related overdose deaths have nearly quadrupled, with every 6 out of 10 drug overdoses linked to opioids or heroin. The CDC also found that almost half of the people who use heroin are also struggling with a prescription opioid addiction. As drug abuse continues to rise, claiming lives and grabbing hold of our youth, it is clear that we must come together to address this crisis.

Throughout my time in the New York State Senate, and now in the United States Congress, one of my top priorities has been to support legislation to help those coping with drug addiction by increasing treatment and recovery services.

One piece of legislation I am proud to support and cosponsor is H.R. 953, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, also known as CARA. CARA would prevent and treat addiction on a local level through community-based education, prevention, treatment, and recovery services. The grants made available through this bill would also provide the necessary funding to expand prescription drug monitoring in States all throughout our country.

Additionally, CARA provides funding to supply our police force and emergency medical responders with higher quantities of Naloxone, a medication that is proven to reverse an opioid overdose. Since this bill was introduced at the beginning of last year, I have been pushing for a vote on CARA in the House. Just last month, the United States Senate passed this bill with an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 94–1. Now it is time to bring this bill to the House floor.

As a member of the Bipartisan Task Force to Combat the Heroin Epidemic, passage in the House of CARA is a top priority of mine, and I will keep fighting so that we can pass this essential piece of legislation and send it to the President's desk for his signature.

There are many other bills, other than CARA, such as the Stop Overdose Stat Act, H.R. 2850. There are bills like the Examining Opioid Treatment Infrastructure Act of 2016, which would require the Comptroller General to issue a report to Congress on substance abuse treatment availability and infrastructure needs across the country, as well as legislation that would task the FDA to create a plan on how to deal with the opioid and heroin epidemic, H.R. 4976.

Fighting drug abuse must be an effort at all levels of government, but it also must be a community effort as well. That is why I have hosted press conferences and panel discussions, including a community summit and drug task force roundtable on Long Island to bring together local elected officials, law enforcement, health professionals, community groups, parents, concerned residents, and recovering substance abusers so that we can all develop and pursue necessary solutions.

The House is also expected to take up legislation to stop the flow of illegal substances into our country, such as H.R. 3380, which would help law enforcement officials identify and target drug traffickers; and H.R. 4985, which makes it easier to prosecute drug traffickers.

We must all continue to support legislation that addresses the rise in heroin and opioid abuse to stop this tragic loss of life, family, and community as a

result of addiction. It is impacting our districts all across America. It is our duty while we are here, as Members of Congress, to do everything in our power to address this now, to turn the tide, to fight back, and to save families that are being torn apart. That is why I support all of these great bills that are moving through the process here in the House.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 101st anniversary of the Armenian genocide and honor the lives of 1.5 million Armenians who were killed between 1915 and 1923 by the Ottoman Empire. The Republic of Turkey, sadly, continues to try to silence the voices of the survivors and their descendants around the world, but we will never forget nor will we be intimidated into silence.

Several years ago I told the foreign minister of Turkey, who is now the President, that Turkey must recognize the genocide and put this chapter of history to rest. It is extremely frustrating that Turkey continues to ignore what really happened, but in addition to that, it is very disappointing and unacceptable that President Obama failed once again to call the murder of 1.5 million Armenians a genocide—because that is what it was.

Recognizing the Armenian genocide is not something to be debated. The Europe Parliament has gone on record of recognizing the genocide, and last year Pope Francis spoke of the tragedy that took place, the Armenian genocide. Scholars and historians acknowledge that the systematic killings and deportations that took place constituted a genocide.

I, however, simply do not have to rely on the word of historians. Growing up in the San Joaquin Valley in the Fresno area, I heard stories from my friends and neighbors, the Kezerians, the Abrahamians, and the Koligians, whose families experienced the horrors at the hands of the Ottoman Empire.

As we reflect on this day, it is equally fitting to honor the hundreds of thousands of Armenian men and women who bravely began new lives in the United States after witnessing unspeakable tragedies to their families and in their villages. Survivors and their descendants, many of whom settled in California, have become bright examples of what it means to live the American Dream in their own diaspora.

I would like to use this opportunity to tell you of an experience last Friday in Fresno. I had the distinct honor of participating in a wreath-laying event with leaders of the Armenian community and the Armenian National Committee of America, its national chairman, Raffi Hamparian.

I want to take this opportunity to honor someone who brought a sense of justice to those who perished during that time. We want to recognize a true Armenian hero, Soghomon Tehlirian. As a part of Operation Nemesis, planned by the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, Soghomon Tehlirian assassinated Talaat Pasha, who was the last prime minister of the Ottoman Empire and the orchestrator of the Armenian genocide.

This was an act of justice served on behalf of the Armenian people. Tehlirian was acquitted of the charges by a jury in Germany in the 1920s and later moved to Serbia, and then to San Francisco, California. He died in 1960 and is buried at the Ararat Massis Armenian Cemetery in Fresno, California, which then was the only Armenian cemetery in the country.

I hope my colleagues will join me and the Armenians throughout the Nation and throughout the world in honoring Mr. Tehlirian and to also pay tribute to the 1.5 million lives lost in the genocide—the first genocide in the 20th century—as well as their descendants who live today, for we must never ever forget the history. As Santayana once said: Those who forget history are doomed to repeat it.

DENIM DAY

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, on a separate matter, I rise today to recognize Denim Day, which is observed in April throughout the world as being Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

My staff today is wearing denim, joining other organizations throughout the district and throughout the Nation to raise the awareness about sexual violence prevention.

I would like to commend the Valley Crisis Center in Merced, the Madera Community Action Partnership, and the Marjaree Mason Center in Fresno, and the San Joaquin Valley organizations for all that they do to support and serve the victims of sexual assault.

Today, on Denim Day, and every day we stand with the victims and survivors, their families, and their friends to make everyone aware and to prevent the spread of sexual violence.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, this year, job creators should expect significant changes to Federal wage and hour laws, throwing yet one more hurdle in front of them and their employees as the U.S. Department of Labor, the DOL, finalizes new overtime regulations under the Fair Labor Standards Act, or the FLSA.

The basic premise of the FLSA, which applies to many Pennsylvania employers, is that if you are receiving a salary, it must be because your employer is cheating you. The rule that has the force of law discourages salaried employees and discourages the give-and-take between employee and employer to work for the best interest of each one.

There are limited exceptions to the FLSA's overtime obligations for narrow categories of employees and for those in particular industries and occupations. The most common exemptions are for white-collar employees like executive, administrative, and professional employees.

□ 1030

Currently, an employee must satisfy three criteria to qualify as exempt from Federal overtime pay: first, you must make a salary; second, your salary must be more than $455 per week, or $23,660 annually; and third, your primary duties must be consistent with managerial, professional, or administrative positions as defined by the Department of Labor. They don't know every single job in every community across the country, but yet they are the ones that decide, not the people actually doing the work or the ones who started and own the business.

Last year, the DOL proposed arbitrarily increasing the salary threshold to $50,440 per year, a 113 percent increase, just arbitrarily said that is the way it is going to be. It also proposed automatically increasing the salary threshold on an annual basis regardless of what the economy is. If the economy grew at 4 percent, I guess it would be one thing. If it didn't grow or it grew at 0.3 percent, which is what GDP is currently, it would still go up—again, just arbitrary. This doesn't come from Congress. This isn't bandied back and forth between the Democrats and the Republicans, between the House and the Senate. This is just bureaucrats making a rule, the force of law.

These proposed rules will bring sweeping changes to Federal wage and hour laws, and they will be especially burdensome on rural areas, like central Pennsylvania. They will also significantly impact local governments, nonprofit organizations, and small retailers, among many others.

Because of this rule, for instance, a dry cleaner that I met with recently simply is going to have to make a choice. They are either going to hire fewer people or raise prices for their customers.

I recently met with county commissioners in the district I am privileged to represent. If the requirement is raised, as DOL proposes, 50 county employees will be affected, which will result in either fewer employees or nearly $400,000 in expenses for the county moving forward. How do you think they are going to offset those costs if they don't lose those employees or fire those employees? You guessed it. You and I are going to pay—the local taxpayers.

I also met with the YWCA in my district, a nonprofit organization. They looked at the potential impact of these regulations and determined that approximately 30 staff members would be affected, resulting in either a loss of

jobs or an additional expense of over $200,000. For a nonprofit that is struggling to get by, struggling to provide services—whether it is a daycare for underprivileged folks—or just to keep the doors open, they are going to have to make a choice, all because of a rule that didn't come from here. It came from the regulators, as usual, who aren't interested in the input of the Nation's citizens in all too many cases. This is just another example of bureaucrats of the administrative state—in this case, the Department of Labor—developing top-down regulations that crush organizations like nonprofits, small businesses, and communities that can least afford it.

For this reason, I am happy to support a solution. We shouldn't have to provide this solution because this is really a problem that doesn't exist. But there is a solution, the Protecting Workplace Advancement and Opportunity Act, introduced by my colleague from Michigan, Mr. TIM WALBERG, which prevents the DOL from implementing this misguided and completely unnecessary proposal and rule. I strongly urge other Members to support this important legislation as well.

VISIT TO GUANTANAMO BAY

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I visited U.S. Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, a critical military national security asset serving key roles in the war on terrorism, drug and migrant interdiction, and as a strategic forward base for the Atlantic Fleet. Every day, approximately 7,000 U.S. military personnel and contractors go to work at GTMO to keep our country safe and to advance our national security interests in the Americas and throughout the world.

I had the privilege of meeting with Captain Culpepper, the base commander, who briefed us on the base's preparedness to assist with major migrant events in the Caribbean. This is important, considering the significant increase in Cubans fleeing the island over the last year.

I also met with Rear Admiral Clarke, who serves as Commander of the Joint Task Force Guantanamo. The JTF is working professionally and diligently to provide safe, humane, legal, and transparent care and custody of detainees. I was able to inspect the detention facilities, and I was impressed with efforts to treat the detainees with dignity and respect.

Our brave young people in uniform do an extraordinary job of representing our country, sometimes under very difficult circumstances, in this theater. Mr. Speaker, the men and women of Naval Air Station Guantanamo, the Joint Task Force, and the Marines who protect the base perimeter deserve the admiration, appreciation, and support of the American people and this Congress.

I thank my colleague from south Florida, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for leading our visit to GTMO. I urge all of my colleagues to work to protect and strengthen this critical military asset.

ZIKA ERADICATION AND GOOD GOVERNMENT ACT

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Zika virus has wreaked havoc throughout Central America, South America, and the Caribbean. We have seen countless pregnant women infected, resulting in devastating fetal brain defects on their newborn children.

As of mid-April, 87 cases of Zika have been identified in Florida, and another 380 cases have been reported across the country. We must be prepared for the first domestic transmission of the virus, especially as the summer mosquito season begins and international travel is more frequent.

For these reasons, I have filed H.R. 5031, the Zika Eradication and Good Government Act. This bill will ensure no new funds are made available for Zika until all unspent Ebola money is disbursed, which the President already said he would do in early April.

This bill will also direct all Federal agencies that receive funds to combat Zika to work in collaboration and share best practice methods.

Finally, this bill will require a report from the President to Congress each month when any future funds are appropriated for Zika, detailing the obligations, expenditures, and effectiveness of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I support the President's call for funding emergency legislation to ensure Zika is eradicated. I also want to make sure the funds are spent wisely and effectively in fighting this virus.

This bill is an important first step forward. I strongly urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Zika Eradication and Good Government Act.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the need to improve our prisons and criminal justice system here in the United States.

Currently, there are more than 2 million individuals who are incarcerated in our country, the majority of whom committed nonviolent offenses.

Last December, I had the opportunity to visit with over 20 inmates at Dade Correctional Institution in south Florida. These individuals were visibly moved that someone had taken the time to speak with them and learn about their struggles. I felt very fortunate to have had the opportunity to hear their stories.

Criminal justice reform is desperately needed in our country, and it is vital that we break the school-to-prison pipeline and ensure that those who have served their time have a second chance at success.

For all these reasons, I signed the Second Chance Petition, to allow nonviolent offenders to recover with dignity and become active members of their communities.

With this week's Criminal Justice Summit taking place at the White House, I call on all of my colleagues to build on this momentum and meet with inmates to learn from their experiences. I am a cosponsor of bipartisan bills focused on criminal justice reform and look forward to working with my colleagues to get these bills signed into law.

HONORING JIM BRADEN

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

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jim Braden, pictured here with his granddaughter Cates. Jim is a native of Ripley, West Virginia, who is being honored on April 30 for his significant accomplishments and contributions to the coaching of young men and women for over 52 years in Tennessee and West Virginia.

Jim Braden's roots in Jackson County, West Virginia, baseball began with his father, Ed Braden. Ed Braden was a member of the Sandy Valley baseball club in the 1940s, which received numerous county pennants that earned them the right to play in the Little World Series.

Ed built houses to accommodate the influx of people relocating to work at the new Kaiser Aluminum plant in the 1960s. He also founded Braden Plumbing and Heating in Ripley and was responsible for installing the first bathrooms in many Jackson County homes. Throughout the years, Ed was a staple at Ripley High School baseball and other athletic events.

While at Ripley High School, Jim Braden was in a car accident that cut his baseball career short. Once he recovered from the accident, Jim, still a high school student in Ripley, West Virginia, started coaching youth sports teams.

After a brief period at Glenville State College, Jim Braden proudly served our country for years in the Vietnam war as a part of a U.S. Navy helicopter squadron.

Upon returning to the United States, he took employment as a teacher at Roane-Jackson Technical Center.

Jim moved to Farragut, Tennessee, in 1980, and enjoyed a long career as an industrial sales consultant. But he took his love of baseball and, most notably, his Cincinnati Reds with him, never forgetting his West Virginia roots. His sister, Pam Braden, is on the board of Ripley Convention & Visitors Bureau.

Braden and his wife, Catherine, raised their two children, Laura and Mark, while Braden continued coaching baseball, basketball, and football. In Farragut, Braden was instrumental in organizing and implementing the countywide Knox County Middle Schools baseball league. He created the Dugout Club's Web page and continues

to serve as one of its Web masters. He also serves as a guiding force to help raise funds for facilities and other activities supporting Farragut baseball.

Braden has coached numerous Division I and professional baseball players, including former Minnesota Twins pitcher Kyle Waldrop, Eli Lorg, and Cale Lorg. He also coached White Sox player Nicky Delmonico, Curt Powell from the Detroit Tigers organization, Nick Williams from the Marlins organization, and Philip Pfeifer from the Dodgers organization.

Thank you, Coach Braden, for your service to our country and for coaching generations of young baseball players.

CONGRATULATING BRITTANY FRENCH

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Brittany French of Berkeley County, West Virginia, for being named the National Volunteer Fire Council's Junior Firefighter of the Year.

As a member of the Junior Volunteer Fire Company and the Volunteer Fire Department in Hedgesville, Brittany is a third-generation firefighter.

Brittany has continually demonstrated a passion for learning about health and emergency services. She studied these subjects, earning several certifications at James Rumsey Technical Institute during her junior and senior years in high school. She is now enrolled in the paramedic course at Blue Ridge Community and Technical College, allowing her to continue her education while still serving her community.

Brittany clearly enjoys helping others and has excelled in doing so. She previously won first place in EMT skills in a statewide health competition. She has helped the fire department fundraise, and she continues to be actively involved in her church.

Brittany is among West Virginia's most devoted young leaders. I am honored to join her family, friends, and the dedicated firefighters with whom she works in congratulating Brittany on being named the National Volunteer Fire Council's Junior Firefighter of the Year.

SEXUAL ASSAULT

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue that has impacted millions of Americans from coast to coast, north to south, also an issue that has impacted my family personally. Mr. Speaker, I care deeply about the survivors of sexual assault and want to ensure that their voices are heard.

Every 2 minutes, Mr. Speaker, an American is sexually assaulted. That is 200,000 of our fellow American citizens that are impacted by this horrendous crime. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, less than half of those victims will report their attack to law enforcement, making sexual assault one of the most underreported crimes in America.

□ 1045

That is why I am proud to stand with my colleague from California, JACKIE SPEIER, to introduce a resolution to recognize April as Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

As Members of Congress, we are in a unique position to raise awareness and speak out on behalf of sexual assault survivors. We must unite. When one in five women will be raped in her lifetime, we cannot afford to stand silent on this issue.

It is only right, Mr. Speaker, that we say enough is enough with sexual assault in America. Enough is enough to no longer speak about this issue because it is something that is difficult to speak publicly about.

That is why I am an ardent and active supporter of the NO MORE Campaign. The NO MORE Campaign has taken it upon itself to unite across the country, to stand in one voice, and many of us across America have seen the commercials on our TVs to say no more to sexual assault.

No more can we put up with excuses like: ''She deserved it.'' ''She was drunk.'' ''Of course she got what she was looking for.'' No more can we say: ''Well, that is what boys do. That is what young men do.''

We need to stand together as American citizens, men and women in this Chamber, to say: No more to sexual assault. It is unacceptable for us to stand silent any longer.

I ask my colleagues to join us in the effort to recognize April as Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month and join us in one voice to send a clear message across America to say: No more.

HONORING DUNBAR HIGH SCHOOL'S BOYS BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the boys basketball team at Paul Laurence Dunbar High School in Lexington, which is my hometown, for winning the Kentucky High School Athletic Association's State championship, better known in Kentucky as the Sweet Sixteen.

As everyone knows, Kentucky is a basketball-crazy State, and this is a great accomplishment. This is the school's first-ever State championship in boys' basketball and the first championship for a Lexington high school since 2001.

In the first three games of the tournament, the Bulldogs posted come-from-behind wins over Mercer County, Bowling Green, and Newport Central Catholic to reach the finals.

However, in the final game, led by junior Taveion Hollingsworth, who was the tournament MVP, they led wire to wire, defeating Louisville's Doss High School 61–52. Like any successful endeavor, the victory was won by dedication, hours of practice, determination, and teamwork.

I congratulate the students, head coach Scott Chalk, and the entire coaching staff on the State championship. I am proud to honor Dunbar High School before the United States House of Representatives.

HONORING PREVENT CHILD ABUSE KENTUCKY

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of National Child Abuse Prevention Month and to highlight the work of Prevent Child Abuse Kentucky.

This organization is on the front lines to make sure Kentucky's children are raised in safe, loving homes and are not abused, mistreated, or neglected. It develops and promotes effective strategies and programs through community involvement, public education, and advocacy.

Efforts are centered on recognizing the inherent potential and goodness of children, on strengthening families, and on empowering the community to become involved with this important mission.

This cause is personal to me. As the father of two girls and as the former president of the board of directors of Prevent Child Abuse Kentucky, I am incredibly proud of the good work this group does every single day for Kentucky's children and all year long.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in thanking Prevent Child Abuse Kentucky and similar organizations around the country as we recognize National Child Abuse Prevention Month.

HONORING DINNY PHIPPS

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Mr. Ogden ''Dinny'' Phipps for his contributions to the American thoroughbred horse-racing industry and in remembrance of a legend in the sport of kings.

Mr. Phipps leaves a proud legacy in his having made a profound and positive impact on the game for many decades. As an owner and breeder, Mr. Phipps owned and reared numerous champions, including the 1993 Kentucky Oaks winner Dispute, the 2005 Breeders' Cup Distaff winner Pleasant Home, and, most recently, the 2013 winner of the Kentucky Derby, Orb.

However, one could argue that Mr. Phipps' greatest impact was felt beyond the racetrack, as he was a steadfast advocate for the industry and served the racing community as an industry executive.

From 1983 until his recent retirement in 2015, Mr. Phipps served as chairman of The Jockey Club, the official breed registry of the thoroughbred industry. He also served as a longtime member of the New York Racing Association, serving as the Association's chairman from 1976 to 1983.

Mr. Phipps' love of this great American pastime will leave an enduring mark on the thoroughbred industry. Mr. Phipps is survived by his wife, Andrea, and his children, Kayce, Kelley, Lilly, Daisy, Samantha, and Ogden.

I extend my deepest sympathy to the Phipps' family, and I join my fellow Americans in honoring the life, contributions, and service of Ogden ''Dinny'' Phipps.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Wade Stevenson, Gideon Missionary Baptist Church, Waukegan, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

God of unity and of peace, we come to this opening session acknowledging that You are the source of life and that each person's life is subject to Your governance.

We bring to this session the diverse concerns of the districts we represent, and in bringing those concerns, we acknowledge that through You we can serve in unity.

As we come to this session and into these Halls, we also acknowledge that through You we can have peace. Let peace rest within these Halls, and let us rest in that peace through the demonstration of our patience and cooperation in serving.

Finally, we pray that our time spent here will be meaningful and that You will bless our service to produce fruit in the lives of those we represent.

We thank You for the opportunity to serve through Your unity as instruments of Your peace.

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 Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CRAWFORD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. WADE STEVENSON

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome my good friend, Pastor Wade Stevenson from Waukegan, Illinois, in Illinois' 10th Congressional District.

For his entire life, Pastor Stevenson has been called to serve others. Pastor Stevenson is the head pastor at Gideon Baptist Church in Waukegan, and at Gideon, he helps to bring God's grace and the word of the Lord to our community.

Pastor Stevenson is the president of the North Shore Baptist Ministers' Alliance and the second vice president of the Lake County Chapter of the NAACP. His numerous public recognitions and appointments reveal a life of public service to the people of our community.

But Pastor Stevenson's role in our community can't be summed up by a list of titles or awards. Since he became pastor of Gideon Baptist Church more than 10 years ago, he has become a beacon of hope for countless people in our community. Pastor Stevenson is one of the first people in our community that people turn to when they are looking for guidance, both spiritual or otherwise.

I have been blessed to work side by side with him to distribute Thanksgiving turkeys to families in need. His dedication has brought joy to countless families around the holidays year in and year out.

It is a great honor to welcome my friend, Pastor Stevenson, to the House of Representatives today, and I am confident that the blessings he brings will serve us well.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

COMMENDING WE THE PEOPLE COURSE

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, 19 students from Valley View High School in my hometown of Jonesboro, Arkansas, have been studying our Nation's constitutional democracy for several months in an intensive course. The course called We the People is taught to students particularly interested in the history and principles of the United States Government.

Last week, those students put their knowledge to the ultimate test in Washington, D.C. They competed in a simulated congressional hearing by evaluating, taking, and defending positions on a variety of historical and contemporary issues. Our government functions more efficiently when passionate citizens engage in the political and policymaking process, and I am proud that these students are already preparing themselves for that process through their education.

Traci Smith, the group's civics teacher, deserves our thanks and respect for the incredibly important role that she plays in preparing our rising generation. I would also like to applaud the efforts of the We the People Arkansas State coordinator, Jeff Whittingham, associate professor at the University of Central Arkansas who has done such a remarkable job through the years organizing and directing the We the People program for our State.

AUTHORIZING DAVID'S SLING WEAPON SYSTEM

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the discovery of major offshore natural gas deposits 90 miles west of Haifa presents Israel with new opportunities—and new threats.

Developing this resource will reduce Israel's dependence on fuel imports and improve ties with its neighbors through export agreements. However, the offshore platforms will be an attractive target for Hamas, Hezbollah, and other terrorist organizations. A successful attack could be a humanitarian, economic, and environmental disaster.

The United States-Israel Maritime Security Partnership Act would authorize the use of the David's Sling Weapon System to intercept short-range missiles, promote Israel's inclusion in naval exercises, and increase the number of visits by U.S. naval vessels to Israeli ports.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to help our ally protect its coastline and offshore infrastructure from attack by cosponsoring this timely legislation.

CELEBRATING 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF HECLA MINING COMPANY

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

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 125th anniversary of the Hecla Mining Company.

Hecla was founded in 1891 to acquire and trade mining claims in north Idaho's Silver Valley. Over the years, this mining district has produced 1.2 billion ounces of silver. The company has survived and thrived through world wars and economic depressions, and today Hecla is the Nation's largest primary producer of silver and employs over 1,300 people in my district and throughout the world.

I recently had the opportunity to visit Hecla's Lucky Friday mine and was able to see firsthand the state-of-the-art mining practices that Hecla uses to extract silver from deep in the Earth.

As Hecla celebrates its 125th anniversary, I join with others in celebrating the company's great legacy and success.

CELEBRATING 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this weekend the Rhode Island School for the Deaf will celebrate 125 years as an educational institution that serves deaf and hard-of-hearing students in Rhode Island.

Each year, approximately 12,000 children are born with some level of hearing loss in this country. The Rhode Island School for the Deaf offers essential support, guidance, and information for deaf and hearing-impaired children from the moment they are born until they are ready to graduate high school and go on to college or a career.

The Rhode Island School for the Deaf's Parent Infant Partners program helps children develop English and American Sign Language skills at an early age. Its elementary, middle, and senior high school programs provide quality education, as well as vocational programs and opportunities to participate fully in social activities and athletic events alongside hearing children.

I applaud the extraordinary educators and staff at the Rhode Island School for the Deaf for their ongoing work to serve deaf and hearing-impaired children, and I congratulate them on their 125th birthday celebration this Friday.

CELEBRATING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF BOB EPLING IN SOUTH FLORIDA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Bob Epling, one of south Florida's most distinguished business and civic leaders.

Bob currently serves as the president and CEO of the Community Bank of Florida and sits on numerous boards, including the National Football Foundation and the College Football Hall of Fame. Bob earned this installment in part because of his arduous work as president of the Orange Bowl Committee. He also serves as chairman of Tomorrow's South Dade, a project of vision that addresses business development, infrastructure, agriculture, and other issues that impact the residents of south Dade.

Another testament to Bob's commitment to our community was as chairman of the board of the International Hurricane Research Center where he spent countless hours helping to rebuild homestead following the devastating impact of Hurricane Andrew.

Bob has also been the recipient of numerous accolades, including the Florida Bankers Association Legends Award, as well as the University Distinguished Service Award and FIU Medallion, both from my alma mater, Florida International University.

I encourage our community to join me in honoring Bob Epling and his contributions to the agricultural sector at this Saturday's Dade County Farm Bureau's Annual Barbecue and ''Fun'' Raiser.

Congratulations, Bob, on a job well done.

HAZING IN THE MILITARY

(Ms. JUDY CHU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the fifth anniversary of the death of my nephew, Harry Lew. While deployed in Afghanistan, Harry was hazed and brutally assaulted by his fellow marines for almost 4 hours. Twenty minutes later, he took his own life. He was 21 years old.

Harry's story is not unique. I have now heard from families and servicemembers across the country who have their own tragic stories and tried to seek help, but many are at a loss of where to turn. That is because the Pentagon's guidance on hazing is unclear, inconsistent, and imperfectly applied. Without an accurate system of tracking hazing incidents, we have no way to actually know the full extent of the problem. This failure costs lives.

It is time the military treat this problem seriously. My bill, the Harry Lew Military Hazing Accountability and Prevention Act, would require the Department of Defense to track and report annually on the problem of hazing in the military.

Our men and women in uniform protect us. We must do what we can to protect them.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF REGNAL WALLACE

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Regnal Wallace, the ''Original Voice of Louisiana Agriculture.''

It is a nickname he earned for good reason. When you heard his voice on the radio, you knew immediately that it was Reg. As a farmer myself, I knew I always needed to listen up because what he was going to tell me was important.

In 1981, Reg launched ''This Week in Louisiana Agriculture,'' a show he imagined as a new way to tell the public about the incredible work taking place in the fields and processing plants across the State by some of the hardest working men and women in Louisiana.

Thirty-five years later, this show is still carried by 18 affiliates in Louisiana and nationwide by RFD-TV, bringing the story of agriculture to 400,000 people each week.

Reg died earlier this month at his home in Franklin Parish, which I represent. Those of us in Louisiana will be forever grateful for Reg's contributions to agriculture in our State and the life he dedicated to serving farmers.

REMEMBERING JUSTICE LAURA LIU

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, Chicago lost a tremendous judge, attorney, mother, wife, and friend on April 15th with the death of Justice Laura Liu. She fought a courageous battle against breast cancer for 5 years, and her spirit, passion, and determination never faltered.

Born to immigrant parents, Justice Liu didn't start speaking English until elementary school, but ended up as class valedictorian.

For nearly 20 years, Justice Liu worked as a litigator, then as a circuit court judge, and finally was appointed to the Illinois Appellate Court. In the court, Justice Liu was a strong advocate for interpreter services for immigrants and people with limited English who might have been otherwise overwhelmed.

She was a tremendous advocate and mentor to Chicago's Chinese American community, setting an exemplary model for young boys and girls that their opportunities were endless if you worked hard.

Our thoughts and prayers are with Justice Liu's family during this difficult time.

MANAGING WILD HORSES AND BURROS

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, the BLM just announced that it would significantly cut grazing allotments and possibly eliminate all cattle grazing on Federal lands in Elko, Nevada, to accommodate the overpopulation of wild horses. Many rural areas in my district are facing the exact identical situation where wild horses are taking over the ranges.

I grew up ranching and riding horses, and I desperately want to protect them. But with 50,000 wild horses on

ranges in the West—which is double what the land can sustain—the ranges are overgrazed, and now horses are starving to death.

Not only are the current conditions inhumane, but due to the overpopulation, the Federal Government is forced to house an additional 50,000 horses at a cost of $55,000 per horse.

I urge my colleagues to join with me to look for solutions to this problem. One solution is my bill, the Wild Horse Oversight Act, which would simply allow States to manage wild horses and burros.

If you care about these horses like I do, then help me solve the problem. If you care about our range and how these animals are destroying the range, then, again, help me solve this problem.

□ 1215

NO ACTION ON ZIKA, FLINT, AND OPIOID ADDICTION

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give voice to lament that House Republican leadership has done nothing at this point to help the thousands of Americans struggling to protect their families from the threat of three different public health emergencies: the Zika virus, the opioid addiction and overdose problem, and the Flint water crisis as well.

Last month, House Democratic leadership wrote to Speaker RYAN asking for him to address these public health crises, calling for swift and decisive congressional action. Unfortunately, House Republican leadership has not responded with anything but inaction and indifference.

As reported by Roll Call: ''an average of 78 people are dying every day from opioid overdoses, and mosquitoes carrying the Zika virus have been found in 30 States. But Congress has shown no urgency about addressing those issues. Maybe that's not surprising from a Republican majority that can't even adopt a nonbinding budget resolution after months of 'family' discussions.''

Mr. Speaker, hardworking families deserve a Congress that can get things done.

ADMINISTRATION USES CLIMATE SCARE TACTICS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration recently released a report that tried to tie extreme weather events to climate change. This is the administration's latest effort to scare the public into supporting its radical climate agenda. The report ignores science in order to justify the administration's dire predictions.

For example, the administration's report says that hurricanes are projected to increase. But hurricanes have not increased in intensity, frequency, or damage since 1900. The same can be said for almost all other extreme weather events.

The administration continues to incite fear so that Americans will wrongly believe that extreme climate events are due to climate change, but the administration should not push costly climate regulations on Americans when there is no good reason for them to do so.

HONORING KEN CHRISTY

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ken Christy, a letter carrier, an extraordinary leader, a member of our community, and a friend of mine.

Ken passed away unexpectedly this past Easter weekend. A family man, Ken left behind his three daughters and his wife, Bonnie, his high school sweetheart, to whom he was married for 52 years.

Ken gave back to his community in spades. He volunteered countless hours to the letter carriers' annual food drive because he wanted to make a real difference in the lives of those in our community who are less fortunate.

Since 2013, Ken served as the clerk of Aurora Township.

Ken always stood up for working families. As president of the Illinois Letter Carriers Association, Ken made sure that the voices of his members were heard by public officials on both sides of the aisle. Not surprisingly, Ken was named into the Illinois Letter Carriers Hall of Fame in 2012.

He knew people from all walks of life and all political persuasions, but I never heard a bad word said about him. Ken was, indeed, a friend. He was a friend to the city of Aurora, he was a friend to the letter carriers and to their families throughout the State of Illinois.

Ken Christy will be missed.

END PRESIDENT OBAMA'S LAWLESS AND DELUSIONAL REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend State Senator Mark Norris and State Representative Terri Lynn Weaver for their work in the Tennessee General Assembly to authorize the State to enter into a lawsuit against the Federal Government. This lawsuit is over concerns with the refugee resettlement program and the 10th Amendment.

I have put forth legislation at the Federal level, H.R. 4218, that would immediately suspend the Syrian refugee resettlement program.

Yesterday, Kansas Governor Sam Brownback announced that he was withdrawing Kansas from the resettlement program because of security concerns. There is no way—no way—to vet these Syrian refugees, Mr. Speaker.

Islamic radicals want to attack America. It is no secret to the American people. However, President Obama and this administration seem not to recognize this.

I call on all of my colleagues to join me to stand against the President's lawless and delusional refugee resettlement program.

DENIM DAY

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, in 1999, the Italian Supreme Court ruled that a 45-year-old driving instructor had not raped his 18-year-old student because she ''wore very, very tight jeans, she had to help remove them, and by removing the jeans it was no longer rape but consensual sex.''

Outraged, the women in the Italian Parliament said they would wear jeans to work until decisions were changed. Their protests spurred action across the globe.

Seventeen years later, and during Sexual Assault Awareness Month, I wear this denim jacket in solidarity with survivors and advocates around the world. I wish I could say that the need for Denim Day was a thing of the past. But, unfortunately, sexual assaults remain rampant, including in our military and on our college campuses. In fact, one in five college coeds will be raped or some sexual assault will be attempted on them, and 20,000 men and women in the military are assaulted each year.

I urge my colleagues to wear denim today, and to support sexual violence prevention and education every day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In response to earlier remarks, Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities towards the President.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF RENOVO, CLINTON COUNTY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Renovo, Clinton County.

Renovo, which is located northeast of Lock Haven, in western Clinton County, was founded in 1866 and built for and by the Philadelphia and Erie Railroad as the midpoint between Philadelphia and Erie. For many years after the community's founding, it was advertised as a mountain resort location,

with several large hotels built there before the turn of the 20th century.

Although it was the railroad that built Renovo and its mountain location that attracted travelers, the lumbering industry formed the bedrock of the town's heritage and economy. Clinton County's timber industry continues to thrive, contributing more than $90 million to the economy of that county.

Many celebrations are planned in May to mark Renovo Borough's anniversary, including a parade along Erie Street, the opening of a time capsule, and a firework display.

I want to commend the local officials and the residents of Renovo and the surrounding areas of western Clinton County for this recognition of their long history.

RECOGNIZING THE RICHMOND HILL HIGH SCHOOL MARCHING BAND

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Richmond Hill High School marching band for being selected to perform in the 2016 National Cherry Blossom Parade.

The Richmond Hill band has gained many accolades and enjoyed numerous successes since its beginning 9 years ago. Membership in the band has become popular among students, as it has grown from an original 90 musicians to nearly 200. The band has also competed and performed across the State of Georgia and twice at Universal Studios in Florida.

The selection process to perform at the National Cherry Blossom Parade is highly competitive. High schools, universities, and specialty marching bands from all across the U.S. apply to march in the parade. Crowds of people line the streets, and thousands at home watch on TV as these bands march down Constitution Avenue.

The band also used the visit to Washington as an educational experience. The students spent time visiting many museums and monuments on The National Mall.

It is with great pride that I rise today to honor the members of the Richmond Hill marching band for their hard work, determination, and perseverance to become a successful marching band. It is truly an honor for them to perform at the parade.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4498, HELPING ANGELS LEAD OUR STARTUPS ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 701 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 701

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4498) to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation, which will benefit small innovative companies and startups by ensuring that they have access to the necessary capital to succeed, grow, and create jobs in their companies.

But I also stand up today to make sure that we are here for a marketplace that is fair and equitable to all Americans, regardless of whether they work for a small company or a large company, whether they are a big-time investor or whether they are a person who is looking at the marketplace, perhaps, with ideas and opportunities.

Last night, the Rules Committee met and reported a structured rule for H.R. 4498, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups, or the HALOS, Act. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chair and ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

I also want to point out that the Rules Committee asked all of our Members of this body to submit their ideas and amendments. As a result, this resolution makes in order all of the amendments that were submitted. That is important because what this Rules Committee is attempting to accomplish is to ask all of the Members for their feedback about how to make bills better; and in this case, when something was germane, it was made in order.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has a three-pronged statutory mission in overseeing U.S. capital markets: to protect investors; to maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and to facilitate capital formation.

Unfortunately, the SEC historically has ignored its mandate to facilitate capital formation in the absence of congressionally mandated rulemakings.

□ 1230

The SEC's inability to fulfill its statutory mandate is ultimately to the detriment of entrepreneurs, smaller companies, and startup ventures, such as Teladoc, the Nation's first and largest telehealth platform, which had it not received startup investment, may not have existed at all.

To remedy the SEC's inaction on capital formation, my colleagues and I passed the bipartisan Jumpstart Our Business Startups, or JOBS Act, which was signed into law on April 5, 2012. The recognition that we had problems in the marketplace for smaller companies and smaller groups of people to bring their ideas to the marketplace was a huge impediment based upon the SEC, and that is why this JOBS Act was created.

Although startups and small businesses are at the forefront of technological innovation and job creation, they often still face significant and unnecessary obstacles in obtaining funding in the capital markets. The JOBS Act lifted the burden of certain securities regulations to help small companies obtain access to these important markets, but we are back at the table again.

Unfortunately, when the SEC promulgated rules to implement the JOBS Act, it classified events held by angel investors as general solicitations, and thus, they were subject to accredited investor mandates, yet another example of the Federal Government's creating unnecessary red tape, stifling innovation, and quite honestly, making it hard for smaller, single entrepreneurs to participate in a worldwide marketplace.

This new classification is burdensome and it jeopardizes educational and economic development for events like demo days. Demo days are held in marketplaces all across our country. It is an opportunity for not just investors, but for general communities to come, primarily in the tech field, and learn about the newest startups as they are occurring. When startups interact with angel investors and venture capitalists, it means that best ideas can then be brought forward to create more jobs, investment, and can move forward so an idea that perhaps was on somebody's blackboard goes directly to the marketplace.

Demo days have been an important part of the entrepreneurial financing

process for decades—nothing new—often with lead sponsorships by Federal, State, and local governments, which are bringing these best ideas into play for the marketplace to see not only about the idea, but for it to become a reality in an economic development format.

To be clear, demo days have existed long before the passage of the JOBS Act and have created collaborative and engaging educational environments that have brought together startups, leading-edge thought leaders, young programmers, people who are looking to network, and, I think, an overall more diverse network of individuals that is looking to exchange ideas. These are the kind of educational incubators that our country needs more of, not less of.

We are here today because the SEC developed rules that would change demo days greatly—and other activities like this—to the detriment of the marketplace, yes, but, more importantly, to the detriment of small business and entrepreneurs.

To address the SEC's burdensome rule, Congressman STEVE CHABOT from Ohio, the chairman of the Committee on Small Business, introduced H.R. 4498, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act. This legislation defines an ''angel investor group'' and clarifies that the Securities Act's general solicitation limitations do not apply to a presentation, communication, or event conducted on behalf of an issuer at an event that is sponsored by certain organizations; where any advertising for the event does not reference any specific offering of securities by the issuer; or where no specific information regarding an offering of securities by the issuer is communicated to or distributed by or on behalf of the issuer.

What does this mean?

This means that these demo days that are regularly held across the country are opportunities whereby a presenter of an idea or a person who represents that idea might bring forward those ideas, many times to hear about a collaborative basis, where there may be someone who recognizes he could add on to that idea or be a part of that idea or work with that idea or be a programmer for that idea or to host or to sponsor something that would enable that idea to get further down the road.

What the SEC did is throw a wet blanket across it and said: You can't do these.

We are trying to segment that out and say: For the purpose of a demo day, when it does not relate to a specific offer or ask for funding, it still can take place.

This is not a narrow interpretation. The intent is to understand that the purpose of a demo day should be to get ideas further down the road so they can gain not only the opportunity for investment, but so they can make their ideas even better.

H.R. 4498 provides essential protections for States, municipalities, trade associations, and other venues that facilitate such meetings between investors and fund managers.

It is important for Congress to act. Just because we are not aware of how marketplaces work does not mean we should wait for the Federal Government to regulate them and then find out, whoops, they made a mistake. Members of Congress need to be active to understand that the SEC should live up to its statutes, that it should live up to its mission statement, and that it should not stifle innovation, but, rather, allow for the creative opportunity and development of these issues and ideas to come forth in order to better not only employment and ideas, but, more specifically, employment within the United States so consumers will then have better options over time. To ensure that angel investors play an active role in startups is why we are here today.

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

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

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for the customary 30 minutes.

I rise in opposition to this structured rule, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 4498, the so-called Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act, otherwise known as the HALOS Act. I also oppose the underlying legislation unless through the amendment process we can improve it.

The gentleman from Texas said something that I agree with: ''It is important for Congress to act.''

I think where we differ is: Act on what? What should Congress be acting on right now? Should we be talking about this? Or should we be talking about other things, quite frankly, that are much more important to this country and to the American people?

Four days from now, Puerto Rico faces a $422 million debt payment. Given the items listed for consideration in the House this week, it appears as though the Republican majority has no plans to act on legislation to address the debt crisis in Puerto Rico.

I understand that my Republican friends in the majority are having a difficult time in coming to an agreement within their Conference on how to move forward, but I urge my colleagues to continue working with Leader PELOSI and Ranking Member GRIJALVA toward a bipartisan solution that allows Puerto Rico to restructure its debt. This is a big deal. The Senate is waiting for us to act, the people of Puerto Rico are waiting for us to act, and our constituents are waiting for us to act. Rather than acting on that which is urgent, we are doing this.

Another thing we might want to think about acting on and is an area in which the House Republican leadership has also failed to act is that of the public health emergency created by the Zika virus. This is a big deal. It is the public health. The well-being of our citizens is a big deal, or at least it should be, but you would never know it if you are following the proceedings on the House floor. My colleague from New York, Congresswoman LOWEY, has an emergency supplemental bill to help to fund what is necessary to protect our people from this virus, but we are told that is on the back burner.

What about doing something in response to the terrible tragedy that unfolded in Flint, Michigan, where that community was poisoned by the water that came out of their faucets? Why aren't we addressing that emergency?

By the way, Flint is not unique, unfortunately. There are other places across this country where the levels of lead in the drinking water are unacceptably high, are dangerously high. We need to make sure that our infrastructure in this country is up to the point at which people don't have to worry about drinking the water that comes out of their faucets. We should be addressing that issue, but for some reason we don't have the time.

There are lots of young people here who are visiting the Capitol this week. Why aren't we doing something about student financial aid so that people can afford to go to college, creating a situation by which young people who go to college are debt free when they get out of college, lowering the interest rates on college loans or eliminating the interest rates on college loans, thus making college more affordable?

That is a huge priority. That is important, but we don't have time to talk about that here in the people's House.

This Congress also continues to shirk its constitutional duty to vote on an authorization for the war against ISIS. In the past week, the Pentagon announced that the United States will send 250 more troops to Syria and 200 more to Iraq. In Iraq alone, the official number of U.S. troops is now over 4,000, but this House still can't seem to find time to debate and vote on an AUMF.

I have great reservations about the President's policy with regard to these wars. I think we ought to debate those wars and I think we ought to go on record as voting to authorize those wars. Instead, we don't want to talk about it. We are putting the lives of young American men and women in harm's way. We are sending them halfway across the world to be engaged in an effort, in my opinion, in which there is not a clearly defined mission.

We are not living up to our constitutional responsibility, which is we ought to debate and deliberate and vote on these wars. That is our constitutional responsibility, and we are not doing it. We don't have the time, or maybe we are just too cowardly to be able to tackle some of these important issues.

The American people are tired of endless wars, and it is our responsibility to

debate these escalations that continue to invest more American tax dollars, add more firepower, and put more U.S. troops closer to the front lines; but, again, this leadership isn't focused on these very serious situations that call for immediate action.

Just so you know, we are not paying for most of these wars. While my friends like to talk about our debt, I would point out that most of these wars are unpaid for. They just go on the credit card. We don't even have the guts to have a vote on whether to pay for these wars. Instead, we are doing this today.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, House Republicans missed the legally mandated deadline for Congress to enact a budget, and it appears as though we are not going to see a budget resolution on the floor this week or anytime soon. On the most pressing issues facing our country today, my friends in the Republican majority have failed—and they have failed miserably—to do their job, plain and simple.

So what is the House debating today? What is so urgent to debate today that all of these other things can be put to the side?

We are debating legislation, the so-called HALOS Act, that will undo an important investor protection that Democrats fought to include in the 2012 JOBS Act.

I supported the JOBS Act, which expanded opportunities for small business capital formation. Since the JOBS Act became law in 2012, companies have raised roughly $71 billion of capital by using the new general solicitation and advertising exemption.

□ 1245

But it is important to balance our desire for capital formation with their need to protect investors, particularly unsophisticated retail investors.

The JOBS Act removed the ban on solicitation in advertising to the general public for private offerings, provided that companies verify the purchasers of their offerings are accredited investors.

The legislation before us today repeals that verification requirement when companies solicit their offers at a wide range of sales events.

The private securities marketplace is already under limited SEC oversight, and many of us share the concern that this legislation could unnecessarily expose investors to risks that they are unprepared to absorb.

Now, my friend, Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS, will offer an amendment later today to restore some of the investor protections that would be eliminated by the underlying legislation. I urge my colleagues to support that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the House is set to adjourn on Friday for yet another weeklong break and we have yet to consider any of the priority legislation that I had just spoken about earlier. We need to focus on important issues. We need to focus on urgent issues rather than taking away important investor protections.

So I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I do appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) bringing up these issues. We try and talk about these issues up at the Rules Committee. There is always a wide-ranging list of not only issues and ideas, but I certainly know that, as we talk about these, we are all after action on the floor.

I don't know the exact answer, but I believe, as it relates to the problem with the Zika virus, that we are dealing with some $600 million. I note that Mrs. LOWEY, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, has come on the floor and I am subject to being corrected by her.

But it is my understanding that right now, in an account that would be allowed to be exchanged, some $600 million is left over in that fund that is unspent from the Ebola crisis and that negotiations between our appropriators, the CDC, and other Federal agencies have said: We do recognize from the House perspective that this is a very, very serious issue. We acknowledge that.

I have acknowledged that up at the Rules Committee. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has several times, in the spirit that I appreciated and that was very complimentary to a proper answer, brought this issue up, that this is what he is looking at, that it is an issue in our country.

The responses that I continue to, I believe, receive back is that our appropriators, on a very professional basis, have allowed use of the funds to be used for that issue.

So I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I do understand his concerns and, really, Mr. MCGOVERN, I appreciate it.

I appreciate you, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. POLIS, and Judge HASTINGS bringing these issues up. But we try and go and clarify what I think are proper or sustainable answers to your ideas. The ideas about other pieces of legislation we will get to.

Where there are emergencies, I do agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). I do not think an AUMF, which is a discussion about military use of force, is necessarily in line right now, but I know that Republicans are preparing that. I know that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) could bring his effort forward and will at the appropriate time for his ideas. They will all fit.

Today, however, what we are here for is something that has been in line for some period of time that is a major issue. The gentleman very appropriately said the last time we brought forth legislation that it created $71 billion worth of entrepreneurial funding, funding that helps our country's research and development, new ideas in medicine, new ideas in communication, new ideas that employ people, money to the marketplace.

That is why we are here today. We think this is just as powerful. After we passed the JOBS Act, the SEC got most of it right, not all of it right, and we are trying to politely—this is the way we do things in a democracy. We try and work with government agencies to say: You got some of it right, but congressional intent needs to be done a little bit further.

Will it bring $71 billion to the marketplace? I don't know. Will it mean that a brighter future exists for innovation, job creation, and investment that keeps America's leading edge as opposed to ideas going somewhere else around the world? Yes.

I would argue that Speaker PAUL RYAN is aware of all the issues that need to be debated. Today we feel like jobs and job creation and perhaps an opportunity to stimulate, whether it is $71 million or $71 billion worth of new stimulating activity for new ideas, is important.

That is why we are here today. That is why people took a number, got in line, and developed their activity. STEVE CHABOT measured twice, brought his legislation here, and understands what it is about.

I would also say, as Mr. MCGOVERN I believe politely alluded to, this is a good idea because it does not say we will only form these opportunities in Republican districts, but we will form them in districts all over the country.

It is a good, bipartisan piece of legislation that helps smaller, less sophisticated people. It helps the marketplace. I think it is important.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that I appreciate the fact that he appreciates the concerns that I have raised, but I would appreciate him even more if we could bring some of the legislation to the floor that would actually solve some of the problems and deal with some of the challenges that I outlined.

I had brought up earlier the issue of the Zika virus, which has infected 891 individuals in the U.S. States and territories, including at least 81 pregnant women. This is a big, big deal.

Some of us are not interested in robbing from Peter to pay Paul to deal with this. We don't want to be dipping into the Ebola fund, which is still an issue, to deal with the Zika crisis. I mean, we have multiple challenges that we have to deal with.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, just a polite dialogue. Do you believe in any

way, because we have not moved a bill, that the Federal Government is stopping and waiting and doing nothing on this issue?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

We are doing something, but I think what people who are dealing with this crisis would feel better about is if there was a certainty that the resources were going to be there.

Those who are fighting the Ebola crisis are concerned that, if you are going to take money from Ebola to put into Zika, that maybe you are not going to replenish the monies to deal with Ebola. We have some serious public health issues that we are trying to deal with.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question. If I do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up a bill that would provide desperately needed funding to combat the Zika virus.

The administration requested this funding more than 2 months ago, and it is reckless to delay our response to this public health crisis any longer. Yes, we are doing things to respond to it. We can be doing a lot more. I think the American people want us to do all that we possibly can to protect the public health of the citizens of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, with great respect for our distinguished chair with whom we work very collegiately, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question in order to provide the funding needed to mount a robust response to a pressing public health emergency.

More than 2 months ago the administration requested funding critical to respond to the Zika virus, a public health emergency tied to microcephaly and other neurological disorders in infants.

It is unconscionable that, when nearly 1,000 people in the U.S. and territories have contracted Zika, the majority continues to drag their feet on meeting our most basic responsibility.

The majority's inaction has forced the administration to redirect funding needed to meet other basic responsibilities, shortchanging still-needed investments to protect against Ebola and to help States and cities improve domestic public health.

The majority's claim that the administration has provided insufficient detail on the request doesn't make any sense. Every cent has been accounted for. Yet, we continue to wait to sit on our hands.

Further, the majority holds this emergency to a new standard, requiring offsetting cuts before providing needed resources. This literally holds emergency funding hostage to unrelated political fights.

This simply cannot go on. Are we waiting for the height of summer when mosquito control will be infinitely more difficult? Are we waiting for this emergency to spiral out of control?

I urge my colleagues to stand with me and defeat the previous question so we can meet our responsibility to protect against Zika.

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

I am delighted that the gentlewoman from New York, who is a regular visitor to the Rules Committee and who really, I believe, adequately and fairly not only represents the needs of this Nation, but really argues many times on behalf of things that are common sense—I want to thank her for being here today.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an argument at all about the Zika virus, about Ebola. The Ebola circumstance to the United States in the United States actually occurred first in Dallas, Texas, within the congressional district that I am so lucky to represent. It did constitute not only an immediate threat and danger to not only that hospital in Dallas, Texas, but, really, all across our country, and it evoked a scare. It did.

Well, we have that same type of circumstance today. That is why, in retouching base with our Appropriations Committee, I now can speak what I believe is from them directly as opposed to what I thought I heard, and that is that the appropriators have said that immediate funding needs for Zika should be provided from unobligated funds that are already available, which would then be backfilled in 17 appropriations bills as needed, which means that there still is money that the approval, the authorization, has been given.

Instead of us delaying through our process here, we have said that we concur this is of immediate nature. Here is a bucket of money. Here is a bucket of money.

As an example, there are some $400 million that is available that was a part of the Ebola funding that is unobligated and is intended to be spent in future years. There is money available to meet the immediate need.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in working with Speaker RYAN, has made sure that the money is available, can be used for this need, and Republicans agree it is the right thing to do.

□ 1300

I do appreciate Mrs. LOWEY coming down. I do appreciate the gentlemen, Judge HASTINGS and Mr. MCGOVERN, seeking these questions.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to make sure that this body understands the money is available. It is there to be used properly, as with any other taxpayer money, but that it may be used for this purpose. Quite honestly, I am very proud of what we are doing to match up the needs of this Nation and its great people.

Mrs. LOWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's eloquent remarks. However, I want to emphasize again that this is an emergency. People are severely, severely, being impacted because of the Zika virus. This is an emergency. We should be doing it immediately.

I understand that it may be tempting to transfer money from another account. However, to have to find offsets here when people are suffering, dying, perhaps having deformed infants doesn't make any sense now.

I would just say in closing, I thank the gentleman for his concern, and I do hope that we can pass this emergency supplemental as soon as possible because so much of where the money is going to go is long-range planning. Vaccines. We have to make sure that we prevent additional cases of Zika, and developing a vaccine can't be done in a month or 2 months. It takes time.

So if, in fact, the administration has requested $1.9 billion, and we have responded, and the administration has responded to the very sincere questions provided to us by the chair, Chairman ROGERS of the committee, we think it has been documented very carefully.

I would ask again my colleagues to consider that this is an emergency, $1.9 billion is what has been documented in detail. It is all in writing. I thank the gentleman for listening.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you are witnessing here a colloquy on the floor between groups of people who can work together. Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Judge HASTINGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. POLIS represent not just the Democratic Party, but millions of people across the country.

I want to forthrightly try again to answer, if I can. I do hear them, Chairman ROGERS hears them. There is at least $500 million—granted, only one-third of what has been requested—that we believe is available for it to be transferred right now.

I talked to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). I said: Mr. MCGOVERN, do you believe in any way that something is being held up?

He said: No, sir. We are working. This government is working feverishly.

As a parent, I understand this. While I have an advantage of having a disabled child as a son, that does not mean that I would want anyone else to have a disabled child. I get this.

I have satisfied myself, and I believe my party has, through our great young Speaker, PAUL RYAN, satisfied ourselves that pending the time when we

can get at a supplemental—perhaps later in the year there will be wildfires, perhaps later in the year there would be a hurricane. We have the money available. No one disputes that the money right now is usable, it is fungible. The question is: When will it be backfilled?

I have properly said here today that Chairman HAL ROGERS has the ear—and we have his ear—of every Member of this body who does understand when we need to get more money and when the new cycle begins, and we will be starting this just in the next few weeks, that that would be available as an option for Chairman ROGERS to take Mrs. LOWEY's request, to take her detailed analysis of if it is a billion-some, would be able to implant that into a priority for this Conference, for this Congress, for these bodies to understand, and that we would hope to work forth then with the United States Senate, with the President of the United States, and work it well together.

Mr. Speaker, what you have seen here is a prime example of people talking, people getting closer to an answer. I am trying to respond back that I believe our Speaker, PAUL RYAN, I believe HAL ROGERS, I believe myself as an instrument of a messaging back and forth properly are responding: The money is available. Please go get your work done. As we get further down the line, we will be further down the process.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do here is sound the alarm bells that we need to do something much more robust than is currently being done. I include in the RECORD the letter that we have referred to from the administration signed by Shaun Donovan, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Susan Rice, the National Security Adviser. This is a letter to Speaker PAUL RYAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: As you are aware, on February 22, the Administration transmitted to Congress its formal request for $1.9 billion in emergency supplemental funding to address the public health threat posed by the Zika virus. Sixty-four days have passed since this initial request; yet still Congress has not acted.

Since the time the Administration transmitted its request, the public health threat posed by the Zika virus has increased. After careful review of existing evidence, scientists at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) concluded that the Zika virus is a cause of microcephaly and other severe fetal brain defects. The Zika virus has spread in Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands and abroad. As of April 20, there were 891 confirmed Zika cases in the continental United States and U.S. territories, including 81 pregnant women with confirmed cases of Zika. Based on similar experiences with other diseases transmitted by the Aedes aegypti mosquito—believed to be the primary carrier of the Zika virus—scientists at the CDC expect there could be local transmission within the continental U.S. in the summer months. Updated estimate range maps show that these mosquitoes have been found in cities as far north as San Francisco, Kansas City and New York City.

In the absence of action from Congress to address the Zika virus, the Administration has taken concrete and aggressive steps to help keep America safe from this growing public health threat. The Administration is working closely with State and local governments to prepare for outbreaks in the continental United States and to respond to the current outbreak in Puerto Rico and other U.S. territories. We are expanding mosquito control surveillance and laboratory capacity; developing improved diagnostics as well as vaccines; supporting affected expectant mothers, and supporting other Zika response efforts in Puerto Rico, the U.S. territories, the continental United States, and abroad. These efforts are crucial, but they are costly and they fall well outside of current agency appropriations. To meet these immediate needs, the Administration conducted a careful examination of existing Ebola balances and identified $510 million to redirect towards Zika response activities. We have also redirected an additional $79 million from other activities. This reprogramming, while necessary, is not without cost. It is particularly painful at a time when state and local public health departments are already strained.

While this immediate infusion of resources is necessary to enable the Administration to take critical first steps in our response to the public health threat posed by Zika, it is insufficient. Without significant additional appropriations this summer, the Nation's efforts to comprehensively respond to the disease will be severely undermined. In particular, the Administration may need to suspend crucial activities, such as mosquito control and surveillance in the absence of emergency supplemental funding. State and local governments that manage mosquito control and response operations will not be able to hire needed responders to engage in mosquito mitigation efforts. Additionally, the Administration's ability to move to the next phase of vaccine development, which requires multi-year commitments from the Government to encourage the private sector to prioritize Zika research and development, could be jeopardized. Without emergency supplemental funding, the development of faster and more accurate diagnostic tests also will be impeded. The Administration may not be able to conduct follow up of children born to pregnant women with Zika to better understand the range of Zika impacts, particularly those health effects that are not evident at birth. The supplemental request is also needed to replenish the amounts that we are now spending from our Ebola accounts to fund Zika-related activities. This will ensure we have sufficient contingency funds to address unanticipated needs related to both Zika and Ebola. As we have seen with both Ebola and Zika, there are still many unknowns about the science and scale of the outbreak and how it will impact mothers, babies, and health systems domestically and abroad.

The Administration is pleased to learn that there is bipartisan support for providing emergency funding to address the Zika crisis, but we remain concerned about the adequacy and speed of this response. To properly protect the American public, and in particular pregnant women and their newborns, Congress must fund the Administration's request of $1.9 billion and find a path forward to address this public health emergency immediately. The American people deserve action now. With the summer months fast approaching, we continue to believe that the Zika supplemental should not be considered as part of the regular appropriations process, as it relates to funding we must receive this year in order to most effectively prepare for and mitigate the impact of the virus.

We urge you to pass free-standing emergency supplemental funding legislation at the level requested by the Administration before Congress leaves town for the Memorial Day recess. We look forward to working with you to protect the safety and health of all Americans.

Sincerely,

SHAUN DONOVAN,
Director, The Office of Management and Budget.
SUSAN RICE,
National Security Advisor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The letter basically says that the existing appropriations are not enough. This is what the letter says: ''Without significant additional appropriations this summer, the Nation's efforts to comprehensively respond to the disease will be severely undermined. In particular, the administration may need to suspend crucial activities, such as mosquito control and surveillance in the absence of emergency supplemental funding. State and local governments that manage mosquito control and response operations will not be able to hire needed responders to engage in mosquito mitigation efforts. Additionally, the administration's ability to move to the next phase of vaccine development, which requires multiyear commitments from the government to encourage the private sector to prioritize Zika research and development, could be jeopardized.''

I mean, I go right down the list on all the warnings here. This is a big deal. This is a big deal. If my friends on the other side are trying to rationalize putting this off, I would suggest to reread this letter. Reread this letter. Talk to the scientists. Talk to the experts. We need to have the necessary resources to be able to combat what might come our way in terms of the Zika virus. I want to do this so that we don't have a loss of life here in this country, so we are prepared.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question. I ask Members to defeat it so that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) can offer an amendment for this House to immediately consider legislation to confront the Zika crisis. There are already 891 confirmed cases of the Zika virus in the United States and its territories, and 81 of them are pregnant women. This is an emergency.

We do have a disaster relief fund in this Congress. It is about $8 billion so that when there is a flood, when there is a fire, when there is a hurricane, we can immediately move to take that

money and address the costs of life and other costs from that disaster.

Unfortunately, we don't have a public health emergency fund, which is why the President is asking for $1.9 billion. This is an emergency. We cannot afford to wait another day to approve the President's request. Every day we delay, we redirect crucial resources away from city and State emergency preparedness funding. We are robbing Peter to pay Paul. Cities and States across the country are being robbed of emergency preparedness grants, $44 million in total. Not only will these States have fewer resources to address public health crises, they will have fewer resources to address the Zika virus itself. Already in addition to that $44 million, the administration has reprogrammed $510 million from the Ebola crisis funding, and that crisis is not over in western Africa.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am going to include in the RECORD a list of all of the States and the amount of money that they have already lost in emergency grants for preparedness for health emergencies.

California, almost 10 percent loss; Florida, almost 10 percent loss; North Carolina, 8 percent; Texas, almost 10 percent in money taken away from preparedness grants.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable that in the midst of a global health crisis, we cannot appropriate emergency funds to save lives and instead resort to gutting our States' emergency preparedness.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to think of the women across our country and the predicament that they face today of choosing whether or not they should get pregnant or, if they are already pregnant, wondering whether or not their baby is okay. We must fund the President's request. It is the responsible and moral thing to do.

Yes, today, physicians are divided as to whether or not they should tell women of the United States not to get pregnant. Is that the message we want to send to American women? I don't think so.

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

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

In closing, I again urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so we can bring forward a bill that we believe can help adequately prepare this country to deal with the Zika virus, something that I think the majority of Americans support, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

This should not be a controversial issue. If it is, then people can vote against it if it comes to the floor, but what we do know is that what we have done up to this point in terms of our responsibility here in Congress in providing the funds has not been adequate. I read earlier from the letter from the White House all the things that could be on hold or not move forward if we don't adequately fund the necessary infrastructure to deal with this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I would also say that it seems to me that dealing effectively with the Zika crisis is a heck of a lot more important than what we are being asked to vote on and debate today. I have been saying this every time I come to the floor and handle a rule, but it seems that legislation that has minimum impact or that in some cases might even be trivial takes precedence over legislation that actually might do something to help lift up the lives of people in this country or, even in this case, protect the lives of people in this country.

We ought to come together in a bipartisan way to make sure that at least priority items come to the floor of the House. This is supposed to be the people's House, and that is where the people's business is supposed to be done. We are not doing it. By not addressing the Zika crisis more forthrightly, we are not doing the people's business.

So, again, vote ''no'' on the previous question and vote ''no'' on the rule.

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

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

What a great day to be on the floor for us to really bring forth our ideas. The obligations that we have here as Members of Congress to work with each other, to listen to each other is apparent to me, but I don't think apparent to every single person.

We have allowed, meaning Chairman ROGERS has allowed, in consultation with the Speaker, for money to be reprogrammed, which is aplenty right now. We have agreed this is an immediate crisis. We have made sure the administration is not wanting for a penny. We recognize that in the processes that will take place, we will go through in a regular order procedure getting these funds reprogrammed and allocated to fill back up the bucket.

□ 1315

I have satisfied myself that we are trying to do the right thing. I have great concern that the American people understand we do care about the children and the families. I get this. We do care. And until we go through this process to further develop it and add money, the administration has the money necessary to do as they see fit to protect the American people, to combat this virus—this disease—and to make sure that we get a handle on it.

Mr. Speaker, the value of startups, which is why we are here today, cannot be understated.

Founded in 2013, back home in Dallas, Texas, which I have the pleasure of representing, is the Dallas Entrepreneur Center, or DEC, which is a nonprofit created to help entrepreneurs start, build, and grow companies. According to the DEC, over 1,000 jobs were created in the past 2 years and another 500 are expected to be hired by Dallas startups in 2016. That is the power of what we are talking about.

The SEC has gotten in the way of this, not only with red tape, but with consternation directly back at the process that the free enterprise system has to make these jobs happen.

Investment in startups has been done in Dallas. Companies like Edition Collective, Rise, PICKUP, and Visage Payroll in Dallas, Texas, are prime examples of the success that could take place all across this country, not just in Dallas, Texas, but in other places where entrepreneurs should be king also. And they are king because they are providing jobs—good-paying jobs—for people.

Mr. Speaker, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act is a bipartisan, bicameral bill that provides small, innovative companies and startups access to the capital they need, just as we have talked about that exists in Dallas, Texas. We are helping them succeed. We are helping them to innovate and grow jobs and turn them into opportunities for our Nation to have better products and services.

As ANGUS KING, a Senator from Maine who is one of the Senate's cosponsors, said: ''By fixing flawed Federal rules, the HALOS Act will remove unnecessary roadblocks and help startups grow and thrive.''

I couldn't have said it better myself. He needs it in Maine. We need it in Dallas, Texas. We do not have all the jobs we need. There are still too many people unemployed in our country. That is why we are here doing this.

In particular, two Dallas startups, iSIGHT Partners and Bottle Rocket, are revolutionizing the field of cyber threat intelligence and mobile strategy development, respectively. Imagine for just a moment what it took them, despite these problems in the marketplace, to get started and get done. I think it is time that we allow others the opportunity to make life a little bit easier.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this rule. This awesome legislation and what it represents is bipartisan, is bicameral, and has no boundaries of who may participate.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 701 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

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. 5044) making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2016 to respond to Zika virus. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair

and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. 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. 5044.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

AMERICAN MANUFACTURING COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2016

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4923) to establish a process for the submission and consideration of petitions for temporary duty suspensions and reductions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4923

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 ''American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE NEED FOR A MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF BILL.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) As of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States imposes duties on imported goods for which there is no domestic availability or insufficient domestic availability.

(2) The imposition of duties on such goods creates artificial distortions in the economy of the United States that negatively affect United States manufacturers and consumers.

(3) The manufacturing competitiveness of the United States around the world will be enhanced if Congress regularly and predictably updates the Harmonized Tariff Schedule to suspend or reduce duties on such goods.

(4) Creating and maintaining an open and transparent process for consideration of petitions for duty suspensions and reductions builds confidence that the process is fair, open to all, and free of abuse.

(5) Complying with the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in particular with clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, is essential to fostering and maintaining confidence in the process for considering a miscellaneous tariff bill.

(6) A miscellaneous tariff bill developed under this process will not contain any—

(A) congressional earmarks or limited tax benefits within the meaning of clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; or

(B) congressionally directed spending items or limited tax benefits within the meaning of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(7) Because any limited tariff benefits contained in any miscellaneous tariff bill following the process set forth by this Act will not have been the subject of legislation introduced by an individual Member of Congress and will be fully vetted through a transparent and fair process free of abuse, it is appropriate for Congress to consider limited tariff benefits as part of that miscellaneous tariff bill as long as—

(A) in the case of a miscellaneous tariff bill considered in the House of Representatives, consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives, a list of such limited tariff benefits is published in the reports of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives accompanying the miscellaneous tariff bill, or in the Congressional Record; and

(B) in the case of a miscellaneous tariff bill considered in the Senate, consistent with the Standing Rules of the Senate—

(i) such limited tariff benefits have been identified through lists, charts, or other similar means; and

(ii) the information identified in clause (i) has been available on a publicly accessible congressional website in a searchable format at least 48 hours before the vote on the motion to proceed to the miscellaneous tariff bill or the vote on the adoption of a report of a committee of conference in connection with the miscellaneous tariff bill, as the case may be.

(8) When the process set forth under paragraph (7) is followed, it is consistent with the letter and intent of the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate and other related guidance.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, to remove the competitive disadvantage to United States manufacturers and consumers and to promote the competitiveness of United States manufacturers, Congress should, not later than 90 days after the United States International Trade Commission issues a final report on petitions for duty suspensions and reductions under section 3(b)(3)(E), consider a miscellaneous tariff bill.

SEC. 3. PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONS FOR DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to establish a process for the submission and consideration of petitions for duty suspensions and reductions.

(b) REQUIREMENTS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) INITIATION.—Not later than October 15, 2016, and October 15, 2019, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register and on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission a notice requesting members of the public who can demonstrate that they are likely beneficiaries of duty suspensions or reductions to

submit to the Commission during the 60-day period beginning on the date of such publication—

(A) petitions for duty suspensions and reductions; and

(B) Commission disclosure forms with respect to such duty suspensions and reductions.

(2) CONTENT OF PETITIONS.—Each petition for a duty suspension or reduction under paragraph (1)(A) shall include the following information:

(A) The name and address of the petitioner.

(B) A statement as to whether the petition provides for an extension of an existing duty suspension or reduction or provides for a new duty suspension or reduction.

(C) A certification that the petitioner is a likely beneficiary of the proposed duty suspension or reduction.

(D) An article description for the proposed duty suspension or reduction to be included in the amendment to subchapter II of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(E) To the extent available—

(i) a classification of the article for purposes of the amendment to subchapter II of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States;

(ii) a classification ruling of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to the article; and

(iii) a copy of a U.S. Customs and Border Protection entry summary indicating where the article is classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(F) A brief and general description of the article.

(G) A brief description of the industry in the United States that uses the article.

(H) An estimate of the total value, in United States dollars, of imports of the article for each of the 5 calendar years after the calendar year in which the petition is filed, including an estimate of the total value of such imports by the person who submits the petition and by any other importers, if available.

(I) The name of each person that imports the article, if available.

(J) A description of any domestic production of the article, if available.

(K) Such other information as the Commission may require.

(3) REVIEW.—

(A) COMMISSION PUBLICATION AND PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—As soon as practicable after the expiration of the 60-day period specified in paragraph (1), but in any case not later than 30 days after the expiration of such 60-day period, the Commission shall publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission—

(i) the petitions for duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(A) that contain the information required under paragraph (2); and

(ii) the Commission disclosure forms with respect to such duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(B).

(B) PUBLIC COMMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall publish in the Federal Register and on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission a notice requesting members of the public to submit to the Commission during the 45-day period beginning on the date of publication described in subparagraph (A) comments on—

(I) the petitions for duty suspensions and reductions published by the Commission under subparagraph (A)(i); and

(II) the Commission disclosure forms with respect to such duty suspensions and reductions published by the Commission under subparagraph (A)(ii).

(ii) PUBLICATION OF COMMENTS.—The Commission shall publish a notice in the Federal Register directing members of the public to a publicly available Internet website of the Commission to view the comments of the members of the public received under clause (i).

(C) PRELIMINARY REPORT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the expiration of the 120-day period beginning on the date of publication described in subparagraph (A), but in any case not later than 30 days after the expiration of such 120-day period, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a preliminary report on the petitions for duty suspensions and reductions submitted under paragraph (1)(A). The preliminary report shall contain the following information with respect to each petition for a duty suspension or reduction:

(I) The heading or subheading of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in which each article that is the subject of the petition for the duty suspension or reduction is classified, as identified by documentation supplied to the Commission, and any supporting information obtained by the Commission.

(II) A determination of whether or not domestic production of the article that is the subject of the petition for the duty suspension or reduction exists, taking into account the report of the Secretary of Commerce under subsection (c)(1), and, if such production exists, whether or not a domestic producer of the article objects to the duty suspension or reduction.

(III) Any technical changes to the article description of the article that is the subject of the petition for the duty suspension or reduction that are necessary for purposes of administration when the article is presented for importation, taking into account the report of the Secretary of Commerce under subsection (c)(2).

(IV) An estimate of the amount of loss in revenue to the United States that would no longer be collected if the duty suspension or reduction takes effect.

(V) A determination of whether or not the duty suspension or reduction is available to any person that imports the article that is the subject of the duty suspension or reduction.

(VI) The likely beneficiaries of each duty suspension or reduction, including whether the petitioner is a likely beneficiary.

(ii) CATEGORIES OF INFORMATION.—The preliminary report submitted under clause (i) shall also contain the following information:

(I) A list of petitions for duty suspensions and reductions that meet the requirements of this Act without modifications.

(II) A list of petitions for duty suspensions and reductions for which the Commission recommends technical corrections in order to meet the requirements of this Act, with the correction specified.

(III) A list of petitions for duty suspensions and reductions for which the Commission recommends modifications to the amount of the duty suspension or reduction that is the subject of the petition to comply with the requirements of this Act, with the modification specified.

(IV) A list of petitions for duty suspensions and reductions for which the Commission recommends modifications to the scope of the articles that are the subject of such petitions to address objections by domestic producers to such petitions, with the modifications specified.

(V) A list of the following:

(aa) Petitions for duty suspensions and reductions that the Commission has determined do not contain the information required under paragraph (2).

(bb) Petitions for duty suspensions and reductions with respect to which the Commission has determined the petitioner is not a likely beneficiary.

(VI) A list of petitions for duty suspensions and reductions that the Commission does not recommend for inclusion in a miscellaneous tariff bill, other than petitions specified in subclause (V).

(D) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The Commission shall consider any information submitted by the appropriate congressional committees to the Commission relating to moving a petition that is contained in the list referred to in subclause (VI) of subparagraph (C)(ii) of the preliminary report submitted under subparagraph (C) to a list referred to in subclause (I), (II), (III), or (IV) of subparagraph (C)(ii).

(E) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the preliminary report is submitted under subparagraph (C), the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a final report on each petition for a duty suspension or reduction specified in the preliminary report. The final report shall contain with respect to each such petition—

(i) the information required under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (C) and updated as appropriate under subparagraph (D); and

(ii) a determination of the Commission whether—

(I) the duty suspension or reduction can likely be administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(II) the estimated loss in revenue to the United States from the duty suspension or reduction does not exceed $500,000 in a calendar year during which the duty suspension or reduction would be in effect; and

(III) the duty suspension or reduction is available to any person importing the article that is the subject of the duty suspension or reduction.

(F) EXCLUSIONS.—The appropriate congressional committees may exclude from a miscellaneous tariff bill any petition for a duty suspension or reduction that—

(i) is contained in any list referred to in subclause (I), (II), (III), or (IV) of subparagraph (C)(ii), as updated as appropriate under subparagraph (E)(i);

(ii) is the subject of an objection from a Member of Congress; or

(iii) is for an article for which there is domestic production.

(G) ESTIMATES BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.—For purposes of reflecting the estimate of the Congressional Budget Office, the appropriate congressional committees shall adjust the amount of a duty suspension or reduction in a miscellaneous tariff bill only to assure that the estimated loss in revenue to the United States from that duty suspension or reduction, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, does not exceed $500,000 in a calendar year during which the duty suspension or reduction would be in effect.

(H) PROHIBITIONS.—Any petitions for duty suspensions or reductions that are contained in any list referred to in subclause (V) or (VI) of subparagraph (C)(ii), as updated as appropriate under subparagraph (E)(i), or have not otherwise undergone the processes required by this Act shall not be included in a miscellaneous tariff bill.

(4) CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION.—The procedures concerning the release of confidential business information set forth in section 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332(g)) shall apply with respect to information received by the Commission in posting petitions on a publicly available website of the Commission and in preparing reports under this subsection.

(5) PROCEDURES.—The Commission shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register and on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission procedures to be complied with by members of the public submitting petitions for duty suspensions and reductions under subsection (b)(1)(A).

(c) DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of publication of the petitions for duty suspensions and reductions under subsection (b)(3)(A), the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with U.S. Customs and Border Protection and other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit to the Commission and the appropriate congressional committees a report on each petition for a duty suspension or reduction submitted under subsection (b)(1)(A) that includes the following information:

(1) A determination of whether or not domestic production of the article that is the subject of the petition for the duty suspension or reduction exists and, if such production exists, whether or not a domestic producer of the article objects to the petition for the duty suspension or reduction.

(2) Any technical changes to the article description that are necessary for purposes of administration when articles are presented for importation.

SEC. 4. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS ON UNITED STATES ECONOMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of a miscellaneous tariff bill, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the effects on the United States economy of duty suspensions and reductions enacted pursuant to this Act, including a broad assessment of the economic effects of such duty suspensions and reductions on producers, purchasers, and consumers in the United States, using case studies describing such effects on selected industries or by type of article as available data permit.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Commission shall also solicit and append to the report required under subsection (a) recommendations with respect to those domestic industry sectors or specific domestic industries that might benefit from permanent duty suspensions and reductions, either through a unilateral action of the United States or though negotiations for reciprocal tariff agreements, with a particular focus on inequities created by tariff inversions.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 5. PUBLICATION OF LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE SENATE.

(a) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The chair of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall include a list of limited tariff benefits contained in a miscellaneous tariff bill in the report to accompany such a bill or, in a case where a miscellaneous tariff bill is not reported by the committee, shall cause such a list to be printed in the appropriate section of the Congressional Record.

(2) LIMITED TARIFF BENEFIT DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection and consistent with clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, as in effect during the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, the term ''limited tariff benefit'' means a provision modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities.

(b) SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the Majority Leader of the Senate, or the designee of the Majority Leader of the Senate, shall provide for the publication in the Congressional Record of a certification that—

(A) each limited tariff benefit contained in a miscellaneous tariff bill considered in the Senate has been identified through lists, charts, or other similar means; and

(B) the information identified in subparagraph (A) has been available on a publicly accessible congressional website in a searchable format at least 48 hours before the vote on the motion to proceed to the miscellaneous tariff bill or the vote on the adoption of a report of a committee of conference in connection with the miscellaneous tariff bill, as the case may be.

(2) SATISFACTION OF SENATE RULES.—Publication of a certification in the Congressional Record under paragraph (1) satisfies the certification requirements of paragraphs 1(a), 2(a), and 3(a) of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(3) LIMITED TARIFF BENEFIT DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection and consistent with rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as in effect during the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, the term ''limited tariff benefit'' means a provision modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities.

(c) ENACTMENT AS EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This section is enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and such procedures supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 6. JUDICIAL REVIEW PRECLUDED.

The exercise of functions under this Act shall not be subject to judicial review.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the United States International Trade Commission.

(3) COMMISSION DISCLOSURE FORM.—The term ''Commission disclosure form'' means, with respect to a petition for a duty suspension or reduction, a document submitted by a petitioner to the Commission that contains the following:

(A) The contact information for any known importers of the article to which the proposed duty suspension or reduction would apply.

(B) A certification by the petitioner that the proposed duty suspension or reduction is available to any person importing the article to which the proposed duty suspension or reduction would apply.

(C) A certification that the petitioner is a likely beneficiary of the proposed duty suspension or reduction.

(4) DOMESTIC PRODUCER.—The term ''domestic producer'' means a person that demonstrates production, or imminent production, in the United States of an article that is identical to, or like or directly competitive with, an article to which a petition for a duty suspension or reduction would apply.

(5) DOMESTIC PRODUCTION.—The term ''domestic production'' means the production of an article that is identical to, or like or directly competitive with, an article to which a petition for a duty suspension or reduction would apply, for which a domestic producer has demonstrated production, or imminent production, in the United States.

(6) DUTY SUSPENSION OR REDUCTION.—The term ''duty suspension or reduction'' refers to an amendment to subchapter II of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States for a period not to exceed 3 years that—

(A) extends an existing temporary duty suspension or reduction on an article under that subchapter; or

(B) provides for a new temporary duty suspension or reduction on an article under that subchapter.

(7) LIKELY BENEFICIARY.—The term ''likely beneficiary'' means an individual or entity likely to utilize, or benefit directly from the utilization of, an article that is the subject of a petition for a duty suspension or reduction.

(8) MEMBER OF CONGRESS.—The term ''Member of Congress'' means a Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress.

(9) MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF BILL.—The term ''miscellaneous tariff bill'' means a bill of either House of Congress that contains only duty suspensions and reductions and related technical corrections that—

(A) are included in the final report of the Commission submitted to the appropriate congressional committees under section 3(b)(3)(E), except for—

(i) petitions for duty suspensions or reductions that the Commission has determined do not contain the information required under section 3(b)(2);

(ii) petitions for duty suspensions and reductions with respect to which the Commission has determined the petitioner is not a likely beneficiary; and

(iii) petitions for duty suspensions and reductions that the Commission does not recommend for inclusion in the miscellaneous tariff bill;

(B) are not excluded under section 3(b)(3)(F); and

(C) otherwise meet the applicable requirements of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4923, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am honored to be here today to speak about the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2016. This bipartisan bill will help our manufacturers of all sizes reduce costs, create jobs, and compete in the global market by creating a transparent process that is entirely consistent with House rules.

This legislation is formally called the Miscellaneous Tariff Bill, or MTB for short, but it makes more sense to think of this as an MTB of another kind: legislation providing manufacturing tax breaks, plain and simple.

Before I begin to speak more specifically about what this bill does, I would like to tell you why it is so essential for the success of our economy.

Since 2012, American manufactures have had to pay full tariffs—border taxes, in essence—for certain imported products that aren't made in the United States, unnecessarily increasing their costs. These tariffs, or border taxes, have cost them $748 million a year, and there has been no opportunity for them to get relief from these taxes. These border taxes, in turn, have made it harder for them to sell their products, grow their businesses, create jobs, and invest in their communities.

A coalition of American businesses of all sizes explained it best in their recent letter. They wrote:

''As a result, manufacturers, especially small- and medium-sized manufacturers, in industries ranging from

agriculture and electronics to textiles, chemicals and beyond, have seen their costs go up for inputs not produced in the United States, undermining American competitiveness and the ability of these companies to retain and create manufacturing jobs in the United States.''

The good news is that help is on the way. After working together for months, Trade Subcommittee Chairman DAVE REICHERT, Ranking Members LEVIN and RANGEL, and I led a bipartisan group of Members in both the House and the Senate who recently introduced the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2016. The bill is designed to solve this problem and deliver much-needed relief to manufacturers across our country. Here is how the new three-step process will work:

First, local businesses of all sizes throughout our districts will petition the independent, nonpartisan International Trade Commission. They will make their case for why they need manufacturing tax breaks. After the ITC receives these petitions, it will solicit comments from the American public and the administration. The ITC will conduct a thorough and transparent analysis.

Secondly, the ITC will then issue a public report to Congress with its analysis and recommendations regarding products that meet the MTB standards. In these reports, the ITC will confirm that no company in America makes these products and explain why it is important to offer these tax breaks to our local manufacturers.

The third and final step in the process is for Congress to consider the ITC's recommendations. The Ways and Means Committee will examine the ITC's recommendations and prepare a package of legislation providing tax breaks for American manufacturers. Consistent with our rules, we cannot add provisions that haven't received a favorable recommendation from the ITC. Then, Congress will consider the entire package.

At the end of this process, American manufacturers of all sizes will be able to enjoy tax breaks that will make it easier for them to compete in the global market and create more jobs in our communities.

While this bill is a victory for manufacturers and consumers, it is really also a victory for openness and transparency. After all, our new MTB process upholds our strong earmark rules and also gives the American people the opportunity to offer their opinion throughout the entire process. By passing this bill today, we are taking a tremendous step to ensure that we finally have a system in place that helps our manufacturers here in America compete in the global market—and win.

I would like to take a quick moment to recognize my colleagues who have worked so hard on this legislation. Specifically, I would like to thank Ranking Member SANDER LEVIN along with Subcommittee Chairman DAVE REICHERT and Ranking Member CHARLIE RANGEL for their help and leadership.

I am also grateful to committee members PAT TIBERI, TOM REED, JIM RENACCI, EARL BLUMENAUER, BILL PASCRELL, and DANNY DAVIS, who have been actively involved in developing this legislation.

We also got help throughout the conference. I would like to specifically thank Representatives MARK WALKER, TOM MCCLINTOCK, TODD ROKITA, MICK MULVANEY, and ROD BLUM for their considerable leadership throughout this process.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this critical legislation to provide tax breaks for our local manufacturers.

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

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 20, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chair, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: On April 19, 2016, the Committee on Ways and Means ordered reported H.R. 4923, the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2016. As you know, the Committee on Rules was granted an additional referral upon the bill's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives over the rules of the House and special orders of business.

Because of your willingness to consult with my committee regarding this matter, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Rules Committee. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Rules Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 4923. In addition, the Committee on Rules reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Rules for conferees on H.R. 4923 or related legislation.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part of your committee's report on the bill and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 21, 2016.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4923, the ''American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2016.'' As you noted, the Committee on Rules was granted an additional referral of the bill.

I am most appreciative of your decision to waive consideration of H.R. 4923 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Rules is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees on any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include a copy of our letters in our Committee's report on H.R. 4923, as well as the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join with the chairman today. We have welcomed the opportunity—indeed, the absolute necessity—to try to work together. So I want to place what we are doing today in some perspective.

It has been nearly 6 years since Congress last passed a miscellaneous tariff bill. We are just now establishing a process to consider a future MTB bill, which would not happen until the end of 2017. This years-long delay has hurt U.S. manufacturers and our manufacturing competitiveness. It is long past time for this House to finally take action and to move forward.

MTB legislation boils down to one thing, basically: supporting and growing manufacturing jobs right here in America. And very importantly, these jobs do not come at the expense of others.

In 2010, the bipartisan, thorough, and transparent process we established to consider MTB bills worked effectively. It included direct input from the public, the administration, and the International Trade Commission.

The committee then posted all of these comments from the public and the administration on a publicly available Web site. And perhaps most importantly, that input was crucial in making sure that domestic production was not competing with imported products in the bill.

At that time, Republican leaders in Congress publicly objected to the MTB bill, conflating it with earmarks. When Democrats brought the bill to the floor in 2010, Republicans bucked their leadership and almost en masse supported the bill because of its importance to U.S. manufacturers and American jobs. It ultimately passed the House 378–43.

Unfortunately, as the Republicans became the majority, action on MTB was frozen. For years, the result was injury to domestic manufacturing and the jobs it supports throughout our country.

This bill shifts the responsibility to formally propose to ITC. I support the bill today before us because it retains all of the uniquely strong provisions on transparency developed in 2010, ensuring that all potential MTBs are thoroughly vetted.

□ 1330

It provides a chance for valuable input from a variety of stakeholders. This input is the key to ensuring that MTB bills do not undermine domestic product or jobs.

The process makes sure that the benefits provided by the bill support and

create American jobs without hurting our domestic manufacturers.

Additionally, this bill allows a Member of Congress to object to and, essentially, remove an individual MTB from the final legislative package.

So it has been a frustrating 6 years, and I say this with some emotion because we have worked hard over these years to try to move, often hitting obstacles. So it has been a frustrating 6 years since this Congress passed an MTB.

It has been even more frustrating for manufacturing across the country, but I believe we have reached a sufficient path forward now that will ultimately be beneficial for American manufacturers and for American workers.

It is more than overdue. It is about time a solution has been found, not one that I initially favored. But it is important to move ahead. So, therefore, I strongly support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the honorable gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade, who has played such a key role, again, in advancing free trade and the manufacturing tax breaks.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BRADY for yielding and for his leadership and, also, Ranking Member LEVIN for his leadership.

This is truly a bipartisan effort working its way through Congress today. It is finally a pleasure to see this come to fruition.

We talk about MTBs. We throw a lot of acronyms around here in Congress, and sometimes it is hard to keep track of what all those acronyms mean.

But the definition of miscellaneous tariff, really, simply put, is a tax. It is a tax on businesses here in America taxed on imports from other countries on products used in building other products here in the United States.

Those products that are imported, that our companies are being taxed on, are not made here in the United States. So it is an additional cost on our manufacturers, who then have to raise their prices and that, of course, is passed on to our consumers and they pay a higher cost for those goods.

Even sometimes, Mr. Speaker, these miscellaneous tariffs can result in jobs being moved overseas.

So the process is simple. Step one is businesses present their requests to an independent board, nonpartisan, called the ITC, International Trade Commission.

Step two is that it is an open and transparent process. They asked for input from all across the country, from the public, from businesses, from Congress, from the administration, an open, transparent process.

Step three is Congress takes action.

And step four is America wins. They become more competitive.

What are the benefits of MTB? It is clear and simple.

The benefits are: Cuts costs for manufacturers importing products not made in the U.S.; reduces prices for consumers; strengthens transparency; and it grows the economy, creating the opportunity to make more products, make more products, hire more people, obviously, more people back to work creating jobs.

So today I rise in strong support of this solution to the problem that we have been facing here for the last few years, as Mr. LEVIN described.

It fully complies with our House rules, has strong bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), one of our key, most effective leaders on trade in the Ways and Means Committee in the House.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the American Competitiveness Act to help our domestic manufacturers.

Today there are American companies that must unfairly pay miscellaneous tariffs, or taxes, on the materials they need to make their products here in the United States simply because these materials are not available in the United States. Instead, they have to import these materials.

The bill before us creates a new, transparent process for miscellaneous tariff bills, or MTBs, to be enacted. And just how important are these MTBs?

Since the last MTB package expired in 2012, we have seen $748 million in additional taxes at the border for American manufacturers every year.

That is a lot of money, Mr. Speaker. It is money that manufacturers could use to hire more employees, to grow their business or, of course, to lower prices for their customers.

And this isn't speculation. The last MTB initiative supported 90,000 manufacturing jobs here in the United States. In Minnesota, it is manufacturers like 3M and Knitcraft and Honeywell that will see the benefits.

I encourage my colleagues to join me today in supporting our manufacturers by voting in support of this legislation.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), one of our key members of the Ways and Means Committee with a business background.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer congratulations not only to our chairman on the Ways and Means Committee, KEVIN BRADY, as well as the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, DAVID REICHERT, but also the ranking member, Mr. LEVIN.

We have come together on a bipartisan basis, Mr. Speaker, to stand for this legislation that is going to help our U.S. domestic manufacturers.

This is a reduction of cost that potentially could go in the millions, if not billions, of dollars in the future and that is going to allow our U.S. manufacturers to compete on the world stage in a much better position than they find themselves today.

So I applaud the efforts of colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together to find a solution that allows us to honor an open and transparent process, to stand with our U.S. manufacturers, to reduce the tax burden, and to reduce the costs on these manufacturers that are the heart and soul of our job creators across the country.

As I know companies in my district in western New York, the benefits that these companies will see impact not only large corporations, but also mom-and-pop domestic manufacturers, companies like Vere Sandals. It is a small mom-and-pop shop in my district that has to rely upon an import that it can only get outside of America.

They are now in a position, after this legislation is passed, to be able to build and manufacture those sandals in a competitive way. That means that that mom-and-pop operation is going be able to employ not only their present employees, but potentially invest in expansion.

Why is that important, Mr. Speaker? Because those are the jobs that are being created today and tomorrow.

So I want to give, again, a congratulatory tip of the hat to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as well as to the chairman on a job well done.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM), one of our key new leaders in trade, manufacturing, and agriculture, a new Member of Congress who played a key role, again, in this legislation.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank Chairman BRADY, Ranking Member LEVIN, the rest of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who join in cosponsoring this important legislation, H.R. 4923, the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2016.

I also want to thank my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for his leadership in educating our freshman class about this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation creates an open and transparent process to consider reducing burdensome manufacturing tariffs through miscellaneous tariff bills while at the same time maintaining the commonsense House ban on earmarks.

Without this legislation, American manufacturers will continue to pay high tariffs on essential raw materials that have no domestic source. This undermines manufacturers' competitiveness with foreign manufacturers and damages their ability to create manufacturing jobs here in America.

Mr. Speaker, our economy has been limping along for quite some time now. This is the worst economic recovery following a recession since World War II. GDP growth is just 60 percent of our 70-year average. I will say that again: 60 percent of average. Because of this, wages for working families are stagnant.

American businesses are being stifled by red tape, high taxes, and a Federal Government that crowds out private investment through its addiction to deficit spending.

I am not willing to accept that this economy is the new normal. We can do far better, Mr. Speaker. We need to make America the best place in the world to do business.

I believe that, by instituting progrowth policies, we can get wages for Americans moving up again and encourage businesses to invest in growing here instead of going overseas.

This bipartisan legislation is a concrete, direct example of something Congress can do immediately to make American manufacturing more competitive. Helping our manufacturers create good-paying jobs for American workers instead of moving them overseas should not be a partisan issue.

I look forward to seeing this bill move through Congress and will continue to be a voice for workers and manufacturers in Iowa and across the country so we can reignite our economy, raise wages for working families and once again make America the best place in the world to do business.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I will be very brief.

We have welcomed the chance to work together, and I want to thank the staff on both sides for doing that.

There were obstacles, I think unfortunate ones, in terms of the interpretation of the rules of this House. Lots of jobs were lost. Tariffs were placed on goods when we could have avoided that.

I am proud that, in 2010, when we were in the majority and we worked together up to a point, we developed the most transparent procedures. They were given the gold seal.

Everything had to be out in the open. Everything had to be there for the public to see. If any one of us on either side of the aisle, Democratic or Republican, Senate or House, objected to a provision, saying, for example, that it would impact jobs in the United States, that provision was gone.

As a result of that effort in 2010, when it came up for a vote, only one Democrat of all of us voted against it.

So time has been lost. Jobs have been lost. We have lost some ground on manufacturing that never should have happened.

But the important thing today is that we are moving ahead and we are going to pass a bill that sets in motion a procedure that will go into effect the end of next year.

So I hope we learn from this experience that we should not be tied up by procedures in this Congress. Instead, we should look at what is the real impact of what we do on jobs in this country. These are basically very middle-income jobs, and we have lost too many.

We are now trying to recapture some of that lost ground with this procedure. I think it is something that we now need to adopt.

So I urge all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle and, I hope, the vast majority of you on your side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, that we will join together at long last to pass what we have come to know as MTB.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Think about the benefits of this bipartisan bill: tax cuts to American manufacturers; more jobs in our community, both retained and, in some cases, grown; lower costs for consumers and our businesses as well; Congress retains its strong constitutional powers over tariffs; and this bill complies fully with the current House earmark ban. That is a win-win for American consumers and our economy. It was achieved through bipartisan work.

I thank Ranking Member LEVIN and those who came together across the aisle and across the rotunda to make this process and this solution a reality.

□ 1345

This is good for America. This is good for our manufacturers, it is good for our local jobs, and I urge support for this bill.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support passage of H.R. 4923, the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2016. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation creates an open and transparent process for the House to consider manufacturing tax cuts through the Miscellaneous Tariff Bill (MTB). This new process corrects distortions in the U.S. tariff code that place an unnecessary and anti-competitive tax on manufacturers, retailers and other businesses across the country that rely on imported products not available domestically.

As an active promoter of free trade, I want to commend my good friend and fellow Texan, Congressman BRADY for steering this important legislation to the House floor. I thank him for consulting with me on the development of this legislation, and I am pleased to support his efforts to ensure swift passage of this critical bill. Our partnership was memorialized in the exchange of letters contained in the Ways and Means Committee's report on the measure.

Congress has not renewed MTBs since the U.S. Manufacturing Enhancement Act in 2010 expired at the end of 2012. Since then, U.S. businesses faced an annual $748 million tax increase on manufacturing with an overall economic loss of $1.875 billion for the U.S. economy.

The new MTB process will help American manufacturers compete in the global market while also ensuring a transparent and public process for consideration of MTBs. U.S. businesses will be able to petition the independent, non-partisan International Trade Commission (ITC), explaining the need for a specific tariff reduction or suspension. The ITC will then be able to issue a public report to Congress analyzing the request and whether or not it meets MTB standards, including that there is no domestic production. Congress would then be able to consider the bill within existing House Rules.

Small businesses and manufacturers across the country have long voiced their support for this new process. I am proud to have worked with Congressman BRADY to ensure passage of this job creating legislation.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4923, the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act.

In today's competitive global economy, too often government hampers American businesses with onerous regulations and red tape. As other nations increase their own global competitiveness, we must provide a level playing field for our businesses in diverse fields that include textiles, pharmaceuticals, and manufacturing.

The American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act only allows for tariff waivers on materials that lack a domestic equivalent. Other countries are already regularly granting similar waivers. The National Association of Manufacturers estimates that these tariffs are costing the American economy $748 million a year. The Indiana Manufacturers Association has said that "helping eliminate these miscellaneous tariffs will reduce costs and lower incentives to relocate manufacturing operations abroad, keeping good jobs here."

I thank Chairman BRADY, for bringing together our working group to get this vital legislation done. I urge passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4923, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NO FLY FOR FOREIGN FIGHTERS ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4240) to require an independent review of the operation and administration of the Terrorist Screening Database (TSDB) maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and subsets of the TSDB, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4240

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 ''No Fly for Foreign Fighters Act''.

SEC. 2. GAO STUDY ON THE TERRORIST SCREENING DATABASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, a report on—

(1) whether past weaknesses in the operation and administration of the Terrorist Screening Database (hereinafter referred to as the ''TSDB'') and subsets of the TSDB have been addressed; and

(2) the extent to which existing vulnerabilities to the United States may be addressed or mitigated through additional changes to the TSDB and subsets of the TSDB, thereby enhancing America's security and defenses.

(b) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—The study and report under subsection (a) shall include information on the extent to which—

(1) information is being integrated into the TSDB from all relevant sources across the government in a timely manner;

(2) agencies are able to comply with increased demands for information to improve the TSDB;

(3) the TSDB, and relevant subsets of the TSDB, are accessible to agencies, authorities, and other entities, as appropriate; and

(4) the TSDB is capable of enabling users to identify known or suspected terrorists in the most timely and comprehensive manner possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4240, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, across the globe, nations are on alert as the threat of ISIS spreads. France, Turkey, Belgium, and the United States have each been tragically affected by ISIS or ISIS-inspired terror plots. It is imperative that America's first lines of defense against ISIS and other terror groups are working effectively.

H.R. 4240, the No Fly for Foreign Fighters Act, is a commonsense bill that requires the U.S. Government Accountability Office to conduct an independent review of the operation and administration of the Terrorist Screening Database, or TSDB, which is sometimes referred to as the terrorist watch list. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) has worked diligently on this important issue, and I am pleased to support this bill.

The terrorist watch list is a critical tool in our fight against terrorism. The watch list and the screening process support the U.S. Government's efforts to combat terrorism by consolidating the terrorist watch list and providing screening and law enforcement agencies with information to help them respond appropriately during encounters with known or suspected terrorists, among other things. At the same time, we must ensure that the watch list and the accompanying processes and procedures comport with the Constitution and the values of the American people.

The GAO previously conducted a study of the terrorist watch list following the December 25, 2009, attempted bombing of Northwest Airlines Flight 253, which exposed weaknesses in how the Federal Government nominated individuals to the terrorist watch list and gaps in how agencies use the list to screen individuals to determine if they posed a security threat. Several improvements were made to the watch listing processes and procedures following the December 25, 2009, attempted bombing.

However, concerns have been raised over the effect the watch listing processes and procedures may have on law-abiding persons, including U.S. citizens, based on inaccurate or incomplete information in the database or similar or identical names to watch listed individuals.

The GAO stated in its 2012 watch listing report that routine, government-wide assessments of the outcomes and impacts of agencies' watch list screening or vetting programs could help ensure that these programs are achieving their intended results or identify if revisions are needed. Such assessments could also help identify broader issues that require attention, determine if impacts on agency resources and the traveling public are acceptable, and communicate to key stakeholders how the Nation's investment in the watch list screening or vetting processes is enhancing security of the Nation's borders, commercial aviation, and other security-related activities.

This bill provides for an independent review of the operation and administration of the watch list. It reaffirms our commitment to our Nation's security while upholding the constitutional values that make America unique in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying that this is evidence of the important commitment that the Judiciary Committee has to the issues of criminal justice, but as well recognizes the title of this committee that covers crime, terrorism, homeland security, and investigations.

So I want to thank the chairman, Mr. GOODLATTE, for working with me and his staff, along with Mr. CONYERS, the ranking member, and his staff, and, of course, Mr. RATCLIFFE for his support for my legislation, H.R. 4240, the No Fly for Foreign Fighters Act.

I particularly want to thank the staff because as they well know, my late staff, Tiffany Joslyn, worked very hard with staff members as well on this legislation. So here we are today with an important initiative coming out of the Judiciary Committee working collaboratively, and I believe that is extremely important.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the ranking member of the House Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, the topic of threats to homeland security has always been of particular concern to me. But over the last couple of months, maybe over the last couple of years, as we have seen ISIL raise its ugly head, we have heard of Americans going for the fight, joining and being a part of the caliphate. We have heard of ISIS members moving around, particularly in Europe, moving from country to country. Some may say that they are crossing in a number of modes of transportation, but we also know they are using aviation modes of transportation. Therefore, they pose a serious threat.

I initially introduced the No Fly for Foreign Fighters Act after the investigation of an attempt to detonate explosives on a Northwest Airlines Flight on Christmas Day, 2009. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that was a long time ago.

An investigation of the incident revealed that counter-terrorism agencies had information that raised flags about this individual referred to as the ''underwear bomber,'' but the dots were not connected and he was not placed in the Terrorist Screening Database, or the TSDB. This incident shone a light on potential gaps in our watching and screening process, and that resulted in significant improvements.

That said, questions about the system remain. In fact, it is not uncommon to see news of a flight being diverted or an emergency landing because a passenger happened to be on the no-fly list, but there was a delay getting that information. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to really ensure that we get it right because one wrong time again jeopardizes maybe hundreds of thousands of lives.

It is even more common to read articles about the frequency of false positives and individuals being mistakenly identified as being on the list, causing them and their fellow passengers significant delay and frustration. I remember, having been on the Committee on Homeland Security since the heinous and tragic terrorist acts of 9/11, in those early days, Members of Congress, United States Senators, and others were on the no-fly list. While it may, after the fact, be a little bit humorous, it is not. So we must get it right. The issue of false positives is something that I know

many of my colleagues on the committee are particularly interested in, as well as groups such as the ACLU who was kept very busy by so many people being on wrongly.

In light of the events of the last 12 months, however, the issue of homeland security and, in particular, the accuracy of our screening and watch listing process has become even more significant to me. More than 30,000 foreign fighters from at least 100 different countries have traveled to Syria and Iraq to fight with ISIL since 2011. I want to say that number again: 30,000 foreign fighters have traveled. That means they may return and move throughout Europe or attempt to come to the United States.

In the last 18 months, the number of foreign fighters traveling to Syria and Iraq has more than doubled. If those individuals try to go throughout places in Europe or elsewhere or to the United States, the mode of transportation would be aviation.

In the first 6 months of 2015, more than 7,000 foreign fighters have arrived in Syria and Iraq. Of those traveling to Syria and Iraq to fight for the Islamic State terrorist group, it is estimated that at least 250 hold U.S. citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, we only need one. The accuracy of our terrorist screening tools is more critical now than ever before. That is why I worked with the chairman, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. CONYERS to introduce H.R. 4240, which mandates an independent review of the TSDB's operation and administration.

Although the Inspector General for the Department of Justice conducts annual audits of the TSDB, there has not been an independent review since the GAO study after the 2009 incident.

H.R. 4240 directs the GAO to conduct an independent review of the operation and administration of the TSDB and subsets of the TSDB, to assess whether past weaknesses have been addressed, the extent to which existing vulnerabilities may be resolved or mitigated through additional changes.

This legislation is drafted broadly to allow the GAO to conduct a comprehensive review not just of the TSDB's accuracy, but its entire operation and administration in the name of securing the American people.

Following its study, the GAO will submit a report to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees with its findings and any recommendations for improvements. I am very glad that my colleagues joined me in shortening that timeframe in which a report is to come back so that we can quickly move to urge any changes that need to be made in the list to be accurate and to secure the Nation.

Let me close by thanking the members of this committee who are cosponsors of H.R. 4240 and urge my colleagues to vote to send this critical and timely bipartisan legislation to the House floor, which we are now.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by extending my appreciation to Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, and Mr. RATCLIFFE for your support of my legislation, H.R. 4240, the "No Fly for Foreign Fighters Act."

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security & Investigations, the topic of threats to homeland security has always of particular concern to me.

I initially introduced the "No Fly for Foreign Fighters Act" after the investigation of an attempt to detonate explosives on a Northwest Airlines Flight on Christmas Day 2009.

Investigation of the incident revealed that counterterrorism agencies had information that raised red flags about this individual, referred to as the "underwear bomber," but the dots were not connected and he was not placed in the Terrorist Screening Database or the TSDB.

This incident shone a spotlight on potential gaps in our watching and screening process and that resulted significant improvements.

That said, questions about the system remain.

In fact, it is not uncommon to see news of a flight being diverted or an emergency landing because a passenger happened to be on the No Fly list but there was a delay getting that information.

It is even more common to read articles about the frequency of false positives and individuals being mistakenly identified as being on the list—causing them and their fellow passenger significant delay and frustration.

The issue of false positives is something that I know many of my colleagues on the Committee are particularly interested in, as well as groups such as the ACLU.

In light of the events of the last 12 months, however, the issue of homeland security and, in particular, the accuracy of our screening and watchlisting process has become even more significant to me.

More than 30,000 foreign fighters from at least 100 different countries have traveled to Syria and Iraq to fight for ISIL since 2011.

In the last 18 months, the number of foreign fighters traveling to Syria and Iraq has more than doubled.

In the first six months of 2015, more than 7.000 foreign fighters have arrived in Syria and Iraq.

Of those traveling to Syria and Iraq to fight for the Islamic State terrorist group, it is estimated at least 250 hold U.S. Citizenship.

The accuracy of our terrorist screening tools is more critical now than ever before.

That is why I worked with the Chairman and Mr. RATCLIFFE, to introduce H.R. 4240, which mandates an independent review of the TSDB's operation and administration.

Although the Inspector General for the Department of Justice conducts annual audits of the TSDB, there has not been an independent review since the GAO study after the 2009 incident.

H.R. 4240 directs the GAO to conduct an independent review of the operation and administration of the TSDB, and subsets of the TSDB, to assess: (1) whether past weaknesses have been address; and (2) the extent to which existing vulnerabilities may be resolved or mitigated through additional changes.

This legislation is drafted broadly, to allow the GAO to conduct a comprehensive review not just of the TSDB's accuracy, but of its entire operation and administration.

Following its study, the GAO will submit a report to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, with its findings and any recommendations for improvements.

I would like to thank the many Members of this Committee who are co-sponsors of H.R. 4240 and urge my colleagues to vote to send this critical and timely bipartisan legislation to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by also thanking the many individuals who work tirelessly to make the Terrorist Screening Center an asset to our homeland security infrastructure.

We want to make certain that those men and women have the tools they need to continue to keep this nation safe.

H.R. 4240 is the next step in ensuring that the screening and watchlisting process works as it is intended.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan measure.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the distinguished ranking member who now is the dean of this House.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the author of this bill, the gentlewoman from Texas, who first saw the importance of it. I want to tell you that this measure before us today strengthens the Terrorist Screening Database maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and in doing so, aids in our efforts to combat terrorism and keep our Nation safe.

The FBI's Terrorist Screening Center helps to identify known and suspected terrorists by integrating information collected by law enforcement and the intelligence community.

Since its inception in 2003, this sophisticated watch list and screening system has undoubtedly saved lives; but despite the work of the dedicated individuals who make the screening database possible, the system is not flawless. Past incidents, such as the 2009 Christmas Day attempted attack on a Northwest Airlines flight bound for my hometown of Detroit, already mentioned by the gentlewoman from Texas, has put a spotlight on potential gaps in the system.

□ 1400

Over the years since, the FBI has made significant improvements to the database. Audits by the Department of Justice's Office of the Inspector General reveal movement in the right direction; but, to date, no independent review has been conducted to evaluate the sufficiency of these changes.

H.R. 4240 addresses this precise issue by directing the Government Accountability Office to conduct a review of the operation and administration of the Terrorist Screening Database. This review will assess whether past weaknesses have been eliminated and the extent to which existing vulnerabilities may be addressed or mitigated

through additional changes. An independent audit will give us the tools we need to make additional changes if necessary.

I want to commend, once again, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations of the Judiciary Committee, for her leadership on this important issue.

I also want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Chairman GOODLATTE, and former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Chairman SENSENBRENNER, for their assistance in bringing this important legislation to the floor today.

I join with all of those who are with us in supporting this measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, a lot of thanks go to, as I indicated, the chairman, Chairman GOODLATTE; Ranking Member CONYERS; Mr. RATCLIFFE, who is a member of the committee; and my colleagues on Homeland Security as well, who have a great interest in this legislation.

Our commitment in this legislation is to leave no stone unturned, no page unturned, and no iota of information that will be necessary to make this list a more viable and secure list. That work now will be done by this legislation, the No Fly for Foreign Fighters Act. It will help to make the Terrorist Screening Center a further asset to our Homeland Security infrastructure.

We want to make certain that those men and women have the tools they need to continue to keep the Nation safe. With 30,000 foreign fighters and others going every day, 250 Americans who have gone to the caliphate, have gone to the fight, individuals who may have an interest in returning to this country and doing us harm, doing us damage, I believe H.R. 4240 is the next step in ensuring that the screening and watch-listing process works as it was intended to have worked and works without as many errors as possible—errorless, if you will—because that is what we need to secure this Nation.

I urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this is good legislation. It is common sense to conduct a review of the terrorist watch-listing process.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4240, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMAIL PRIVACY ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 699) to amend title 18, United States Code, to update the privacy protections for electronic communications information that is stored by third-party service providers in order to protect consumer privacy interests while meeting law enforcement needs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 699

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 ''Email Privacy Act''.

SEC. 2. VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE CORRECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2702 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''divulge'' and inserting ''disclose'';

(ii) by striking ''while in electronic storage by that service'' and inserting ''that is in electronic storage with or otherwise stored, held, or maintained by that service'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''to the public'';

(ii) by striking ''divulge'' and inserting ''disclose''; and

(iii) by striking ''which is carried or maintained on that service'' and inserting ''that is stored, held, or maintained by that service''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''divulge'' and inserting ''disclose''; and

(ii) by striking ''a provider of'' and inserting ''a person or entity providing''

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''wire or electronic'' before ''communication'';

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

''(1) to an originator, addressee, or intended recipient of such communication, to the subscriber or customer on whose behalf the provider stores, holds, or maintains such communication, or to an agent of such addressee, intended recipient, subscriber, or customer;''; and

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) with the lawful consent of the originator, addressee, or intended recipient of such communication, or of the subscriber or customer on whose behalf the provider stores, holds, or maintains such communication;'';

(3) in subsection (c) by inserting ''wire or electronic'' before ''communications'';

(4) in each of subsections (b) and (c), by striking ''divulge'' and inserting ''disclose''; and

(5) in subsection (c), by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) with the lawful consent of the subscriber or customer;''.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO REQUIRED DISCLOSURE SECTION.

Section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) through (c) and inserting the following:

''(a) CONTENTS OF WIRE OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS IN ELECTRONIC STORAGE.—Except as provided in subsections (i) and (j), a governmental entity may require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is in electronic storage with or otherwise stored, held, or maintained by that service only if the governmental entity obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that—

''(1) is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction; and

''(2) may indicate the date by which the provider must make the disclosure to the governmental entity.

In the absence of a date on the warrant indicating the date by which the provider must make disclosure to the governmental entity, the provider shall promptly respond to the warrant.

''(b) CONTENTS OF WIRE OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS IN A REMOTE COMPUTING SERVICE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (i) and (j), a governmental entity may require the disclosure by a provider of remote computing service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is stored, held, or maintained by that service only if the governmental entity obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that—

''(A) is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction; and

''(B) may indicate the date by which the provider must make the disclosure to the governmental entity.

In the absence of a date on the warrant indicating the date by which the provider must make disclosure to the governmental entity, the provider shall promptly respond to the warrant.

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) is applicable with respect to any wire or electronic communication that is stored, held, or maintained by the provider—

''(A) on behalf of, and received by means of electronic transmission from (or created by means of computer processing of communication received by means of electronic transmission from), a subscriber or customer of such remote computing service; and

''(B) solely for the purpose of providing storage or computer processing services to such subscriber or customer, if the provider is not authorized to access the contents of any such communications for purposes of providing any services other than storage or computer processing.

''(c) RECORDS CONCERNING ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICE OR REMOTE COMPUTING SERVICE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (i) and (j), a governmental entity may require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service of a record or other information pertaining to a subscriber to or customer of such service (not including the contents of wire or electronic communications), only—

''(A) if a governmental entity obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that—

''(i) is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction directing the disclosure; and

''(ii) may indicate the date by which the provider must make the disclosure to the governmental entity;

''(B) if a governmental entity obtains a court order directing the disclosure under subsection (d);

''(C) with the lawful consent of the subscriber or customer; or

''(D) as otherwise authorized in paragraph (2).

''(2) SUBSCRIBER OR CUSTOMER INFORMATION.—A provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service shall, in response to an administrative subpoena authorized by Federal or State statute, a grand jury, trial, or civil discovery subpoena, or any means available under paragraph (1), disclose to a governmental entity the—

''(A) name;

''(B) address;

''(C) local and long distance telephone connection records, or records of session times and durations;

''(D) length of service (including start date) and types of service used;

''(E) telephone or instrument number or other subscriber or customer number or identity, including any temporarily assigned network address; and

''(F) means and source of payment for such service (including any credit card or bank account number);

of a subscriber or customer of such service.

''(3) NOTICE NOT REQUIRED.—A governmental entity that receives records or information under this subsection is not required to provide notice to a subscriber or customer.'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking ''(b) or'';

(B) by striking ''the contents of a wire or electronic communication, or'';

(C) by striking ''sought,'' and inserting ''sought''; and

(D) by striking ''section'' and inserting ''subsection''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) NOTICE.—Except as provided in section 2705, a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service may notify a subscriber or customer of a receipt of a warrant, court order, subpoena, or request under subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) of this section.

''(i) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED TO LEGAL PROCESS.—Nothing in this section or in section 2702 shall limit the authority of a governmental entity to use an administrative subpoena authorized by Federal or State statute, a grand jury, trial, or civil discovery subpoena, or a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) by a court of competent jurisdiction to—

''(1) require an originator, addressee, or intended recipient of a wire or electronic communication to disclose a wire or electronic communication (including the contents of that communication) to the governmental entity;

''(2) require a person or entity that provides an electronic communication service to the officers, directors, employees, or agents of the person or entity (for the purpose of carrying out their duties) to disclose a wire or electronic communication (including the contents of that communication) to or from the person or entity itself or to or from an officer, director, employee, or agent of the entity to a governmental entity, if the wire or electronic communication is stored, held, or maintained on an electronic communications system owned, operated, or controlled by the person or entity; or

''(3) require a person or entity that provides a remote computing service or electronic communication service to disclose a wire or electronic communication (including the contents of that communication) that advertises or promotes a product or service and that has been made readily accessible to the general public.

''(j) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED TO CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS.—Nothing in this section or in section 2702 shall limit the power of inquiry vested in the Congress by Article I of the Constitution of the United States, including the authority to compel the production of a wire or electronic communication (including the contents of a wire or electronic communication) that is stored, held, or maintained by a person or entity that provides remote computing service or electronic communication service.''.

SEC. 4. DELAYED NOTICE.

Section 2705 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2705. Delayed notice

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A governmental entity acting under section 2703 may apply to a court for an order directing a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service to which a warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive under section 2703 is directed not to notify any other person of the existence of the warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive.

''(b) DETERMINATION.—A court shall grant a request for an order made under subsection (a) for delayed notification of up to 180 days if the court determines that there is reason to believe that notification of the existence of the warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive will likely result in—

''(1) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

''(2) flight from prosecution;

''(3) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

''(4) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

''(5) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

''(c) EXTENSION.—Upon request by a governmental entity, a court may grant one or more extensions, for periods of up to 180 days each, of an order granted in accordance with subsection (b).''.

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed to preclude the acquisition by the United States Government of—

(1) the contents of a wire or electronic communication pursuant to other lawful authorities, including the authorities under chapter 119 of title 18 (commonly known as the ''Wiretap Act''), the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), or any other provision of Federal law not specifically amended by this Act; or

(2) records or other information relating to a subscriber or customer of any electronic communication service or remote computing service (not including the content of such communications) pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), chapter 119 of title 18 (commonly known as the ''Wiretap Act''), or any other provision of Federal law not specifically amended by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 699, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today is an historic day. Today, the House of Representatives will be the first Chamber in Congress to approve legislation that has been pending before the House and Senate for several years to reform and modernize the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, or ECPA. Reforming this outdated law has been a priority for me as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I have worked with Members of Congress, advocacy groups, and law enforcement agencies for years on many complicated nuances involved in updating this law.

Two weeks ago, the House Judiciary Committee unanimously reported a revised version of H.R. 699, the Email Privacy Act. The resulting bill is a carefully negotiated agreement to update the procedures governing government access to stored communications content and records.

Thirty years ago, when personal computing was still in its infancy and few of us had ever heard of something called the World Wide Web, Congress enacted ECPA to establish procedures that strike ''a fair balance between the privacy expectations of American citizens and the legitimate needs of law enforcement agencies.''

In 1986, mail was sent through the U.S. Postal Service, a search engine was called a library, tweets were the sounds made by birds in the trees, and clouds were found only in the sky. In 1986, computer storage was finite and expensive. It was unheard of that a commercial product would allow users to send and receive electronic communications around the globe for free and store those communications for years with a third-party provider.

So much has changed in the last three decades. The technology explosion over the last three decades has placed a great deal of information on the Internet, in our emails, and on the cloud. Today, commercial providers, businesses, schools, and governments of all shapes and sizes provide email and cloud computing services to customers, students, and employees.

The Email Privacy Act establishes, for the first time in Federal statute, a uniform warrant requirement for stored communication content in criminal investigations, regardless of the type of service provider, the age of an email, or whether the email has been opened.

The bill preserves the authority for law enforcement agents to serve the warrant on the provider because, as with any other third-party custodian, the information sought is stored with them. However, the bill acknowledges that providers may give notice to their customers when in receipt of a warrant, court order, or subpoena, unless the provider is court-ordered to delay such notification.

The bill continues current practice that delineates which remote computing service providers, or cloud providers, are subject to the warrant requirement for content in a criminal investigation.

ECPA has traditionally imposed heightened legal process and procedures to obtain information for which the customer has a reasonable expectation of privacy, namely, emails, texts,

photos, videos, and documents stored in the cloud. H.R. 699 preserves this treatment by maintaining in the statute limiting language regarding remote computing services.

Contrary to practice 30 years ago, today, vast amounts of private, sensitive information are transmitted and stored electronically. But this information may also contain evidence of a crime, and law enforcement agencies are increasingly dependent on stored communications content and records in their investigations.

To facilitate timely disclosure of evidence to law enforcement, the bill authorizes a court to require a date for return of service of the warrant. In the absence of such a requirement, H.R. 699 requires email and cloud providers to promptly respond to warrants for communications content.

Current law makes no distinction between content disclosed to the public, like an advertisement on a Web site, versus content disclosed only to one or a handful of persons, like an email or a text message. The result is that law enforcement could be required to obtain a warrant even for publicly disclosed content. The bill clarifies that commercial public content can be obtained with process other than a warrant.

Lastly, H.R. 699 clarifies that nothing in the law limits Congress' authority to compel a third-party provider to disclose content in furtherance of its investigative and oversight responsibilities.

Thirty years ago, the extent to which people communicated electronically was much more limited. Today, however, the ubiquity of electronic communications requires Congress to ensure that legitimate expectations of privacy are protected, while respecting the needs of law enforcement.

I am confident that this bill strikes the necessary balance and does so in a way that continues to promote the development and use of new technologies and services that reflect how people communicate with one another today and into the future.

I would like to thank Congressman YODER and Congressman POLIS for introducing the underlying legislation and for working with the committee on improvements to the bill.

With this historic vote today, Congress will approve legislation that embodies the principles of the Fourth Amendment and reaffirms our commitment to protecting the privacy interests of the American people without unduly sacrificing public safety.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In 2014, in a unanimous ruling delivered by Chief Justice Roberts, the Supreme Court concluded that the police may not search a cell phone without first demonstrating probable cause. Citing an obvious Fourth Amendment interest in the vast amount of data we store on our personal devices, the Court wrote: ''The fact that technology now allows an individual to carry such information in his hand does not make the information any less worthy of the protection for which the Founders fought. Our answer to the question of what police must do before searching a cell phone seized incident to an arrest is accordingly simple—get a warrant.''

With that decision, the Court took a bold step toward reconciling the Fourth Amendment with the advent of modern communications technology. Today, the House takes a similar step to reconcile our interests in privacy and due process with the realities of modern computing.

H.R. 699, the Email Privacy Act, recognizes that the content of our communications, although often stored in digital format, remains worthy of Fourth Amendment protection. And to the investigators and government agents who seek access to our email, our advice is accordingly simple: Get a warrant. It is an idea whose time has long since come. This bill will allow us to move to a clear, uniform standard for law enforcement agencies to access the content of our communications, namely, a warrant based on probable cause.

H.R. 699 also codifies the right of the providers to give notice of this intrusion to their customers, except in certain exigent circumstances that must also be validated by the court.

□ 1415

We should note the absence of a special carve-out from the warrant requirement for the civil agencies, like the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Internal Revenue Service. In the House Judiciary Committee, we reached quick consensus that a civil carve-out of any kind is unworkable, unconstitutional, or both. I would have preferred to have kept the notice provisions of the original bill, which are absent from the version we reported from committee.

In the digital world, no amount of due diligence necessarily tells us that the government has accessed our electronic communications. The government should have an obligation to provide us with some form of notice when intruding on a record of our most private conversations; but I understand that not everyone shares this view, and I am willing to compromise, for now, in order to advance the important reforms that we will adopt today.

I am proud of the work we have done. This legislation is several years in the making, and it should not be delayed any further. I compliment our colleague Mr. POLIS. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 699, the Email Privacy Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER), the chief sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. YODER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for the Constitution. It is a great day for the spirit of bipartisanship in this Chamber. It is a great day for Americans everywhere who use modern technology, such as emails and text messages and cell phones, to communicate with one another.

This day has been a long time in the making, and I want to thank the chairman and his staff, Ranking Member CONYERS, my colleague Mr. POLIS, and everyone who has worked on this legislation. This is the most cosponsored bill in the entire United States House—the most popular bill—because it is a commonsense piece of legislation that affects every American and will clear up a long-time hole in the law that has allowed the government to intrude on Americans' privacy.

You have to go back to 1986 when this law was passed: Halley's Comet was passing by Earth; ''Top Gun'' was coming out as a new movie; Cabbage Patch dolls were flying off the shelves. It was a good time in America. It was also the time in which Congress last wrote the laws that updated the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. At that point, there were only 10 million Americans who even had email accounts. Today, there is an estimated 232 million Americans who have email accounts. It wasn't until 6 years later that someone sent the first text message in 1992. Yet, now, we expect 1 billion text messages to be sent every single year.

The current law, which is the law that was written in 1986, allows an abuse of our constitutional rights by treating our digital information as if it is not private information—as if it can be searched and seized by the government without a warrant, without probable cause, without due process. The theory in 1986 was, if you left your email on a server, once it was left there, it was considered abandoned. It was like trash that was left out on the street corner, which didn't have an expectation of privacy anymore. We know the ways that Americans communicate today is in a way in which they expect that those transmissions are private, and they expect that the government will honor that and not search those emails or capture them for other purposes. The Fourth Amendment is being violated.

Today, we restore the Fourth Amendment by treating digital information just like paper information, and we stand strong on the notion that Americans do have an expectation of privacy in their email accounts. I would think, if I and my colleagues would each ask our constituents if they expect that their email conversations are private, they would know that they are, and they would expect that they are. As we are debating this bill, Americans are sending emails and text messages back and forth, and they expect that their government is not reviewing those.

What we do in this legislation is require a warrant. We say the government must have probable cause. They must go to a judge whether it is at the

Federal level, the State level, or the local level. To review those pieces of digital information that are stored either in a drop box or on the iCloud—or just a text message that is sent back and forth—you have to have a warrant, and in a civil matter, you have to have a subpoena, and that subpoena is served on the individual.

We have documents on our desks at home. The police can't kick in your door and go read those documents unless they have a warrant backed up on probable cause. We have a digital set of documents that goes around with us wherever we go. There is a file cabinet with us. When we store things, we are doing so not because we are abandoning it. We are storing it because we are wanting to protect it, and we are wanting to ensure that we can keep it. We don't want to lose our Fourth Amendment protections because of that. This legislation would require that a warrant or a civil subpoena exist in order to read that information so that due process occurs.

This is a great unifier. Quite often on the House floor, we are divided—Republicans and Democrats—and we are not able to find resolution on some of the biggest challenges that face us; but the Fourth Amendment in the Constitution has to be preserved. I am heartened by the fact that my colleague Mr. POLIS and groups on the left and groups on the right and groups in the center and that America has come together on this legislation to say we are going to fix this, and we are going to ensure that this Congress modernizes its laws and that it does so in a bipartisan fashion so that we can put this bill on the President's desk and he will sign it into law. As we continue to advance, we must remember to advance the laws that this country utilizes, and as Americans communicate in different ways, we have to modernize the way the laws treat that communication.

I am proud of the work we are doing in the House today. I thank the chairman and his team. I thank Ranking Member CONYERS and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. This is a great day for America, a great day for the Constitution, and a great day for each and every one of us who uses email to correspond to know that the Fourth Amendment continues to protect us and to know that the Internet is not immune from the protections of the Constitution.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), one of the authors of the measure before us.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Email Privacy Act is an enormous victory. It is a victory for all Americans who believe in the right to privacy, in the Fourth Amendment, and in due process.

The Email Privacy Act mandates, for the first time, that Americans have the same legal protection for their emails as they do for papers, letters, faxes, and other old communications. The bill protects those of us—myself included and many Members of this body—who have email accounts in the cloud. Maybe it is Google mail or Yahoo Mail or AOL or other email accounts on their hard drives. It makes sure that the government doesn't have the right, without a warrant, to search emails that are older than 180 days.

This bill is also a victory for bipartisanship. When I introduced the bill, along with my colleague Mr. YODER, in the winter of 2015, we knew it would be popular. Yet, as this bill sits before us today, ready for passage, I am very proud to say it has garnered 314 cosponsors, and it stands as the single most popular bill in this session of the House of Representatives. I am excited that it is scheduled for a floor vote.

When Congress passed the Electronic Communications Privacy Act in 1986, electronic communications were different than they are today. They didn't really exist as such. A few professors were using a predecessor for the Internet. It was not a mass form of communication. Today, with 24/7 accessibility with mobile devices and laptops, over 205 billion emails are sent every day, according to some estimates, including many that contain our private communications for millions of Americans who deserve the same right to privacy as documents in a file cabinet.

With the passage of the Email Privacy Act, Congress will ensure that your emails that are older than 180 days are subject to the same protection under the Fourth Amendment. You often hear Members on both sides of the aisle talk about commonsense bills. When you read our bill and when you look at the immense support, there is nothing more common sense than the Email Privacy Act.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' and pass the bill. I urge the Senate to take it up and act. There is the unanimous support from the House Judiciary Committee and, as of today—hopefully soon—overwhelming support on the floor of the House. This bill should be passed. It should be brought to the desk of the President of the United States. We should finally bring our email privacy laws into the 21st century.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the chairman for bringing this bill up and for his work on it in a bipartisan way.

I especially want to thank Congressman YODER for pushing this legislation that has overwhelming support in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the Electronic Communications Privacy Act was passed in 1986—30 years ago. It was an eternity. Understand that IBM invented and put on the market its first laptop in 1986. A lot has changed since that day 30 years ago. As the chairman mentioned, the cloud was where rain came from, or sometimes we see it here in Washington, D.C.—the cloud. No one even knew what that was. The Electronic Communications Privacy Act needs to be fixed because it does not protect the right of privacy of Americans.

If something is stored in the cloud that is over 180 days old, then it is open season for government to seize all of that information. All governments—local or State or Federal—can go in and get those emails, texts, photographs, documents that you are storing. Up to 180 days, it is protected by the Constitution. Interesting—180 days of constitutional rights—but on the 181st day, you have no right of privacy. That is absurd. This bill fixes that former legislation.

I used to be a judge in Texas for 22 years, and I had peace officers all the time come to see me who wanted a warrant. They followed the Fourth Amendment and described the place to be searched. They would go in with that warrant, after stating probable cause, and they were allowed to seize whatever they could seize under the warrant. The Fourth Amendment ought to apply today. It ought to apply in the electronic age. It ought to apply to emails that are stored in the cloud or to anything else that is stored in the cloud. If the police officers have to have a warrant to go into your house and take documents you store in your desk or wherever, then they have to have a warrant if you store documents in the cloud. That is what this legislation does, and it makes sense that we protect the constitutional right.

The government cannot tap our phones without a warrant, it can't read hard mail without a warrant, and it can't enter our homes without a warrant because of the Fourth Amendment. We are unique among all peoples because we have in our Constitution the Fourth Amendment that protects Americans—I think better than any other population anywhere—of their rights.

Speaking of rights, the government doesn't have rights. People have rights, and the Bill of Rights protects the citizens of the United States. Government has authority—it has power—and if you read the Bill of Rights, the 10 Amendments especially, it is to limit government power and authority against us, the citizens. So, of course, the Fourth Amendment should apply to the Federal Government in this area.

Unfortunately, we have seen in our own government abuses of the government in the area, especially of snooping and spying on Americans, with the NSA and its story that we are all familiar with. We have to control government, and it is our obligation, the House of Representatives, to protect the Constitution—the Bill of Rights especially—from government intrusion.

I support this legislation. It is a good piece of legislation. I thank the chairman and the ranking member and Ms. LOFGREN for her support of this legislation that we have been working on for a long time. Let Congress speak out

and support the right of privacy for all Americans and keep the government out of the snooping business.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Email Privacy Act.

It has long been evident that we need to update the laws impacting electronic communications and privacy. I am pleased that, today, the House will take a major step forward by considering and approving the Email Privacy Act. Its passage is long overdue.

In 2009 and 2010, when I was the chair of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, we held multiple hearings on ECPA, or electronic communication and privacy laws, and began to seriously consider reforms to our Nation's electronic communication and privacy laws. During the 112th Congress, Representative CONYERS and I introduced the Electronic Communications Privacy Act Modernization Act of 2012, which would have required law enforcement to obtain a warrant based on probable cause before searching email. That approach, now embodied in the Yoder-Polis Email Privacy Act, is what we are here to consider today.

The Email Privacy Act requires the government to obtain a warrant in order to access people's electronic communications from a third-party provider, protecting Americans' privacy rights while still enabling law enforcement to do its job.

□ 1430

This is consistent with a stark American practice going back to the Fourth Amendment. Current law is inconsistent and unclear regarding the standards for government access to the content of communications, and a single email is potentially subject to multiple different legal standards.

Clarifying the laws will help industry stakeholders, who currently struggle to apply the existing, outdated categories of information to their products and services, and it will provide a clear standard for law enforcement.

In an era where government access to people's private information held by third-party providers has become far too easy, Congress is finally taking steps to update our laws to reflect our new understanding of what it means for ''people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures,'' in the words of the Fourth Amendment.

This bill is not perfect, and clearly there is more to be done. In particular, we must ensure that we keep working to require a probable cause warrant for location information.

I am pleased that Chairman GOODLATTE has announced that he plans to hold hearings on location information, and I look forward to those hearings and to subsequent legislation.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill, and I applaud the House for considering this landmark legislation today.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this bill to ensure that our laws strike the right balance between the interests and needs of law enforcement and the privacy rights of the American people.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud my colleagues from Kansas and from Colorado for their work in crafting this bill. I think it is awfully important.

I think it is what people expect. When they think about government, they want a government that works for them. Part of having a government that works for them means actually updating laws as technology has changed.

So I think that, at the core, this is about keeping current with the rate of change in the world of technology.

It is amazing to me—I pulled the numbers—that there are roughly 205 billion emails sent every day around the world. If you presuppose that America's economy is about 20 percent of that world pie, that means around 40 million or more emails are sent across this country every single day.

In contrast is the U.S. Postal Service. There are about 600 million letters that go across this country every day, which is to say, mathematically, you are saying that about 1.5 percent of the communication flow, either via mail or electronic means, are sent by the Postal Service.

The other, in essence, 99 percent of the communications are sent via email, which is to say we have a real problem with a law that was created in the 1980s that doesn't take into account the way the world has changed.

So I applaud the crafters of this bill for what they have done in recognizing technology change. I applaud them for the way that they stayed true to the Fourth Amendment.

Our Founding Fathers were so deliberate in recognizing the notion that you didn't want to have British soldiers coming into a house and rumbling around until they finally found something to charge you with and then moving forward.

The Fourth Amendment is about protecting individual liberty. Jefferson said: ''The natural progress of things is for the government to gain ground and for liberty to yield.''

Fundamentally, what this bill is about is pushing back in the way that the government has now encroached on that space of individual liberty.

Finally, I would say simply this: This is about recognizing how true history is on the importance of protecting liberty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, Edward Gibbon wrote a book back in 1776 about the fall of the Romans. In it, he harkens back to the fall of Greece and the Athenians.

He said, at the end of the day, in the end, more than they wanted freedom, they wanted security. They wanted a comfortable life, and they lost it all—security, comfort, and freedom—when the Athenians no longer wanted to give to society, but to receive. And he goes on with a long quote from there.

He talks about the fundamental tension that exists in any developed society between freedom and security. We have moved too far in the opposite direction as it relates to email. This bill brings us back toward the center.

I again applaud Mr. YODER and Mr. POLIS for what they have done. I also applaud Chairman GOODLATTE for what he has done on this front.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a very effective member on the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, updating our laws to reflect the way the world works in the 21st century has been one of my top priorities in Congress.

After spending two decades in the technology sector where things change at light speed, it can be hard to understand why we still have laws on the books that don't reflect how society functions in the digital age. Nowhere has this been more obvious than in our email privacy laws that date back to the 1980s.

Under current law, there are more protections for a letter in a filing cabinet than an email on a server. This was never really the intent, but email's evolution has made it clear that our policies are woefully outdated.

I have supported a number of different proposals to reform our electronic privacy laws, and I will continue to push for those. Today's vote on the Email Privacy Act is a great step forward for American civil liberties.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this important legislation, and I urge our friends in the Senate to take up the bill without delay so we can send it to the President and ensure Americans are guaranteed the privacy protections most think that they already have.

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

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

I would like to close today by thanking Chairman GOODLATTE of the Judiciary Committee and his staff for working with us to develop the final draft of this legislation. Once again the chairman has helped us find a way to resolve our differences and advance core civil liberties and constitutional values.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) and

the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for their leadership on this issue from the very beginning.

The Email Privacy Act comes to the floor today in large part because of your work in gathering more than 300 cosponsors for this bill.

Finally, I want to express appreciation to the coalition of technology companies, civil liberties organizations, and individual experts whose persistence and dedication have made this moment possible.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 699, the Email Privacy Act. I believe that they will do so. I also urge our comparable body in the Senate to take up this measure as quickly as possible.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for moving this bill through his committee. I especially thank Congressman YODER of Kansas for bringing this bill forward and for being bold enough to say let's modernize a law that is so outdated that it goes back to 1986, governing email communication when we didn't even have email and text messages.

Why do we want to do this? We want to do it because Federal agencies are abusing this law to invade the privacy of hardworking, law-abiding citizens all across this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is a document from the Internal Revenue Service titled ''Search Warrant Handbook.'' In this document by the IRS, their protocol says: ''In general, the Fourth Amendment does not protect communications held in electronic storage, such as email messages stored on a server, because internet users do not have a reasonable expectation of privacy in such communications.''

The IRS has made it clear that they don't believe that American citizens have a Fourth Amendment protection of privacy for their email communications. The IRS has gone further and is actually reading emails of American citizens, and no one across the country knows about it unless the IRS finds something that then they are going to go after you criminally on.

So they are reading the private emails, Mr. Speaker, of American citizens every single day, and they have been doing it for years. It is time for this abuse of power to end.

We need to pass this bill with strong bipartisan support, send it over to the Senate, and get it to the President's desk so that American citizens have real privacy protections that they deserve, that they think they have, but they don't have, Mr. Speaker, because Federal agencies like the IRS today are reading the private emails of American citizens and using them against them.

It is wrong. They ought to go get a warrant, but they should not be reading our private emails when people haven't done anything wrong.

Let's pass this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, we are here today talking about modernizing a law, but we are modernizing a law that encompasses a centuries-old principle.

Back in the days when the Founding Fathers wrote our Constitution, they were concerned about the government rifling through our papers. Today we have electronic papers. Stuff is stored in the cloud.

This piece of legislation brings us back in line with the intent of the Founding Fathers that the government can't just rifle through your papers.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

I want to take this time to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and many Members on his side of the aisle, including Mr. POLIS.

I especially want to thank Mr. YODER, who has worked long and hard on this legislation for which he is the chief sponsor.

I most especially want to take note of the fact that we have very disparate points of view from a whole array of people around this country, from law enforcement, to technology companies, to civil liberties organizations. It took a long time to sort through that and find the common ground that is the legislation we have before us today.

That ground would not have been found without the outstanding work of our staff, most especially Caroline Lynch, the chief counsel of the Judiciary Committee's Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee, and her able team of attorneys, and Aaron Hiller, minority counsel as well.

They deserve a great deal of gratitude for the years of work to bring us to this point where we can pass this important, important legislation by what I believe will be a resounding majority.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 699, the Email Privacy Act.

Current law protecting electronic privacy is drastically out of step with modern technology, and H.R. 699 represents a long overdue update. This bill would provide Americans the privacy protections in their electronic communications they expect and deserve.

While it is important that the House advance H.R. 699 today, no bill is perfect. Law enforcement has raised a few concerns about it, such as that it does not provide them the ability to access to critical information quickly enough. As a former prosecutor, I take their views seriously. I hope we can continue the dialogue with law enforcement and consider ways to improve the bill as it moves along in the legislative process.

I encourage all Members to support H.R. 699.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 699, the Email Privacy Act.

This is an important and long negotiated bill that will update the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, a law that both protects the privacy of our email communications and provides a critical tool for law enforcement to investigate crime.

I want to thank Judiciary Chairman BOB GOODLATTE and Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS for their leadership and for working together on this legislation to accomplish the goals of this bill for the benefit and protection of citizens, law enforcement, and communications providers.

I am an original cosponsor of this bill, which has 314 cosponsors, enjoying overwhelming bipartisan support.

The Electronic Communications Privacy Act, or ECPA, was enacted in 1986.

The statute is outdated and provides unjustifiably inconsistent standards for law enforcement access to stored communications.

The law was designed at a time when few of us used email or could have imagined a world in which we could securely share information and edit electronic documents online with others, or where businesses could input, store, process, and access all data related to their operation.

The outdated, inconsistent, and unclear aspects of this statute undermine both our privacy interests and law enforcement goals.

It is critical that we enact the central reforms provided by this bill.

For instance, a probable cause standard should apply to the government's ability to compel a communications provider to disclose a customer's email message—no matter how old the message is.

Currently, the statute requires the government to obtain a warrant based on probable cause to compel disclosure of an email that is in storage for 180 days or less.

However, the statute only requires a subpoena for the government to obtain email messages that are older than 180 days.

This makes no sense because citizens have the same, reasonable expectation that these stored communications are private.

Therefore, we must change the law so that the higher standard applies regardless of the age of these communications, and H.R. 699 would accomplish this.

In addition, the law does not adequately protect communications stored ''in the cloud'' by third parties on behalf of consumers, and a probable cause warrant should be required for government access.

ECPA additionally provides a lesser standard for some cloud storage than it does for many communications stored by electronic communications services.

To further complicate matters, many companies provide both communications services and remote storage, making the services to the same customer difficult to separate for purposes of determining which standard applies.

Applying inadequate and unclear standards to government access to cloud communications undermines consumer confidence in cloud privacy and threatens to hamper the development of this important engine of economic growth.

H.R. 699 addresses this issue by providing a clear and consistent probable cause standard for access to the contents of stored communications for which customers have a reasonable expectation of privacy.

H.R. 699 would accomplish these fairly straightforward reforms and that is why it has the support of privacy advocates and electronic communications companies.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan measure.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, as a proud original cosponsor of H.R. 699, the Email Communications Privacy Act (ECPA), I am pleased to rise in full support of this bill on the House floor.

Since being introduced on February 4, 2015, we have been able to secure more than 300 cosponsors of this important bill, which will improve privacy protections for the email communications of ordinary American citizens.

Under current law there is little protection for the content of electronic communications stored or maintained by third party service providers. ECPA corrects this oversight and updates our laws to require a court ordered warrant that is based on probable cause before an email service provider can disclose these private communications.

In the current era where individual privacy is often overlooked or sidelined, this bill takes an important step to protect your privacy.

It is long past due that we update our privacy laws to give emails—a major means of communication today—the same protection as traditional mail and telephone calls. This bill has been endorsed by a broad range of privacy groups, including such conservative organizations as the Heritage Foundation and FreedomWorks.

Our bill modernizes these outdated statutes to ensure that the rights protected by the Fourth Amendment extend to Americans' email correspondence and digital data.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 699, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

DEFEND TRADE SECRETS ACT OF 2016

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1890) to amend chapter 90 of title 18, United States Code, to provide Federal jurisdiction for the theft of trade secrets, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1890

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 ''Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. FEDERAL JURISDICTION FOR THEFT OF TRADE SECRETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1836 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) PRIVATE CIVIL ACTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An owner of a trade secret that is misappropriated may bring a civil action under this subsection if the trade secret is related to a product or service used in, or intended for use in, interstate or foreign commerce.

''(2) CIVIL SEIZURE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—

''(i) APPLICATION.—Based on an affidavit or verified complaint satisfying the requirements of this paragraph, the court may, upon ex parte application but only in extraordinary circumstances, issue an order providing for the seizure of property necessary to prevent the propagation or dissemination of the trade secret that is the subject of the action.

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS FOR ISSUING ORDER.—The court may not grant an application under clause (i) unless the court finds that it clearly appears from specific facts that—

''(I) an order issued pursuant to Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or another form of equitable relief would be inadequate to achieve the purpose of this paragraph because the party to which the order would be issued would evade, avoid, or otherwise not comply with such an order;

''(II) an immediate and irreparable injury will occur if such seizure is not ordered;

''(III) the harm to the applicant of denying the application outweighs the harm to the legitimate interests of the person against whom seizure would be ordered of granting the application and substantially outweighs the harm to any third parties who may be harmed by such seizure;

''(IV) the applicant is likely to succeed in showing that—

''(aa) the information is a trade secret; and

''(bb) the person against whom seizure would be ordered—

''(AA) misappropriated the trade secret of the applicant by improper means; or

''(BB) conspired to use improper means to misappropriate the trade secret of the applicant;

''(V) the person against whom seizure would be ordered has actual possession of—

''(aa) the trade secret; and

''(bb) any property to be seized;

''(VI) the application describes with reasonable particularity the matter to be seized and, to the extent reasonable under the circumstances, identifies the location where the matter is to be seized;

''(VII) the person against whom seizure would be ordered, or persons acting in concert with such person, would destroy, move, hide, or otherwise make such matter inaccessible to the court, if the applicant were to proceed on notice to such person; and

''(VIII) the applicant has not publicized the requested seizure.

''(B) ELEMENTS OF ORDER.—If an order is issued under subparagraph (A), it shall—

''(i) set forth findings of fact and conclusions of law required for the order;

''(ii) provide for the narrowest seizure of property necessary to achieve the purpose of this paragraph and direct that the seizure be conducted in a manner that minimizes any interruption of the business operations of third parties and, to the extent possible, does not interrupt the legitimate business operations of the person accused of misappropriating the trade secret;

''(iii)(I) be accompanied by an order protecting the seized property from disclosure by prohibiting access by the applicant or the person against whom the order is directed, and prohibiting any copies, in whole or in part, of the seized property, to prevent undue damage to the party against whom the order has issued or others, until such parties have an opportunity to be heard in court; and

''(II) provide that if access is granted by the court to the applicant or the person against whom the order is directed, the access shall be consistent with subparagraph (D);

''(iv) provide guidance to the law enforcement officials executing the seizure that clearly delineates the scope of the authority of the officials, including—

''(I) the hours during which the seizure may be executed; and

''(II) whether force may be used to access locked areas;

''(v) set a date for a hearing described in subparagraph (F) at the earliest possible time, and not later than 7 days after the order has issued, unless the party against whom the order is directed and others harmed by the order consent to another date for the hearing, except that a party against whom the order has issued or any person harmed by the order may move the court at any time to dissolve or modify the order after giving notice to the applicant who obtained the order; and

''(vi) require the person obtaining the order to provide the security determined adequate by the court for the payment of the damages that any person may be entitled to recover as a result of a wrongful or excessive seizure or wrongful or excessive attempted seizure under this paragraph.

''(C) PROTECTION FROM PUBLICITY.—The court shall take appropriate action to protect the person against whom an order under this paragraph is directed from publicity, by or at the behest of the person obtaining the order, about such order and any seizure under such order.

''(D) MATERIALS IN CUSTODY OF COURT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Any materials seized under this paragraph shall be taken into the custody of the court. The court shall secure the seized material from physical and electronic access during the seizure and while in the custody of the court.

''(ii) STORAGE MEDIUM.—If the seized material includes a storage medium, or if the seized material is stored on a storage medium, the court shall prohibit the medium from being connected to a network or the Internet without the consent of both parties, until the hearing required under subparagraph (B)(v) and described in subparagraph (F).

''(iii) PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIALITY.—The court shall take appropriate measures to protect the confidentiality of seized materials that are unrelated to the trade secret information ordered seized pursuant to this paragraph unless the person against whom the order is entered consents to disclosure of the material.

''(iv) APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL MASTER.—The court may appoint a special master to locate and isolate all misappropriated trade secret information and to facilitate the return of unrelated property and data to the person from whom the property was seized. The special master appointed by the court shall agree to be bound by a non-disclosure agreement approved by the court.

''(E) SERVICE OF ORDER.—The court shall order that service of a copy of the order under this paragraph, and the submissions of the applicant to obtain the order, shall be made by a Federal law enforcement officer who, upon making service, shall carry out the seizure under the order. The court may allow State or local law enforcement officials to participate, but may not permit the applicant or any agent of the applicant to participate in the seizure. At the request of law enforcement officials, the court may

allow a technical expert who is unaffiliated with the applicant and who is bound by a court-approved non-disclosure agreement to participate in the seizure if the court determines that the participation of the expert will aid the efficient execution of and minimize the burden of the seizure.

''(F) SEIZURE HEARING.—

''(i) DATE.—A court that issues a seizure order shall hold a hearing on the date set by the court under subparagraph (B)(v).

''(ii) BURDEN OF PROOF.—At a hearing held under this subparagraph, the party who obtained the order under subparagraph (A) shall have the burden to prove the facts supporting the findings of fact and conclusions of law necessary to support the order. If the party fails to meet that burden, the seizure order shall be dissolved or modified appropriately.

''(iii) DISSOLUTION OR MODIFICATION OF ORDER.—A party against whom the order has been issued or any person harmed by the order may move the court at any time to dissolve or modify the order after giving notice to the party who obtained the order.

''(iv) DISCOVERY TIME LIMITS.—The court may make such orders modifying the time limits for discovery under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as may be necessary to prevent the frustration of the purposes of a hearing under this subparagraph.

''(G) ACTION FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY WRONGFUL SEIZURE.—A person who suffers damage by reason of a wrongful or excessive seizure under this paragraph has a cause of action against the applicant for the order under which such seizure was made, and shall be entitled to the same relief as is provided under section 34(d)(11) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1116(d)(11)). The security posted with the court under subparagraph (B)(vi) shall not limit the recovery of third parties for damages.

''(H) MOTION FOR ENCRYPTION.—A party or a person who claims to have an interest in the subject matter seized may make a motion at any time, which may be heard ex parte, to encrypt any material seized or to be seized under this paragraph that is stored on a storage medium. The motion shall include, when possible, the desired encryption method.

''(3) REMEDIES.—In a civil action brought under this subsection with respect to the misappropriation of a trade secret, a court may—

''(A) grant an injunction—

''(i) to prevent any actual or threatened misappropriation described in paragraph (1) on such terms as the court deems reasonable, provided the order does not—

''(I) prevent a person from entering into an employment relationship, and that conditions placed on such employment shall be based on evidence of threatened misappropriation and not merely on the information the person knows; or

''(II) otherwise conflict with an applicable State law prohibiting restraints on the practice of a lawful profession, trade, or business;

''(ii) if determined appropriate by the court, requiring affirmative actions to be taken to protect the trade secret; and

''(iii) in exceptional circumstances that render an injunction inequitable, that conditions future use of the trade secret upon payment of a reasonable royalty for no longer than the period of time for which such use could have been prohibited;

''(B) award—

''(i)(I) damages for actual loss caused by the misappropriation of the trade secret; and

''(II) damages for any unjust enrichment caused by the misappropriation of the trade secret that is not addressed in computing damages for actual loss; or

''(ii) in lieu of damages measured by any other methods, the damages caused by the misappropriation measured by imposition of liability for a reasonable royalty for the misappropriator's unauthorized disclosure or use of the trade secret;

''(C) if the trade secret is willfully and maliciously misappropriated, award exemplary damages in an amount not more than 2 times the amount of the damages awarded under subparagraph (B); and

''(D) if a claim of the misappropriation is made in bad faith, which may be established by circumstantial evidence, a motion to terminate an injunction is made or opposed in bad faith, or the trade secret was willfully and maliciously misappropriated, award reasonable attorney's fees to the prevailing party.

''(c) JURISDICTION.—The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction of civil actions brought under this section.

''(d) PERIOD OF LIMITATIONS.—A civil action under subsection (b) may not be commenced later than 3 years after the date on which the misappropriation with respect to which the action would relate is discovered or by the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been discovered. For purposes of this subsection, a continuing misappropriation constitutes a single claim of misappropriation.''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1839 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''the public'' and inserting ''another person who can obtain economic value from the disclosure or use of the information''; and

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

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) the term 'misappropriation' means—

''(A) acquisition of a trade secret of another by a person who knows or has reason to know that the trade secret was acquired by improper means; or

''(B) disclosure or use of a trade secret of another without express or implied consent by a person who—

''(i) used improper means to acquire knowledge of the trade secret;

''(ii) at the time of disclosure or use, knew or had reason to know that the knowledge of the trade secret was—

''(I) derived from or through a person who had used improper means to acquire the trade secret;

''(II) acquired under circumstances giving rise to a duty to maintain the secrecy of the trade secret or limit the use of the trade secret; or

''(III) derived from or through a person who owed a duty to the person seeking relief to maintain the secrecy of the trade secret or limit the use of the trade secret; or

''(iii) before a material change of the position of the person, knew or had reason to know that—

''(I) the trade secret was a trade secret; and

''(II) knowledge of the trade secret had been acquired by accident or mistake;

''(6) the term 'improper means'—

''(A) includes theft, bribery, misrepresentation, breach or inducement of a breach of a duty to maintain secrecy, or espionage through electronic or other means; and

''(B) does not include reverse engineering, independent derivation, or any other lawful means of acquisition; and

''(7) the term 'Trademark Act of 1946' means the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes, approved July 5, 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.) (commonly referred to as the ''Trademark Act of 1946'' or the ''Lanham Act'')'.''.

(c) EXCEPTIONS TO PROHIBITION.—Section 1833 of title 18, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''or create a private right of action for'' after ''prohibit''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The section heading for section 1836 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1836. Civil proceedings''.

(2) The table of sections for chapter 90 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1836 and inserting the following:

''1836. Civil proceedings.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to any misappropriation of a trade secret (as defined in section 1839 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this section) for which any act occurs on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendments made by this section shall be construed to modify the rule of construction under section 1838 of title 18, United States Code, or to preempt any other provision of law.

(g) APPLICABILITY TO OTHER LAWS.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall not be construed to be a law pertaining to intellectual property for purposes of any other Act of Congress.

SEC. 3. TRADE SECRET THEFT ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 90 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1832(b), by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''the greater of $5,000,000 or 3 times the value of the stolen trade secret to the organization, including expenses for research and design and other costs of reproducing the trade secret that the organization has thereby avoided''; and

(2) in section 1835—

(A) by striking ''In any prosecution'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In any prosecution''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) RIGHTS OF TRADE SECRET OWNERS.—The court may not authorize or direct the disclosure of any information the owner asserts to be a trade secret unless the court allows the owner the opportunity to file a submission under seal that describes the interest of the owner in keeping the information confidential. No submission under seal made under this subsection may be used in a prosecution under this chapter for any purpose other than those set forth in this section, or otherwise required by law. The provision of information relating to a trade secret to the United States or the court in connection with a prosecution under this chapter shall not constitute a waiver of trade secret protection, and the disclosure of information relating to a trade secret in connection with a prosecution under this chapter shall not constitute a waiver of trade secret protection unless the trade secret owner expressly consents to such waiver.''.

(b) RICO PREDICATE OFFENSES.—Section 1961(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''sections 1831 and 1832 (relating to economic espionage and theft of trade secrets),'' before ''section 1951''.

SEC. 4. REPORT ON THEFT OF TRADE SECRETS OCCURRING ABROAD.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

(2) FOREIGN INSTRUMENTALITY, ETC.—The terms ''foreign instrumentality'', ''foreign

agent'', and ''trade secret'' have the meanings given those terms in section 1839 of title 18, United States Code.

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' includes the District of Columbia and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

(4) UNITED STATES COMPANY.—The term ''United States company'' means an organization organized under the laws of the United States or a State or political subdivision thereof.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and biannually thereafter, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, the Director, and the heads of other appropriate agencies, shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and make publicly available on the Web site of the Department of Justice and disseminate to the public through such other means as the Attorney General may identify, a report on the following:

(1) The scope and breadth of the theft of the trade secrets of United States companies occurring outside of the United States.

(2) The extent to which theft of trade secrets occurring outside of the United States is sponsored by foreign governments, foreign instrumentalities, or foreign agents.

(3) The threat posed by theft of trade secrets occurring outside of the United States.

(4) The ability and limitations of trade secret owners to prevent the misappropriation of trade secrets outside of the United States, to enforce any judgment against foreign entities for theft of trade secrets, and to prevent imports based on theft of trade secrets overseas.

(5) A breakdown of the trade secret protections afforded United States companies by each country that is a trading partner of the United States and enforcement efforts available and undertaken in each such country, including a list identifying specific countries where trade secret theft, laws, or enforcement is a significant problem for United States companies.

(6) Instances of the Federal Government working with foreign countries to investigate, arrest, and prosecute entities and individuals involved in the theft of trade secrets outside of the United States.

(7) Specific progress made under trade agreements and treaties, including any new remedies enacted by foreign countries, to protect against theft of trade secrets of United States companies outside of the United States.

(8) Recommendations of legislative and executive branch actions that may be undertaken to—

(A) reduce the threat of and economic impact caused by the theft of the trade secrets of United States companies occurring outside of the United States;

(B) educate United States companies regarding the threats to their trade secrets when taken outside of the United States;

(C) provide assistance to United States companies to reduce the risk of loss of their trade secrets when taken outside of the United States; and

(D) provide a mechanism for United States companies to confidentially or anonymously report the theft of trade secrets occurring outside of the United States.

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) trade secret theft occurs in the United States and around the world;

(2) trade secret theft, wherever it occurs, harms the companies that own the trade secrets and the employees of the companies;

(3) chapter 90 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Economic Espionage Act of 1996''), applies broadly to protect trade secrets from theft; and

(4) it is important when seizing information to balance the need to prevent or remedy misappropriation with the need to avoid interrupting the—

(A) business of third parties; and

(B) legitimate interests of the party accused of wrongdoing.

SEC. 6. BEST PRACTICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Judicial Center, using existing resources, shall develop recommended best practices for—

(1) the seizure of information and media storing the information; and

(2) the securing of the information and media once seized.

(b) UPDATES.—The Federal Judicial Center shall update the recommended best practices developed under subsection (a) from time to time.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL SUBMISSIONS.—The Federal Judicial Center shall provide a copy of the recommendations developed under subsection (a), and any updates made under subsection (b), to the—

(1) Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(2) Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 7. IMMUNITY FROM LIABILITY FOR CONFIDENTIAL DISCLOSURE OF A TRADE SECRET TO THE GOVERNMENT OR IN A COURT FILING.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 1833 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''This chapter'' and inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—This chapter'';

(2) in subsection (a)(2), as designated by paragraph (1), by striking ''the reporting of a suspected violation of law to any governmental entity of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, if such entity has lawful authority with respect to that violation'' and inserting ''the disclosure of a trade secret in accordance with subsection (b)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) IMMUNITY FROM LIABILITY FOR CONFIDENTIAL DISCLOSURE OF A TRADE SECRET TO THE GOVERNMENT OR IN A COURT FILING.—

''(1) IMMUNITY.—An individual shall not be held criminally or civilly liable under any Federal or State trade secret law for the disclosure of a trade secret that—

''(A) is made—

''(i) in confidence to a Federal, State, or local government official, either directly or indirectly, or to an attorney; and

''(ii) solely for the purpose of reporting or investigating a suspected violation of law; or

''(B) is made in a complaint or other document filed in a lawsuit or other proceeding, if such filing is made under seal.

''(2) USE OF TRADE SECRET INFORMATION IN ANTI-RETALIATION LAWSUIT.—An individual who files a lawsuit for retaliation by an employer for reporting a suspected violation of law may disclose the trade secret to the attorney of the individual and use the trade secret information in the court proceeding, if the individual—

''(A) files any document containing the trade secret under seal; and

''(B) does not disclose the trade secret, except pursuant to court order.

''(3) NOTICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer shall provide notice of the immunity set forth in this subsection in any contract or agreement with an employee that governs the use of a trade secret or other confidential information.

''(B) POLICY DOCUMENT.—An employer shall be considered to be in compliance with the notice requirement in subparagraph (A) if the employer provides a cross-reference to a policy document provided to the employee that sets forth the employer's reporting policy for a suspected violation of law.

''(C) NON-COMPLIANCE.—If an employer does not comply with the notice requirement in subparagraph (A), the employer may not be awarded exemplary damages or attorney fees under subparagraph (C) or (D) of section 1836(b)(3) in an action against an employee to whom notice was not provided.

''(D) APPLICABILITY.—This paragraph shall apply to contracts and agreements that are entered into or updated after the date of enactment of this subsection.

''(4) EMPLOYEE DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'employee' includes any individual performing work as a contractor or consultant for an employer.

''(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Except as expressly provided for under this subsection, nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize, or limit liability for, an act that is otherwise prohibited by law, such as the unlawful access of material by unauthorized means.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1838 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''This chapter'' and inserting ''Except as provided in section 1833(b), this chapter''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

□ 1445

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 1890, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today we are here to consider S. 1890, the Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016. This bill puts forward enhancements to our Federal trade secrets law, creating a Federal civil remedy for trade secrets misappropriation that will help American innovators protect their intellectual property from criminal theft by foreign agents and those engaging in economic espionage. This bill will help U.S. competitiveness, job creation, and our Nation's future economic security.

Our intellectual property laws cover everything from patents, copyrights and trademarks, and include trade secrets.

But what are trade secrets?

Trade secrets law is used to protect some of the most iconic inventions in America. For example, a trade secret can include recipes like Colonel Sanders' secret recipe of 11 herbs and spices, and the 125-year-old formula for Coca-Cola housed in a vault at the World of Coca-Cola in Atlanta, Georgia.

However, trade secrets are not simply isolated to the realm of food and

beverages. They can include confidential formulas like the formula for WD–40, manufacturing techniques, customer lists, and algorithms like Google's search engine.

Trade secrets occupy a unique place in the IP portfolios of our most innovative companies, but because they are unregistered and not formally reviewed like patents, there are no limitations on discovering a trade secret by fair, lawful methods, such as reverse engineering or independent development. In innovative industries, that is simply the free market at work.

Though trade secrets are not formally reviewed, they are protected from misappropriation, which includes obtaining the trade secret through improper or unlawful means. Misappropriation can take many forms, whether it is an employee selling blueprints to a competitor or a foreign agent hacking into a server. In addition, one could argue that even a foreign government's policies to require forced technology transfer is a form of misappropriation.

Though most States base their trade secrets laws on the Uniform Trade Secrets Act, the Federal Government protects trade secrets through the Economic Espionage Act. In the 112th Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary helped enact two pieces of legislation to help improve the protection of trade secrets, and in the 113th Congress, we introduced and passed out of committee the first version of this trade secrets bill unanimously.

Today we build on our efforts over these past 2 years and are taking a significant and positive step toward improving our Nation's trade secrets laws and continuing to build on our important work in this area of intellectual property. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.
Hon. DOUG COLLINS,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN CONYERS,
Ranking Member, House Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.
Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, DEMOCRATIC LEADER PELOSI, CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE, RANKING MEMBER CONYERS, REPRESENTATIVE COLLINS, AND REPRESENTATIVE NADLER: On behalf of the members of the Information Technology Industry Council (ITI), I write to express our support for S. 1890, the Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016 (DTSA), and commend your efforts to bring it to the House floor for debate and vote. Given the importance of trade secrets protection to the high-tech industry, we will consider scoring votes in support of DTSA in our 114th Congressional Voting Guide.

ITI companies are at the forefront of innovation and have some of the largest trade secret and patent portfolios in the world tied to numerous goods and services offered to governments, commercial enterprises and consumers around the globe. In fact, patent portfolios often grow as a result of the ideas and products originating as trade secrets. Customer lists, manufacturing processes, and source code are just a few examples of important assets considered to be trade secrets by many companies.

Our companies pour billions of dollars into research and development to create products and services that ultimately become the backbone of their businesses. Trade secrets produced through this research and development increasingly have become attractive to competitors in other countries. In addition, advances in technology now make it easy to copy trade secret materials onto a jump drive or lap top computer that once would have taken reams of paper to reproduce. As a result, the threat posed to American trade secrets has increased and theft of these secrets robs our economy of growth and innovation.

It is long overdue for our trade secrets law to be modernized to keep pace with the rapid developments of our companies and the technologies and methods used by the criminals who target them. The patchwork of state trade secrets laws, while effective for local theft, fail to meet the demands of the global nature of today's trade secret misappropriation. In addition, trade secrets do not enjoy the same federal protections as other types of intellectual property. While it is a federal crime to steal a trade secret, unlike patents, copyrights and trademarks, there is no federal civil remedy.

DTSA provides a solution to these problematic gaps by making federal law more comprehensive and providing trade secrets owners with remedies all forms of intellectual property should be afforded. With both a federal criminal and a federal civil cause of action, large and small companies alike will have access to more tools they need to effectively combat trade secret theft and help to ensure future innovation continues to occur in the United States.

While trade secret protection is important domestically, as American companies expand in the global marketplace, this protection is also needed worldwide. As we operate in other countries and work with them to encourage strong intellectual property protection within their own borders, the Defend Trade Secrets Act will serve as a model for effective protection.

We thank the House Judiciary Committee for quickly approving this legislation, and we look forward to seeing the bill pass in the House of Representatives and move to the president's desk to become law.

On behalf of ITI's member companies, I thank you for your leadership on intellectual property protection and urge you and your colleagues to support S. 1890.

Sincerely,

DEAN C. GARFIELD,
President & CEO.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
April 26, 2016.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), the largest manufacturing association in the United States representing manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states urges you to support S. 1890, the Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016. S. 1890 passed the Senate by a vote of 87–0, and represents a bipartisan and amended version of H.R. 3326, introduced by Representatives Doug Collins (R–GA) and Jerrold Nadler (D–NY).

The NAM supports further safeguarding of confidential business information and trade secrets through the expansion of federal jurisdiction to enable faster, nationwide enforcement of all intellectual property (IP) rights. IP is one of the most valued business assets for manufacturers of all sizes. The impact of its theft has increased exponentially in today's digitally-driven environment. Mass amounts of this critical business information can now be illegally transferred to a small data storage device and removed easily and quickly from a manufacturers' facility. The value of this business information creates an inseparable link between the need for protection of intellectual property rights and innovation, competitiveness, and sound economic growth.

The NAM supports S. 1890 because it would strengthen the ability of manufacturers to protect their IP by creating a federal civil right of action to help prevent and prosecute trade secret theft, an important tool that does not exist today. Such a tool eliminates the difficult, time-consuming, and costly process imposed on manufacturers as they currently must work with multiple state jurisdictions in order to apprehend perpetrators of trade secret theft. A federal process that cuts across state lines would also increase the likelihood of preventing this valuable data from leaving the country permanently.

Manufacturers deploy the latest technology and controls to protect the critical information guarded by trade secrets. In the unfortunate instances when this data is compromised, manufacturers need to act quickly before it is disclosed and its value is lost forever. S. 1890 would modernize our current system, providing owners of trade secrets the same legal options as owners of other forms of IP, and give them the ability to pursue trade secret theft aggressively and efficiently.

The NAM's Key Vote Advisory Committee has indicated that votes on S. 1890, including procedural motions, may be considered for designation as Key Manufacturing Votes in the 114th Congress. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ARIC NEWHOUSE.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2016.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, strongly supports S. 1890, the ''Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016,'' and urges the House to expeditiously pass this bill.

Intellectual property sector industries generate 35% of all U.S. Gross Domestic Product and are responsible for two-thirds of all exports and over forty million good-paying jobs. The threat of trade secrets theft is of increasing concern to U.S. economic security and domestic jobs, and S. 1890 would provide companies with an effective tool to combat this growing problem. Creating a federal civil cause of action to complement existing criminal remedies and providing a uniform system and legal framework would enable companies to better mitigate the commercial injury and loss of employment that often occur when trade secrets are stolen.

The Chamber appreciates the House's attention to this important issue that impacts

companies that depend on intellectual property to spur innovation, create jobs, and bring new products to market that benefit consumers. By creating a federal civil remedy for trade secrets theft, this bill would help ensure the trade secrets of U.S. companies are given similar protections afforded to other forms of intellectual property including patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

The Chamber urges you to support S. 1890 and may consider votes on, or in relation to, this bill in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

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

I rise in support of S. 1890, the Defend Trade Secrets Act. This measure amends the Economic Espionage Act of 1996 to create a Federal civil cause of action and to facilitate expedited ex parte seizure of property when necessary to preserve evidence or prevent dissemination.

The House counterpart to this bill, H.R. 3326, which was introduced by our committee colleagues, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), now has 164 bipartisan cosponsors, including myself.

Likewise, S. 1890 enjoys broad bipartisan and bicameral support, as evidenced by the fact that the Senate passed this bill by a vote of 87–0 earlier this month. The House Committee on the Judiciary reported this bill favorably by a unanimous voice vote only last week.

There are several reasons that I support the legislation. To begin with, S. 1890 will enhance the protection of trade secrets, which is integral to the success of any business. It is estimated that the value of trade secrets owned by United States companies as of 2009 was approximately $5 trillion.

Although trade secrets are fundamental to the success of any business, United States companies have struggled to protect these valuable assets, especially in the digital age of smartphones and the Internet. It is estimated that the loss of trade secrets as a result of cyber espionage costs these businesses between $200 billion and $300 billion annually.

Thieves take advantage of ever-evolving, innovative technologies to access sensitive trade secrets information and to distribute it immediately.

While Federal law protects other forms of intellectual property by providing access to Federal courts for aggrieved parties to seek redress, there is no Federal civil cause of action for enforcement of trade secrets protection.

S. 1890 addresses this need by establishing a Federal cause of action for trade secrets owners to obtain injunctive and monetary relief, which will be a powerful new tool to protect their intellectual property.

Now, another reason I support the bill is that it would foster uniformity among the States. Although States provide civil remedies for trade secrets theft, these laws often fall short when trade secrets are taken across State lines. As a result, businesses that have nationwide operations must deal with various differing State laws, which can be too costly for some businesses, particularly smaller ones. This also prevents businesses from taking full advantage of the rights that they might have under the law.

S. 1890 would provide trade secrets owners access to uniform national law and the ability to make their case in Federal court.

Lastly, I support the bill because it reflects constructive feedback from various stakeholders.

We have been working on this legislation for almost 2 years. It reflects the input from a broad spectrum of stakeholders, and the bill is an excellent example of what can be achieved when there is bipartisan collaboration.

I close by urging my colleagues to support this important legislation so that we can send it to the President's desk for signature.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), the chief sponsor of the House version of this bill and a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1890, the Defend Trade Secrets Act. I introduced the House companion, and I am proud to see this bill moving forward. This legislation is sorely needed to protect the United States from the billions of dollars it faces in losses each year due to trade secrets theft.

However, the legislation could not have reached this point without the hard work and dedication of several people. First, I would like to thank Chairman GOODLATTE and his staff for their efforts to move this bill through the Committee on the Judiciary and bring it to the floor. This has been, as the ranking member said, a several-year process. We are glad to see it here.

I also wanted to thank those who introduced the House legislation with me, Mr. NADLER and Mr. JEFFRIES, both from New York, and their staff, for their commitment to the issue and their willingness to work across the aisle to implement meaningful reform.

On the Senate side, Senators HATCH and COONS were instrumental in getting us to this point. Their leadership, along with the leadership of Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator LEAHY, helped ensure the strong Senate vote of 87–0 and ensured this product was able to come to the House.

I would finally like to take just a moment to thank Jennifer Choudhry, my former legislative director, for her hand in introducing and shepherding this bill through the legislative process. Her contributions were invaluable, and she should be proud of her part in getting this legislation to the House floor today. I also thank Sally Rose Larson, who has taken up the mantle in my office and helped to get us here to the finish line.

The Defend Trade Secrets Act enjoys support from a broad coalition of groups and industries, from Americans for Tax Reform, the American Bar Association Intellectual Property Law Section, the Information Technology Industry Council, the chamber of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and many more. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this bill has more than 160 bipartisan cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, estimates show that as much as 80 percent of companies' assets are intangible, many in the form of trade secrets. Couple that with the fact that trade secrets theft is costing America billions of dollars each year. In fact, one study indicates that trade secrets theft costs America approximately $300 billion annually. That price tag will continue to grow as technology and thieves become more sophisticated. Trade secrets theft jeopardizes our economic security and threatens jobs, which is why it is so important that we take steps to address it.

Trade secrets include everything from business information to designs, prototypes, and formulas. Coming from Georgia, one good example is the recipe for Coca-Cola. Trade secrets are commercially valuable information subject to secrecy protection. They are a critical form of intellectual property, yet they do not enjoy the same protections that apply to other forms of intellectual property, such as copyrights, patents, and trademarks.

Additionally, trade secrets derive economic value from not being publicly known, and this confidential business information can be protected for an unlimited time. However, once trade secrets are disclosed, they instantly lose their value, making it even more important to have the mechanisms in place to protect them.

Currently, Federal law is insufficient to address many of the challenges related to trade secrets theft in today's economy. The only Federal mechanism for trade secrets protection under current law is the 1996 Economic Espionage Act, which made trade secrets theft by foreign nationals a criminal offense.

However, this only addresses part of the problem, and criminalizes only a portion of trade secrets theft, whereas a civil remedy for misuse and misappropriation would allow companies to more broadly protect their property.

The Defend Trade Secrets Act will address that, and it will strengthen the ability of companies to protect valuable trade secrets, which, in turn, allows them to protect American jobs and innovation. The bill will empower companies to protect their trade secrets in Federal court by creating a Federal private right of action.

The bill streamlines access to relief, and, in extraordinary circumstances, allows victims of trade secrets theft to obtain a seizure to ensure trade secrets

are not abused while cases are pending. The Defend Trade Secrets Act also provides for an injunction and damages.

Protecting the trade secrets of American businesses is crucial to keeping our country a leader in the world economy. Providing a Federal civil remedy will create certainty for companies throughout the Nation, including my home State of Georgia.

Congress has the responsibility to give industries the tools they need to protect their intellectual property and, in turn, encourage job creation and economic growth. This bill takes a step forward in better protecting American innovation.

Again, I want to thank the tireless work of my House and Senate colleagues in advancing this critical legislation. I am proud to see this bill, which provides critical intellectual property protections and protects American businesses, move forward. I would encourage all my colleagues to join me today in supporting the Defend Trade Secrets Act.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary and author of this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1890, the Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016. This long overdue legislation would protect businesses across the country from the growing threat of trade secrets theft by creating a uniform Federal civil cause of action for misappropriation of trade secrets.

Trade secrets are proprietary business information that derive their value from being and remaining secret. This includes secret recipes, software codes, and manufacturing processes—information that, if disclosed, could prove ruinous to a company. As the United States economy becomes more and more knowledge- and service-based, trade secrets are increasingly becoming the foundation of businesses across the country, with one estimate placing the value of trade secrets in the United States at $5 trillion.

□ 1500

Unfortunately, with such fortunes resting on trade secrets, theft of this property is inevitable. And in today's digital environment, it has never been easier to transfer stolen property across the globe with the click of a button. By one estimate, the American economy loses annually as much as $300 billion or more due to misappropriation of trade secrets, leading to loss of up to 2.1 billion jobs each year.

With so much at stake, it is absolutely vital that the law include strong protections against theft of trade secrets. However, our current patchwork of Federal and State laws has proven inadequate to the job. While the Federal Government may bring criminal prosecutions and may move for civil injunctions, this power is rarely exercised and often fails to adequately compensate the victims.

The States provide civil causes of action for victims of theft, with money damages available, but this system has not proven efficient or effective for incidents that cross State and, sometimes, international borders.

Once upon a time, trade secrets might have been kept in a file cabinet somewhere, and would-be thieves would have to spirit away a physical copy, making it likely that they would be caught before crossing State lines. But today, trade secrets can be loaded onto a thumb drive and mailed out of State or even sent electronically anywhere across the globe in an instant.

Pursuing a defendant and the evidence in dispute across State lines present a host of challenges for victims of trade secret theft, particularly when time is of the essence. The need for a Federal solution is, therefore, clear.

The Defend Trade Secrets Act fills this gap by creating a uniform Federal civil cause of action for theft of trade secrets. It also provides for expedited ex parte seizure of property, but only in extraordinary circumstances where necessary to preserve evidence or prevent dissemination.

As the lead Democratic cosponsor of H.R. 3326, the House companion to this legislation, I am very pleased that this bill is on the floor today, and I want to thank everyone who worked hard to bring us to this point. In particular, I want to thank the sponsor of H.R. 3326, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), as well as Ranking Member CONYERS, Chairman GOODLATTE, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES). I also appreciate the sponsors of the Senate bill, S. 1890, Senators HATCH and COONS, for all of their work on this legislation.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. The bill we are considering today represents the culmination of over 2 years of negotiations with various stakeholders and has strong bipartisan support, with 164 cosponsors in the House and 65 in the Senate.

This is good legislation that carefully balances the rights of defendants and the needs of American businesses to protect their most valuable assets. The Senate passed the bill 87–0. With passage here today, we can send it straight to the President's desk.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding, as well as for his tremendous leadership, and Chairman GOODLATTE, Congressman COLLINS, Congressman NADLER, as well as the Protect Trade Secrets Coalition, for their tremendous work in getting us to this point where we are on the verge of passing this very important piece of legislation.

Whether it is the original recipe created by Colonel Sanders in connection with Kentucky Fried Chicken or whether it is the special sauce made famous by the iconic Big Mac of McDonald's or whether it is Corning's glass that is so frequently used and found in many of our smartphones all across the country, trade secrets are as American as baseball and apple pie. Unfortunately, we have found ourselves, over the last few years, in a situation where trade secret theft has become a significant problem, by some accounts costing us in excess of $300 billion per year and more than 2 million jobs annually.

Traditionally, trade secret theft has been dealt with on the civil side as a matter of State law. But because of the increasing nature of the problem and the fact that it is both multistate and multinational in nature, the State law domain has become inadequate, which brings us to this piece of legislation that would create a Federal civil cause of action for trade secret misappropriation, giving our companies and stakeholders access to a uniform body of law that can deal with trade secret theft in a more appropriate fashion.

That is why this piece of legislation is so significant in this climate and why I am so thankful for the leadership of all those who have brought us to this point. I urge everyone to support this bill.

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

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

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my fellow Judiciary Committee colleagues and their staffs who have devoted much time and energy and intellect to this project. We have worked together for the common goal of improving our Nation's trade secret laws for the past 2 years.

I want to particularly thank Representatives DOUG COLLINS, JERROLD NADLER, and the over 150 Members of Congress who joined as cosponsors of this legislation in the House. In the Senate, we have worked closely with Senators HATCH, GRASSLEY, LEAHY, COONS, and others, and I want to thank them and their staffs for their contributions to this effort.

Furthermore, I would like to thank the White House and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office for working collaboratively with us, as well as the Protect Trade Secrets Coalition for its work on this effort. I also want to thank my staff for all their hard work on this important legislation.

This bill is the product of years of bipartisan, bicameral work, and it will have a positive impact on U.S. competitiveness, job creation, and our Nation's future economic security. I urge my colleagues to support S. 1890.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1890, the "Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016".

S. 1890, amends the, ''Economic Espionage Act of 1996,'' to create a federal civil remedy for trade secret misappropriation, and expedite ex parte seizure of trade secrets to preserve evidence or prevent dissemination, without preempting state law.

''Trade secrets'' are the form of intellectual property that protect confidential information, including: marketing data and strategies, manufacturing processes or techniques, confidential and chemical formulae, product design, customer lists, business leads, pricing schedules, and sales techniques.

Trade secret law offers protection from trade secret ''misappropriation,'' which is the unauthorized acquisition, use, or disclosure of such secrets obtained by some improper means.

Under U.S. law, trade secrets consist of three parts: (i) information that is non-public; (2) the reasonable measures taken to protect that information; and (3) the fact that the information derives independent economic value from not being publicly known.

American companies are at the forefront of innovation and have some of the largest trade secret and patent portfolios in the world tied to numerous goods and services offered to governments, commercial enterprises, and consumers around the globe.

In fact, patent portfolios often grow as a result of the ideas and products that originated as trade secrets.

President Obama's Administration identified the importance of this legislation and, ''strongly supports the Defend Trade Secrets Act,'' because he recognizes that as the United States continues to shift from a manufacturing, to a knowledge- and service-based economy, businesses increasingly depend on trade secrets to protect their confidential know-how.

A 2009 estimate placed the value of trade secrets owned by U.S. companies at five trillion dollars, demonstrating that trade secrets have become an increasingly important part of most companies' overall assets.

But, the global economy creates a competitive environment in which companies struggle to safeguard this information in light of innovative technologies, such as cell phones, which allow nearly anyone to photograph or otherwise record data and send information nearly instantaneously.

A 2013 report, by the Commission on the Theft of American Intellectual Property, estimated that the American economy loses more than $300 billion annually as a result of theft of intellectual property, largely trade secrets, leading to a loss of up to 2.1 million jobs each year.

The same theft is slowing U.S. economic growth and diminishing the incentive to innovate that we celebrate today.

Our companies pour billions of dollars into research and development, creating products and services that ultimately become the backbone of their businesses.

And rightly so, those trade secrets produced through research and development increasingly have become the attractive envy of competitors in other countries.

In addition, advances in technology now make it easy to copy trade secret materials onto a jump drive or laptop computer that in a world of less advanced technology would have taken reams of paper to reproduce.

Modernization of trade secrets law is long overdue if our legislation is to keep pace with the rapid developments of premier American companies and the technologies and methodologies used by the criminals who target them.

The patchwork of state trade secrets laws, while effective for local theft, fail to meet the demands of the global nature of today's trade secret misappropriations.

In addition, trade secrets do not enjoy the same federal protections as other types of intellectual property. While it is a federal crime to steal a trade secret, unlike patents, copyrights and trademarks, there is no current federal civil remedy.

This confidential business information can be protected for an unlimited time, unlike patents, and requires no formal registration process.

But unlike patents, once this information is disclosed it instantly loses its value and the property right itself ceases to exist, demonstrating a stark difference in the potential consequences of securing patent protections versus keeping an innovation as a trade secret.

When an inventor seeks patent protection, he or she agrees to disclose to the world their invention and how it works, furthering innovation and research, as well as securing a 20-year exclusive term of protection, and the right to prevent others from making, using, selling, importing, or distributing a patented invention without permission.

However, in contrast by maintaining it as a trade secret, an inventor could theoretically keep their invention secret indefinitely (ex: formula for Coca-Cola; the KFC Colonel's Secret Recipe); but, the downside is there is no protection if the trade secret is uncovered by others through reverse engineering or independent development.

Trade secrets must be valiantly guarded because discovery of a trade secret by fair, lawful methods, such as reverse engineering or independent development, is permitted.

As a result, the threat posed to American trade secrets has increased and theft of these secrets robs our economy of growth and innovation. S. 1890, provides a solution to these problematic gaps by making federal law more comprehensive and providing trade secrets owners with remedies that all forms of intellectual property should be afforded.

With both a federal criminal and a federal civil cause of action, large and small companies alike will have access to more of the tools that they need to effectively combat trade secret theft and help to ensure future innovation continues to occur within the United States.

While trade secret protection is important domestically, as American companies expand in the global marketplace, this protection is also paramount worldwide.

As we operate in other countries and work with them to encourage strong intellectual property protection within their own borders, the ''Defend Trade Secrets Act'' will serve as a model for effective protection.

S. 1890 will prevent the occurrence of (1) trade secret theft occurring in the United States and around the world; and (2) trade secret theft harming owner companies and their employees; while allowing the ''Economic Espionage Act of 1996'' to continue to apply broadly to protect trade secrets from theft.

I thank the House Judiciary Committee for quickly approving this legislation, and look forward to seeing this bill pass in the House to move to the President's desk to become law.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our Leadership for its prowess on intellectual property protection and urge you and your colleagues to support S. 1890.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2016.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, strongly supports S. 1890, the ''Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016,'' and urges the House to expeditiously pass this bill.

Intellectual property sector industries generate 35% of all U.S. Gross Domestic Product and are responsible for two-thirds of all exports and over forty million good-paying jobs. The threat of trade secrets theft is of increasing concern to U.S. economic security and domestic jobs, and S. 1890 would provide companies with an effective tool to combat this growing problem. Creating a federal civil cause of action to complement existing criminal remedies and providing a uniform system and legal framework would enable companies to better mitigate the commercial injury and loss of employment that often occur when trade secrets are stolen.

The Chamber appreciates the House's attention to this important issue that impacts companies that depend on intellectual property to spur innovation, create jobs, and bring new products to market that benefit consumers. By creating a federal civil remedy for trade secrets theft, this bill would help ensure the trade secrets of U.S. companies are given similar protections afforded to other forms of intellectual property including patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

The Chamber urges you to support S. 1890 and may consider votes on, or in relation to, this bill in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1890.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules on H.R. 4923 and H.R. 699, each by the yeas and nays;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 701; and

Adoption of House Resolution 701, if ordered.

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

AMERICAN MANUFACTURING COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4923) to establish a process for the submission and consideration of petitions for temporary duty suspensions and reductions, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 2, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

YEAS—415

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

NAYS—2

Griffith
Thompson (PA)

NOT VOTING—16

Capuano
Fattah
Gohmert
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Issa
Lawrence
MacArthur
McCaul
McKinley
Pelosi
Pittenger
Sewell (AL)
Van Hollen
Wasserman Schultz
Westmoreland

□ 1530

Mr. CARNEY, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 166 on H.R. 4923, I am not recorded because I was absent for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

EMAIL PRIVACY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 699) to amend title 18, United States Code, to update the privacy protections for electronic communications information that is stored by third-party service providers in order to protect consumer privacy interests while meeting law enforcement needs, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

YEAS—419

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar

Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
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
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—14

Fattah
Gohmert
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hastings
Issa
Lawrence
MacArthur
McCaul
Pittenger
Sewell (AL)
Van Hollen
Wasserman Schultz
Westmoreland

□ 1537

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 167 on H.R. 699, I am not recorded because I was absent for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4498, HELPING ANGELS LEAD OUR STARTUPS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 701) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4498) to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 181, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

YEAS—238

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
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
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
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
Scott, David
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
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—181

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

NOT VOTING—14

Bishop (UT)
Fattah
Gohmert
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Issa
Lawrence
MacArthur
McCaul
Pittenger
Sewell (AL)
Van Hollen
Wasserman Schultz
Westmoreland

□ 1544

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 240, noes 177, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

AYES—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
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
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
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
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
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—177

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
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)
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
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Brady (TX)
Fattah
Gohmert
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Issa
Lawrence
MacArthur
McCaul
McNerney
Pittenger
Reichert
Sewell (AL)
Van Hollen
Wasserman Schultz
Westmoreland

□ 1551

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.

HELPING ANGELS LEAD OUR STARTUPS ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 701, I call up the bill (H.R. 4498) to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Pursuant to House Resolution 701, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4498

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 ''Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act'' or the ''HALOS Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF ANGEL INVESTOR GROUP.

As used in this Act, the term ''angel investor group'' means any group that—

(1) is composed of accredited investors interested in investing personal capital in early-stage companies;

(2) holds regular meetings and has defined processes and procedures for making investment decisions, either individually or among the membership of the group as a whole; and

(3) is neither associated nor affiliated with brokers, dealers, or investment advisers.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF GENERAL SOLICITATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise Regulation D of its rules (17 C.F.R. 230.500 et seq.) to require that in carrying out the prohibition against general solicitation or general advertising contained in section 230.502(c) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, the prohibition shall not apply to a presentation or other communication made by or on behalf of an issuer which is made at an event—

(1) sponsored by—

(A) the United States or any territory thereof, by the District of Columbia, by any State, by a political subdivision of any State or territory, or by any agency or public instrumentality of any of the foregoing;

(B) a college, university, or other institution of higher education;

(C) a nonprofit organization;

(D) an angel investor group;

(E) a venture forum, venture capital association, or trade association; or

(F) any other group, person or entity as the Securities and Exchange Commission may determine by rule;

(2) where any advertising for the event does not reference any specific offering of securities by the issuer;

(3) the sponsor of which—

(A) does not make investment recommendations or provide investment advice to event attendees;

(B) does not engage in an active role in any investment negotiations between the issuer and investors attending the event;

(C) does not charge event attendees any fees other than administrative fees; and

(D) does not receive any compensation with respect to such event that would require registration of the sponsor as a broker or a dealer under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or as an investment advisor under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940; and

(4) where no specific information regarding an offering of securities by the issuer is communicated or distributed by or on behalf of the issuer, other than—

(A) that the issuer is in the process of offering securities or planning to offer securities;

(B) the type and amount of securities being offered;

(C) the amount of securities being offered that have already been subscribed for; and

(D) the intended use of proceeds of the offering.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (a) may only be construed as requiring the Securities and Exchange Commission to amend the requirements of Regulation D with respect to presentations and communications, and not with respect to purchases or sales.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today of H.R. 4498, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act, known as the HALOS Act. This is yet another bipartisan bill that has been passed out of the Financial Services Committee that I know will help create jobs and grow our economy.

We all know from listening to our constituents that jobs and the economy continue to be the number one issue of concern because this economy is still not working for working Americans. After many years, they still see their paychecks have stagnated. They have seen their savings evaporate. They are losing hope. We see entrepreneurship is at a generational low.

The HALOS Act is a step in the right direction. It is one of many solutions that we need to enact in this body.

I commend the bipartisan sponsor of the bill, Mr. CHABOT, the chairman of the Small Business Committee; Mr. HURT of Virginia and Ms. SINEMA of Arizona, the latter two who serve with me on the Financial Services Committee.

I want to thank all of my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee for voting overwhelmingly in favor of this bill. Almost 80 percent of the membership of the committee voted to advance it to the floor.

I am proud that our committee has a strong record of bipartisanship. Since the beginning of the 114th Congress, Mr. Speaker, the House has passed 56 of our measures—30 have been signed into law—and each one of these measures received bipartisan support. In an era of divided government, that is not a bad record.

I believe that most Americans also believe that our economy works better for all Americans when small businesses can focus on creating jobs rather than navigating meaningless bureaucratic red tape.

The HALOS Act provides an important fix to regulations so it will be easier for our small businesses to attract investments. Again, Mr. Speaker, so critical when entrepreneurship is at a generational low and our economy limps along at even less than 2 percent of economic growth.

The HALOS Act provides a clearer path for startup businesses to connect with angel investors and allows investors to make their own informed decisions. Angel investors play an incredibly active role in helping small businesses open their doors and grow so they can open their doors even wider and hire more workers.

We should remember—and many of our colleagues are now aware—that companies like Amazon, Costco, Google, Facebook, and Starbucks were all first funded by angel investors. Now, today, not only the services they provide in our economy, but approximately 600,000 employees earn their paychecks and provide for their families working for companies that were started with angel investors.

Unfortunately, as so often happens, when Washington regulators get out of control, they step into the picture and we have yet more unintended consequences. Four years ago, Congress passed a bipartisan JOBS Act to make it easier for business startups to gain access to capital, but the Securities and Exchange Commission issued misguided regulations on angel investors that had exactly the opposite effect.

By inappropriately classifying events where entrepreneurs showcased their business models to angel investors as general solicitations, the SEC regulations are causing innovative startups to lose access to capital, which means our economy loses jobs. This is counter to Congress' intent when we passed the JOBS Act, and it is certainly counter to what our economy needs now. Mr. Speaker, what is so ironic is that the practice was legal and proper before the passage of the JOBS Act. It should remain legal and proper after the passage of the JOBS Act.

This is a problem that Congress can easily fix by approving the HALOS Act. It is not a complicated bill, Mr. Speaker. It is four pages long. It simply ensures that funding from angel investors remains available to business startups.

The bipartisan bill makes sure that events where entrepreneurs and angel investors get together are not classified as general solicitations because they are not. Instead of onerous bureaucratic red tape that deters investors from backing new business startups, the four-page HALOS Act will help new businesses gain investor support when they need it most.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, this bill sailed through the House Financial Services Committee with strong bipartisan support. Out of 57 members voting in committee that day, only 13 opposed the bill. In other words, 80 percent of the committee voted in favor of the HALOS Act.

The bill has strong bipartisan support because it is common sense. It is about jobs; it is about helping small businesses overcome misguided regulation; and it is about making sure that Congress makes the law—not the regulators, who are unelected and who are unaccountable.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 4498, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act.

This bill will make changes to investor protections under the JOBS Act that I believe are ill-advised and could lead to unintended consequences for our regulatory framework.

□ 1600

It would do so by broadening the scope of when private securities offerings can be solicited or advertised to the public without first verifying that the purchaser is financially sophisticated enough to understand the risk involved, what we call ''accredited investors.''

Specifically, the bill would require the SEC to amend its safe harbor rules for private placements under Rule 506 of Regulation D so that the current verification requirements for general solicitation and advertising do not effectively apply to sales events that are sponsored by certain groups, colleges, nonprofits, trade associations, or angel investor groups, for example.

The bill's intent is to expand the role of angel investors in capital formation. It is a laudable goal, but it is one that needs appropriate rules to ensure investors have the protection and legal recourse needed to make sound investments.

So, while the bill would limit the amount and type of information that can be communicated for these events, it would still allow companies to condition the markets for their securities and offer them to any member of the public who walks in the door.

Let me be clear. If a university wants to sponsor a so-called demo day with companies that want to pitch their ideas and products, they already can, and the entire public can attend. The companies, however, just can't talk about offers or sell securities in their companies.

I am concerned that this bill, however, would cause real harm to retail investors. For example, a hedge fund could set up an event that is sponsored by a questionable college, like Corinthian, could pass out flyers on campus

that advertise their shares, and then sell those shares to anyone who had attended the event, including the students who may know nothing about how this whole operation works. They would not have to take reasonable steps to verify that these purchasers are accredited investors.

Furthermore, events sponsored by government entities, nonprofits, and universities are likely to attract the very people we are trying to protect, investors who are not accredited and do not have enough financial sophistication or wherewithal to understand the investments or bear their high risk of loss.

We created the Rule 506 exemption under the JOBS Act to expand the market for private offerings. Private companies can now advertise and solicit offerings to the general public, which helps them to raise the capital they need to grow their businesses.

In exchange for the expanded framework and lower levels of investor protection, we passed a simple amendment that I offered to require companies to just take reasonable steps to verify that the purchaser of the security is an accredited investor.

The intent was simple. If a company is going to advertise riskier private offerings, it must ensure that the buyer has the necessary income and assets to qualify for such a purchase rather than rely on so-called self-certification. The bill would effectively reverse this sensible amendment during these sales events.

At best, the bill is also unnecessary. The SEC has already provided relief to angel investor groups if they curate the people who attend these sales events. They have to either make sure they have a preexisting relationship with the investor or verify their income and assets at the time of purchase, which is consistent with our regulatory framework.

I have offered an amendment, which will be debated later today, that would codify the SEC's relief and prevent harm to everyday investors. It would also limit the exemptions to operating companies so that shell companies and investment vehicles, like hedge funds, can't solicit potentially risky offerings to unknowing investors.

These revisions to the bill would strike an appropriate balance between capital formation and investor protection while still supporting angel investor groups. However, without my amendment, I cannot support this bill.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished Republican leader and a leader in the JOBS Act and in innovation.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Before I move on, I thank the gentleman for his work on the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. Speaker, this is another bill that comes to the floor with a large bipartisan vote coming out so as to create jobs, and that is what this floor is all about. Today we are talking about an American economy that is ripe for innovation. This is what is needed to create jobs and opportunity.

To my colleagues, I ask them: How many times have you traveled back to your districts and sat down and seen individuals who crave to be entrepreneurs? It could be that single mom or maybe it is that person who is stuck in a job or is a young kid with a great idea.

But as they roll out their ideas, they find they are not going to get stopped except by, maybe, a government regulation. Think of the jobs they could create and the places in which we can grow.

Because of the technological revolution of our country's experience, the startups we have come to know are now some of the largest companies in our economy. Our goal shouldn't be to stop the next great American company from coming into existence. We should actually enable it.

We should tear down the government-made barriers to their potential and embrace the positive disruption that will keep America as the world leader in innovation. That is the goal of the Innovation Initiative, and that is what we are doing here today.

We will pass today the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act, which enables ready investors to invest in startups. Startups are in a world of high risk and high reward.

They can't just go to a bank for a loan. They need angel investors who are willing to take that risk for the next company that will change the world, and Washington should not stand in the way of making that happen.

Several years ago Congress passed and the President did sign the JOBS Act. Our goal was to help increase access to capital. Unfortunately, some of the provisions in our bill were misinterpreted by the SEC against the spirit of entrepreneurship, thus keeping the barriers to capital in place.

Today's bill gives new companies an opportunity to identify and to interact with potential investors, thus opening the door for the next great idea to get the funding it needs to get up and running.

I give a special thanks to Chairman CHABOT for identifying this inefficiency and acting to solve it.

I started my first business when I was 19 years old. There are three lessons you learn: you are the first one to work; you are the last one to leave; and you are the last one to be paid. The last thing you need is for government to stop you from achieving your dream.

It is very simple, when I talk to my colleagues here, in that there are one or two ways to go on this bill. If you sit back and you look at Facebook, Amazon, or Starbucks, they are amazing success stories in America and are where millions of people work.

The idea would be, if you believe America needs to continue the opportunity for our entrepreneurs and for more companies such as those, it starts with angel investing. So you would vote ''yes.''

If you believe America doesn't need innovation, that America thinks that the new Facebook shouldn't be there, that we should put up new barriers to stop a dream, to stop the growth, you would probably vote ''no.''

That is why later today, when this bill gets through, it will be a big bipartisan vote: because we believe in America.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS for granting me time.

I thank Mr. CHABOT and Mr. HURT and others for working with me on this bipartisan bill to help entrepreneurs and startup companies create jobs and grow our economy.

Mr. Speaker, American startup businesses are growing both in number and diversity. Entrepreneurs are finding new and better ways to bring together talent, innovation, and investment capital in an increasingly competitive small-business environment.

The HALOS Act clarifies SEC regulations to ensure small businesses may participate in educational demo days without the burden of having to verify that attendees are accredited investors. These events provide invaluable opportunities for entrepreneurs to meet and exchange ideas with students, professors, business professionals, and potential future investors.

The HALOS Act creates a clear path for startups to participate in demo days that are sponsored by a government entity, a nonprofit organization, an angel investor group, a venture association, or other entity that is permitted by the SEC.

Specifically, this act clarifies the definition of ''general solicitation'' to exempt communications and presentations at these events where advertising does not make specific investment offerings and where no specific securities offering information is communicated at the event.

This permits startups to connect with business experts, potential future investors, and other entrepreneurs while maintaining existing accredited investor verification requirements and exceptions already under Regulation D for the actual purchase or sale of securities. It does not in any way permit the sale of securities to unaccredited investors at demo days.

Companies such as Amazon, Costco, Facebook, Google, and Starbucks were all initially funded by angel investors. As we work to make America more competitive in the new global economy, we need to encourage the growth of innovative startups and job-creating small businesses.

Again I thank my cosponsors and the chairman for working with us on this commonsense, bipartisan bill. I am committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that Arizona startups have the support that they need to grow their businesses and create jobs.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is the chief sponsor of the HALOS Act and is the chairman of our Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank Mr. HENSARLING for his leadership on this. I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona, who just spoke, for her leadership on this as well.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I have the pleasure of hearing from America's small-business owners each and every day, both in my district and up here in Washington.

The stories of success are always encouraging to hear, but all too often, what I am told is how the government is making it difficult for small businesses to grow and succeed and to, therefore, create jobs.

Perhaps the most common concern is just how difficult it is for entrepreneurs who are starting out to access the needed capital to grow. This bill expands access to capital by ensuring small businesses can continue to connect with so-called angel investors.

One popular way small businesses have connected with angel investors is through demo days. These are events that are sponsored by universities, nonprofits, local governments, accelerators, incubators, and other groups that allow entrepreneurs to showcase their products and to informally meet investors and customers.

However, SEC regulations are threatening to force these events out of business by imposing unwieldy regulations that dictate who is and who is not allowed to simply attend.

These regulations would force everybody who merely walks through the door to go through what is essentially a full financial interrogation in one's handing over of tax documents and bank statements, paybook information, and on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, this doesn't make any sense. We should be encouraging participation in demo days, not creating obstacles. After all, not only are these events places at which to connect investors with our communities' small businesses and entrepreneurs, but they also provide a great opportunity for students, for example, and our next generation of entrepreneurs to ask questions and learn what it takes to get a business off the ground.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership in getting this bill through the committee, as well as to thank Representative HURT, Representative SINEMA, and Representative TAKAI for working in a cooperative and bipartisan manner to move this bill to the House floor.

It was very bipartisan. All of the Republicans voted for it, and almost half of the Democrats voted for it in committee. It is always wonderful when we are able to work together to support small business, and there is no better time than now.

Next week is National Small Business Week, when we will be celebrating the contributions of small businesses and entrepreneurs in every community all across America. Every one of us has small businesses in our districts. It serves as a reminder to us in this Chamber of how important it is to create policies that promote an environment for small businesses to succeed, and this bill is one more step in that direction.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4498. Again, I really appreciate the bipartisan nature of this bill and its support thus far.

1615

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT), a sponsor of the bill.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the HALOS Act. I first would like to thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. HENSARLING, for his leadership on the JOBS Act and on this issue specifically.

I would also like to commend the efforts of Representatives CHABOT and SINEMA. It has been an honor to be able to work with them on such an important issue, and it is an honor to be able to work with them to craft a sensible bipartisan bill aimed at removing a regulatory hurdle for innovative companies and startups seeking early-stage equity capital investment.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a rural district in Virginia, Virginia's Fifth District, that stretches from the northern Piedmont of Virginia to the North Carolina border. As I travel across my district, a recurring theme that I hear from my constituents is that they are concerned about jobs and the economy.

At a time when our economy is struggling, Congress must do everything possible to help small businesses achieve success. These entities are our Nation's most dynamic job creators, and their success is essential to our economy.

Earlier this year Charlottesville, Virginia, was recognized as one of the Nation's fastest growing markets for venture capital investment. Over the past 5 years, the amount of capital invested in Charlottesville has grown over 150 percent.

This type of investment can have a profound impact on a community, making it more attractive to other startup companies and ultimately producing more job growth. Indeed, Senator CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut said it best when he introduced the Senate version of the HALOS Act:

> I have heard from local entrepreneurs and interested backers alike that the most important thing we can do to help these businesses is make it easier for angel investors to put capital behind them, and that is exactly what our bipartisan HALOS Act will do.

In 2014 alone, angel investors deployed over $24 billion to over 70,000 startups. Many of these investments go into companies in their own communities and States.

Beyond capital, angel investors often provide advice and guidance to help these companies succeed and create jobs. It is for these reasons that I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

If enacted, the HALOS Act would amend the Securities Act to define an angel investor group and would clarify the definition of general solicitation so that startup enterprises would be able to continue to promote their businesses at certain events called demo days where there is no direct investment offering.

The HALOS Act would alleviate the burden placed on startups with regard to privacy and compliance concerns, which often require entrepreneurs and startups to take on burdens that they do not have the means to handle.

These burdens have a significant impact on an entrepreneur's ability to interface with investors because of the risk of violating Federal securities laws by having their interactions with investors being viewed as a general solicitation.

HALOS would lift this burden and is an important step to continuing the success that this committee has achieved with the bipartisan JOBS Act.

The JOBS Act made it easier for startup enterprises to market their securities to a larger pool of investors. Unfortunately, while implementing the JOBS Act, the SEC has classified events held by angel investors as general solicitations, requiring entrepreneurs and startups to verify accredited investor status.

This jeopardizes the future of events like demo days where startups can interact with these investors and venture capitalists.

The HALOS Act would simply ensure that angel funding remains available to startups by defining the term ''angel investor group'' and exempting an angel investor event from being considered general solicitation.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Virginia an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the HALOS Act is a simple, bipartisan, bicameral solution that will ensure that investors and companies can continue this commonsense interaction.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the other side has any further speakers before we use all our time?

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the chairman of our Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises Subcommittee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the sponsor of the underlying legislation for the underlying bill.

I rise in support of H.R. 4498, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it was 2 weeks ago at the Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises Subcommittee that we held a hearing that examined the positive impact the 2012 JOBS Act is having on our economy. By reducing burdens on startup companies and modernizing our security laws, the consensus was very clear.

The JOBS Act was a big win for entrepreneurs, innovation, and, ultimately, economic growth and opportunity and job creation in this country.

But that doesn't mean that we shouldn't be doing more besides the JOBS Act, and it certainly doesn't mean that the Securities and Exchange Commission, the SEC, has done a perfect job, by any means, when it comes to implementing the important provisions of the JOBS Act.

At times, the SEC has taken liberties, if you will, with their rulemaking that run contrary to the wishes and purposes of Congress, which ultimately could limit the impact this great, new revolutionary legislation has for our economy.

One example of this was the way in which the SEC implemented title II of the JOBS Act, which made it easier for companies to use general solicitation in order to attract investors for private offering of stocks.

You see, what happened here was, in their final rule, the SEC classified events such as demo days held by angel investors as being general solicitation. This means that angel groups would have to then comply with all the rules and regulations that are designed for issuers who are actually engaged in the offering of securities, which this is not.

So events such as demo days are an important economic development tool, if you will, used by small startup companies to help educate people, educate a pool of potential investors. They are not security offerings, and they should really, really not be treated as such.

Why is this important? Well, in 2014, angel investors put some $24 billion to work in over 73,000 startups. So, clearly, this is a preferred source of capital throughout the economy.

Any kind of regulation that would hamper the ability of angel investors to communicate with startup companies would jeopardize the ability of angel investors to fund the next Apple or Google or startup.

So here we are with H.R. 4498. It would simply make a small technical fix to the JOBS Act and would allow such events to continue without that heavy hand of government getting in the way. So I want to thank the sponsors.

I urge bipartisan support of this underlying bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), chairman of Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as a small-business owner and coming from a family of very entrepreneurial people, I know the importance of fostering an environment that promotes economic opportunity and especially allows small businesses to grow and create jobs.

West Michigan, which I represent, is a hub of entrepreneurial activity. Organizations like the Grand Rapids Inventors Network and a very innovative place called Start Garden are the center of that.

Start Garden does two demo days a year with very sophisticated investors. In fact, over the last 3 years of Start Garden's existence, they have helped and launched 200 various companies and have given them that investment.

One of those is Boxed Water is Better. Just this past week, my office received its first shipment from Holland, Michigan, of Boxed Water is Better.

Founded in 2009, the team at Boxed Water combined west Michigan ingenuity with capital from investors through Start Garden, who now employ 60 people and have facilities in both Michigan and Utah. They sell their product in over 8,000 stores nationwide and are now starting to sell around the globe.

Small businesses across the globe and across the country like Boxed Water are looking for real solutions from Congress to help them innovate and thrive.

The JOBS Act, a solution designed to jump-start capital formation for small businesses, entrepreneurs, and startups, was signed into law in 2012. Instead of helping small businesses access capital through the JOBS Act, as Congress had intended, the Securities and Exchange Commission has choked off avenues of that capital formation.

In order to participate in a demo day, the SEC requires startups to register a securities offering and verify the sophistication level of potential funders, something most of them do not have the physical or financial means to do, according to Start Garden.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio for introducing the HALOS Act, an important bill that connects fledgling companies to angel investors who may provide them with the capital that they need to turn their startup into a growing, thriving business.

By exempting demo days featuring many small businesses like Boxed Water and others, these participants are not considered as general solicitors under the Securities Act.

We need more entrepreneurs to expand, hire, and invest, and the HALOS Act is an innovative way of doing that.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative CHABOT of Ohio for introducing this bipartisan piece of legislation as well as my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee, Congressman HURT of Virginia and Congresswoman SINEMA of Arizona, for sponsoring the legislation.

H.R. 4498, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act, provides an important fix to our securities regulations that removes friction between entrepreneurs and the potential investors that are looking to support startup companies.

When we think about angel investing or venture capital, we naturally think of the Silicon Valley tech scene or the financial powerhouse of New York City.

However, more and more startups all across the country are using important changes under the JOBS Act in order to raise financing no matter where they are located. In fact, as reported in the St. Louis Business Journal, St. Louis has the Nation's fastest growing startup scene.

As more and more investors are drawn to the St. Louis area, these early-stage investments are critical for helping keep these companies in Missouri and creating more local Missouri jobs.

Yet, while St. Louis' startups have experienced tremendous growth recently, small businesses and startups everywhere are still having difficulty in obtaining financing and investment in today's economy at a crucial stage when they are trying to grow and expand.

The HALOS Act will make a small change that makes it easier for small businesses to find those vital investments. It would exempt demo days from general solicitation requirements that would put a burden on entrepreneurs and that would make it more difficult for investors to provide financing.

For those companies that are not yet ready to go public, it is important that they are given the opportunity to pitch their business ideas to those who are interested in learning more.

I urge passage of this bipartisan piece of legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to be able to speak in support of the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups, or HALOS, Act.

I would also like to thank Chairman CHABOT, Congressman HURT, and Congresswoman SINEMA for putting forward this important bipartisan legislation.

I am fortunate to hear regularly from innovators across Illinois and through my work on the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Chicago is recognized nationally as a hub for angel investors. The Illinois Venture Capital Association was one of the first associations to represent private equity and venture capital groups.

The State of Illinois also offers an angel investment credit program to attract and encourage investment into early-stage innovative companies throughout my State.

These innovators oftentimes have a simple idea that can be life changing, but financing these ideas so that they can become a reality is harder than you might think.

Angel investors play a key role in the earliest stages of these startups. They provide the initial round of funding to help get these life-changing ideas off the ground. Startups are the job creators that drive our economy, make life-changing medical breakthroughs, and harness technology to accomplish the impossible.

These startup companies frequently participate in demo days, as has been talked about, to increase the visibility of their company, explain their ideas and hope to informally attract investors. These demo days are sponsored by a variety of organizations interested in promoting innovation and job creation.

For example, the University of Illinois Research Park told me that this bill would address some of the unintended consequences of the JOBS Act and crowdfunding, which could make things like Cozad New Venture Competition, Urbana-Champaign Angel Network angel presentations, the Share the Vision Technology Showcase, pitch practice at EnterpriseWorks, and other public forums for startups in Illinois problematic.

They want to encourage showcasing our startups without fear that these programs would be constituting a formal fundraising solicitation that would require reporting to the SEC.

This bill simply clarifies SEC regulations to ensure small businesses may participate in educational demo days without having to verify that attendees are accredited investors. This is a burdensome process meant only for security solicitation, not just informal conversations.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this important bill.

□ 1630

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, there is a crisis right now in our country, and the fact of the matter is, we have more business concerns closing, going out of business, than being started. If you are concerned about economic growth, if you are concerned about growing payrolls, people being able to survive financially, you should be fixated on the fact that we have more businesses closing than opening.

Being someone who was here and spent a year of his life working on the JOBS Act, the individual bills, who was almost giddy that we had a bipartisan piece of success that so many of us were incredibly optimistic that was going to create some economic growth, and to be here today 4 years later dealing with something, I am sorry, that is almost absurd in the discussion: that the SEC has made it more restrictive today than it was before the JOBS Act.

Think about this: your university, your community college, your group brings together a number of little businesses that are trying to raise capital, and now under the interpretation that is coming at us, you are going to have to have security at the door to interview people, look at their financials. I mean, this is crazy.

Is the caterer going to have to get certified? How about the security person at the door, are they going to have to get secure?

Think about what this means and the absurdity that little businesses that were trying to capitalize can't even tell their story without making sure that the people in the room hearing it have met some sort of definition that the SEC has imposed after we all thought we did a piece of legislation that opened up this type of communication.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4498, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act.

I cosponsored this bipartisan legislation because it will assist entrepreneurs in accessing angel investors, who provide critical financing for startup businesses and local entrepreneurs.

From construction companies to medical technology producers and manufacturing and perhaps even the next iPhone app, there are Pennsylvanians in my district who are full of forward-thinking ideas who need access to capital.

By revising an unintended bureaucratic regulation that places an encumbrance on startup businesses, this legislation will further enable entrepreneurs access to the capital they need to create jobs and be successful.

Let me just say that again, Mr. Speaker. Here we have an example of a Washington, D.C., bureaucratic rulemaking interpretation getting in the way of enabling entrepreneurs with good ideas from getting access to capital and subsequently creating jobs in local communities. There is a simple solution to fix that.

That is why I am supporting this legislation. I am proud of Pennsylvania's longstanding history as a leader in innovation, and I want to do everything I can to remove barriers and support our local job creators. I encourage all my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

The United States leads the global economy on innovation. There are a lot of pieces of the innovation agenda, some that Republicans and Democrats disagree on, some that they agree on. I am pleased to be here today on a small but important piece that can help move the innovation agenda forward, help America retain and grow its competitive advantage.

Let me set the scene. This could be a ballroom at a university, it could be a theater that is rented out for the night. There might be 5 or 10 teams of entrepreneurs who worked hard on their business plans. Perhaps they were part of some business plan competition to refine what they call their pitch deck. The audience fills out.

Who is in the audience?

It wouldn't be a worthwhile event if there weren't potential investors there. So, of course, the bulk of the audience—it could be half, it could be three-quarters, it could be most of it—will be accredited investors. They are the only people who can invest in these companies.

Who else should be in the room? Who do we want to make sure that we don't seal off the opportunity to learn and gain from that experience?

Well, it could be university faculty, graduate students, professors. They don't happen to be worth $2 million, but they might have technical expertise. They might be able to be consultants. They might be professionals, lawyers and bankers, who might be able to assist the companies develop, patent their ideas, and raise money. It might be students and future entrepreneurs who want to learn about the pitch process so they, too, can refine their ideas and be on the stage the next time around.

That is what this bill allows, for us to make sure that the great opportunity that this country offers reaches

people from all economic backgrounds. We can't lock everybody except for the millionaires and billionaires out of the room that helps form the seed capital for tomorrow's great company.

HALOS does not change the existing law about who can and can't buy private securities. What it does do is allow folks who are not accredited investors, who are not there as a potential investor to be in the room, to learn from the experience, to perhaps get a job if they are an aspiring programmer, to have to team up with one of the companies that presented as a cofounder to complement some of the competencies that the other founder has, to make sure that they, too, are in that great room of opportunity.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our startup communities will be strengthened. Startup ecosystems like the ones that I am proud to say exist in towns like Fort Collins and Boulder in my district can be made more diverse through this law and will inevitably make sure that those in the room can expand opportunity beyond people who are already millionaires and billionaires.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members, we have heard a lot of conversation from the opposite side of the aisle about what the SEC has done or has not done. As a matter of fact, it was represented that the SEC had misinterpreted the bill. That is not true.

We absolutely need rules of the road. We need to make sure that we are protecting investors. We need to make sure that we are not allowing folks to be put at great risk who don't understand or know what is happening in these rooms. I am concerned about these demo days on campuses where students may be encouraged in these presentations to invest their parents' money or get their parents involved in schemes that they may not be aware of.

Why is this so important to us?

It is important to us because we have arrived at a time in the Congress of the United States where we recognize the need for consumer protection. Prior to the recession that we had that was created in 2008 because of the subprime meltdown and the faulty products that were placed out in the marketplace by banks and financial institutions, consumers were really ignored and not protected.

We have payday loans that target our communities that charge 400 to 500 percent interest and take advantage of some of the most vulnerable people in our society. We have all of these fraudulent mortgages that almost brought this country down, that created a recession—almost a depression—and we are still finding out about some of the exotic products that they put out on the market that tricked people into signing on the dotted line who eventually lost their homes.

We have the fiduciary duty that we have been debating in Congress.

Do you know why we are debating that?

We are debating that because we have investment advisers who were in conflict with the people they were supposed to be protecting and supposed to be advising, and they literally were advising seniors, who had savings for their retirement, to invest in plans that they would ultimately lose all of their money in.

So in addition to payday loans and fraudulent mortgages and conflict of interest and fiduciary, we have had mandatory arbitration and on and on and on. We have arrived at a time when Democrats are implementing Dodd-Frank. We are making sure that we have the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that is doing the work that had not been done all of these years.

Yes, we are concerned about this. We supported the JOBS Act. We supported it with an amendment that I put in there that said that you must take reasonable opportunities to ensure that you know who these investors are. We are talking about accredited investors, folks who have resources, folks who know how this game is operated, folks who can protect themselves. They have lawyers, they have consultants, all of that.

What we don't want is—we don't want these students and we don't want people who walk in off the street who may be presented with an opportunity that is not a real opportunity.

For example, what if we had something like Corinthian that is a private, postsecondary school that we had to close down, or DeVry University, or the University of Phoenix, or the Trump University?

Any of these could present themselves as credible businesses to be invested in, only to find out later that the students have been misled, they have not gotten jobs, they don't have anything. They have not made any money. We are saying this is another effort to simply protect those who oftentimes are the targets of the rip-offs and the fraud.

I would ask my colleagues to support the amendment that I am going to put to the bill to make sure that they know who is in the room. I would ask them to support this simple amendment that was made in order in the Committee on Rules to make sure that we are protecting those investors and keeping them from getting ripped off.

Now, some of my friends on the opposite side of the aisle would have you believe that we are not interested in capital formation, that we are not interested in entrepreneurship, that we are not interested in joint ventures. That is absolutely not true. As a matter of fact, folks on this side of the aisle are fighting to make the financial institutions responsible and the banks to make loans where they should be making loans. We have to have a CRA to make sure that they are doing what they should be doing with the depositors' money and on and on and on. We fight for small businesses every day.

We joined up with our colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle to support the JOBS Act even though we had some concerns, and the SEC tried to make sure that we had the kind of legislation that would protect these investors.

Now they are saying: We don't like what the SEC is doing. They are misinterpreting it. They are messing this all up.

Well, that is not true. Now, we know they don't like the SEC. As a matter of fact, they do everything that they can to limit their funding so that they cannot be effective. But these are our cops on the block. The SEC is our cop on the block to try and make sure that we limit the rip-off and the fraud and the undermining of average citizens in our society. We support the JOBS Act. We believe that we should not have these operations on the campuses without knowing who is in the room and allowing investors to be put at risk.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I would ask for a ''no'' vote on the bill. I am going to ask for an ''aye'' vote on the amendment that is going to come up. If my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle accept this very, very reasonable amendment, then I will vote to support the bill. But if they don't show any concern or compassion for the interests of investors, then I cannot support the bill, and I will ask my caucus not to support the bill. It is as simple as that.

□ 1645

When are we going to stop the fraudulent operations in this country that rip off working people every day, rip off students, and don't care about our investors who are interested in capital formation and investing in real enterprises that can help to grow their business and make some money themselves? When are we going to recognize we can do both?

We don't have to just be on the side of those who would take advantage of people. We must be on the side of both—our investors who are willing to put up money and our businesses who need capital formation—but somehow we always end up letting the most vulnerable people in our society be the target of fraud by those who take advantage of them.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I am very, very happy that yet another bipartisan bill has come out of the Financial Services Committee to try to get this economy working for working people. I took note that there were more Democrats coming to the floor in favor of the bill than against the bill, and that almost 80 percent of the members of the Financial Services Committee reported this bill favorably.

Now, the ranking member spoke passionately about trying to help the most vulnerable. She cares about investor protection. But, Mr. Speaker, the only people who can buy these securities in a private offering are millionaires. So the question is: Who do you care more about, the millionaire investors or the working poor who need better jobs?

You can't have capitalism without capital, and yet the ranking member would put one more burden in front of small businesses and entrepreneurs trying to create businesses so that people can have better jobs and a better future for themselves and their families.

I am glad we have millionaire investors. I wish we had more of them. But they are already protected. You must be an accredited investor in order to partake, to actually buy the security. All we are debating now is whether you are going to have to prescreen, as the gentleman from Arizona said, the caterer or the security guard at the door, to be part of the demo day—something, Mr. Speaker, that was perfectly legal and had gone on for years and years and years prior to this SEC rule.

Yet we have an agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission, creating law out of thin air, making it more difficult for the working poor to find better jobs, to make sure that people have a better career path, to make sure that we can find the next Facebook. They are making it more difficult.

I believe this will have strong bipartisan support on the floor. We all need to support the HALOS Act, H.R. 4498. At the end of the day, who are you going to come down in favor of, the working poor or millionaire investors who are already protected? This side of the aisle will come down in favor of the working poor who need jobs in an economy that has been hurt by Obamanomics.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 5, strike ''and''.

Page 5, after line 5, insert the following:

(D) does not receive any compensation for making introductions between investors attending the event and issuers, or for investment negotiations between such parties; and

Page 5, line 6, strike ''(D)'' and insert ''(E)''.

Page 5, line 11, strike ''and''.

Page 5, line 23, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 5, after line 23, insert the following:

(5) where attendance to the event is limited to members of an angel investor group or to accredited investors.

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

(c) DEFINITION OF ISSUER.—For purposes of this section and the revision of rules required under this section, the term ''issuer'' means an issuer that is in day-to-day operations as a business, is not in bankruptcy or receivership, is not an investment company, and is not a blank check, blind pool, or shell company.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 701, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned during the general debate on H.R. 4498, I am offering this amendment today in order to clarify and improve the bill. If this amendment is accepted, I am prepared to support this legislation.

Indeed, I support the goal of connecting angel investor groups with companies seeking funding, particularly startups and emerging firms. Angel investor groups tend to be comprised of highly sophisticated individuals with significant experience investing in higher risk offerings. They tend to curate their groups carefully and are good gatekeepers for these demo day events.

As such, my amendment seeks to support the efforts of these angel investor associations without creating a harmful loophole in some of the protections we put in place when we adopted the JOBS Act of 2012. This amendment includes several provisions to advance these goals.

First, my amendment stipulates that no sponsor of a demo day can collect finders' fees for connecting investors to companies. This provision ensures that event sponsors—colleges, nonprofits, trade associations, or otherwise—don't have perverse incentives to drum up securities sales.

Second, my amendment limits the relief offered under the bill to actual operating companies in the ''real economy.'' As such, it excludes certain entities like shell companies and investment vehicles like hedge funds. I think that my amendment is appropriately calibrated to ensure that the benefits provided under the bill go to startups like technology firms or manufacturing companies rather than opaque or speculative firms.

Third, my amendment would codify the relief the SEC has already provided for angel investor groups as it relates to these demo days. This will provide legal certainty to these groups without opening up any new loopholes. Let me describe how this would work.

If the company wants to hold a demo day and also condition the market for a securities sale, as H.R. 4498 would allow, they would have to curate the group of people that attend the event. To be clear, under the bill as currently drafted, companies aren't limited to holding science fair-style demonstrations. They can discuss actual securities being offered, the types and amounts of those securities, who has already subscribed to their offerings, and how they intend to use the proceeds of the offering.

Under the SEC's relief and codified in this provision in my amendment, companies can hold these presentations, can talk about their securities, and can solicit attendance. They can even avoid the accredited investor verification requirement in the JOBS Act. They just have to call their existing networks of accredited investors and angel investor group members rather than blasting out an invitation to an entire college campus. If companies do want to blast out the invitation to entire campuses, they still can; they just have to abide by the verification provisions in the JOBS Act.

In summary, this amendment I am offering today ensures that no loopholes to the JOBS Act verification requirement are opened up, that all manner of conflicted fees are prohibited, and that the benefits of the bill go to actual operating companies. And that is very important, actual operating companies.

Mr. Speaker, whether it is through my work to clarify and improve the JOBS Act during the 112th Congress or my work with members on the committee this Congress to amend the definition of ''accredited investors'' or through my amendment today, I have long shown a willingness to work in good faith on issues related to capital formation. I would urge my colleagues to adopt my amendment so that we can all support a strong, bipartisan bill.

Mr. HENSARLING brags about how many Democrats supported this bill. He brags about the fact that, in committee and then on the floor, we all tried to be very cooperative in the JOBS Act. And I bent over backwards to ensure that we could get a JOBS Act to see what could happen with creating jobs, but what they have done now is to go a step further beyond what we agreed upon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for an ''aye'' vote on my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, the amendment from the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee effectively repeals the HALOS Act.

We are having the same debate that we just had. It would effectively outlaw

demo days as they are currently practiced. The whole idea of the HALOS Act is to ensure that demo days, which existed prior to this SEC rule, will continue and that startups can continue to have access to capital without the additional burden of having to screen those who actually come in to demo days.

Mr. Speaker, again, a private offering. The security can only be purchased by an accredited investor. Those are the existing rules. So there is almost a mythical group that the ranking member is attempting to protect. At the end of the day, these are millionaire investors who are the angel investors, who are the accredited investors whom we need to help fund these startups.

What the gentlewoman from California's amendment does, again, is guts the bill. It basically just simply codifies this SEC rule, and that absolutely overturns the congressional intent to make sure that we have greater access to capital.

In addition, there is an entire new defined term of ''issuer'' in her amendment, notwithstanding the fact that this is already defined in section 3(aa) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934. So we have undefined, vague terms that are being introduced here.

I would also remind the gentlewoman from California and all that the HALOS Act already prohibits a sponsor from engaging in investment negotiations between the issuer and investors, charging event attendees any fees other than administrative fees, and receiving any compensation that would require the sponsor to register with the SEC as a broker-dealer or investment adviser.

So these are ill-placed concerns that at the end of the day put up yet another hurdle for angel investors funding the next new Facebook, the next new Costco, the next new Starbucks, and putting tens of thousands of Americans back to work.

It is time that we affirm the JOBS bill, not gut the JOBS bill, and I would urge all Members to reject the amendment of the gentlewoman from California.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, and on the amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

The question is on the amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

A motion to recommit, if ordered;

Passage of the bill, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 1890.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 139, nays 272, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—139

Adams
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Esty
Farr
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—272

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
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
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—22

Amodei
Conyers
Fattah
Gohmert
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Kaptur
Lawrence
Lynch
MacArthur
McCaul
Pascrell
Pittenger
Richmond
Sewell (AL)
Torres
Van Hollen
Wasserman Schultz
Westmoreland

□ 1719

Messrs. FARENTHOLD, GROTHMAN, RUSSELL, POE of Texas, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. ESHOO, Messrs. CULBERSON, ROKITA, CALVERT, WITTMAN, and SHUSTER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, KILMER, and SCHIFF changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 170 on H.R. 4998, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "no" when I should have voted "yes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 325, nays 89, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—325

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—89

Adams
Bass
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Langevin
Lee
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pocan
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Amodei
Conyers
Fattah
Gohmert
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Lawrence
MacArthur
McCaul
Pittenger
Richmond
Sewell (AL)
Torres
Van Hollen
Wasserman Schultz
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1726

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFEND TRADE SECRETS ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1890) to amend chapter 90 of title 18, United States Code, to provide Federal jurisdiction for the theft of trade secrets, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 2, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—410

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

NAYS—2

Amash
Massie

NOT VOTING—21

Amodei
Conyers
Eshoo
Fattah
Gohmert
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jones
Lawrence
MacArthur
McCaul
Pittenger
Quigley
Sewell (AL)
Torres
Van Hollen
Wasserman Schultz
Westmoreland

□ 1733

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 2016, I missed the following votes:

H.R. 4923—American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2016—"Yea."

H.R. 699—Email Privacy Act—"Yea."

S. 1890—Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016—"Yea."

H.R. 4498—HALOS Act

Amendment No. 1—"Nay."

P.Q—"Yea."

Rule—"Yea."

MTR—"Nay."

Passage—"Yea."

Had I been present for these votes, with the exception of H.R. 4498 Amendment No. 1 and MTR where I would have voted "nay", I would have voted "yea" for each.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4901, SCHOLARSHIPS FOR OPPORTUNITY AND RESULTS REAUTHORIZATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 88, DISAPPROVING DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RULE RELATED TO DEFINITION OF THE TERM ''FIDUCIARY''; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 2, 2016, THROUGH MAY 9, 2016

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–533) on the resolution (H. Res. 706) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4901) to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 88) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term ''Fiduciary''; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 2, 2016, through May 9, 2016, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

BONNIE SCOTT—PEACE CORPS VICTIM

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, targeted, bullied, and terrorized, these are the words that Bonnie Scott used to describe her dismissal from the Peace Corps.

One month after reported allegations that another U.S. Peace Corps member had harassed and sexually assaulted two local women, Scott was dismissed—interesting. This is not the first time that we have heard of these actions.

In 2015, a report found that one in five Peace Corps volunteers were victims of sexual assault. Half of the victims do not report their attacks. Many state that they were blamed by the Peace Corps for their sexual assaults.

Even though Congress has passed the Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act of 2011, the Peace Corps has work to do to protect these amazing ambassadors abroad.

Mr. Speaker, Peace Corps volunteers are the best America has. These volunteers must know that America will protect them overseas. If a crime occurs against them, America will stand by them, not abandon them. And if a crime is committed, they need to know the crime is not their fault; it is the fault of the perpetrator.

And that is just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was detained with a meeting off campus at the White House. I would like to indicate my vote on the Waters amendment. For the Waters amendment, I would have voted ''aye''; for final passage of H.R. 4498, Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act, I would have voted ''no''; and for S. 1890, Defend Trade Secrets Act, I would have voted ''aye.''

EL DIA DE LOS NINOS: CELEBRATING YOUNG AMERICANS

(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 today to recognize April 30 as El Dia de Los Ninos: Celebrating Young Americans.

This holiday serves to honor and celebrate the importance of children in our Nation. El Dia de Los Ninos, which when translated means Day of the Children, helps bring Hispanic families and other communities together nationwide to recognize the importance of literacy and education for all children.

Recognizing this day highlights the growing presence of Hispanic youth in the United States and the lasting impact of Hispanic Americans on the social, political, economic, and cultural fabric of this Nation.

This important holiday is celebrated by numerous countries and more than 130 cities across the United States. In order to support the many cities, counties, States, and communities that already celebrate El Dia de Los Ninos, I will introduce a resolution with Senator BOB MENENDEZ to recognize April 30 as El Dia de Los Ninos: Celebrating Young Americans.

Senator BOB MENENDEZ, Senator JACK REED, and Representative RUBÉN HINOJOSA began the movement to recognize El Dia de Los Ninos 17 years ago. I am committed to continuing their work.

I urge my colleagues to support this important holiday and to join me in cosponsoring my resolution to recognize April 30 as El Dia de Los Ninos: Celebrating Young Americans.

UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TROTT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on tonight's Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I want to very quickly thank all of the Members who have volunteered their time to speak tonight. I know they are running on a tight schedule, as we all are.

With that in mind, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), a tireless advocate for conservative values, whose bold leadership, tenacity, and kindness make her one of this body's greatest Members. I would like to thank her for introducing H.R. 4730, the Unauthorized Spending Accountability Act, that is a vitally important piece of legislation that will go a long way in helping to eliminate Federal programs that have not been authorized by Congress, yet somehow still come in to receive appropriations. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation, and encourage all Members of the House to support it.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing us together this evening. This is a very important discussion. It really goes to what is foundational about America in Article I and the authority that rests in Congress, as outlined in Article I.

I am looking forward to this Special Order and hope that we will continue this discussion in the weeks ahead. But a big thank you to the gentleman from Florida for his leadership and bringing us all together.

In the fall of 2014—so this was right after the Ice Bucket Challenge—Gail Gleason, who is a mom in my district in eastern Washington, had a meeting with me. She was almost in tears because CMS, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, was proposing new rules and regulations that would take away the important communication device for those who have lost their ability to speak, largely impacting a lot of ALS patients. Her son, Dave Gleason, is a football player, a football star. She came to me in desperation because CMS rules were going to take away his communication device.

Do you know what? This is just one of many examples where bureaucrats, arrogant and unaccountable so often and disconnected from their mission, are making rules and regulations outside of the Congress, outside of the vote and of the approval of the elected representatives of the people.

I think about the VA, the Veterans Administration. This is an agency that is dedicated to our veterans. So often our veterans feel like they get lost. Instead of having the red-carpet treatment, they feel like they are given the runaround. They have to wait weeks and weeks, even, just to schedule a simple doctor's appointment.

Recently, the FDA came out with new rules, 400-page menu labeling rules, that for a pizza restaurant would require them to somehow disclose on a menu board the 34 million combinations of pizza. Land management, environmental regulations, threatening to regulate every mud puddle in America from Washington, D.C., and the list goes on and on.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned three branches of government—very important. There was the judicial branch, the legislative branch, and the executive branch. Each one has very important roles. No one person was to be making all of the decisions.

□ 1745

Part of the reason that people in this country are so frustrated today is due to 1600 Pennsylvania. The President has been delegitimizing us as an institution and in our role as Representatives on behalf of the people. Too often, Members of Congress feel like we are bystanders in the process as more and more rules and regulations are generated outside of our input and certainly outside of our approval.

It is interesting to note that the Capitol—the Congress—is really the center of Washington, D.C. Our Founding Fathers, I think, envisioned that this would be the center and that all other roads would lead from the Capitol. The White House is actually on a side street down on Pennsylvania.

How did we go so far from being what our Founders envisioned—a body that is closest to the people, most accountable to the people? How do we restore people's trust in this institution, which is the branch of government that is directly elected by them?

At the start is Article I of the Constitution—getting our government off of autopilot and restoring the decision-making that belongs in the House and in the Senate with the elected Representatives of the people.

There are many ideas out there as to how to restore the balance of powers, but I want to focus on one in particular—a way that we can be positive disruptors, can challenge the status quo, take back the power of the purse, and get the Federal Government off of autopilot. That is by tackling what we refer to as ''unauthorized spending.''

There are hundreds of programs and departments that have stayed on the books despite the fact that their deadlines have come and gone. I like to refer to them as ''zombie'' government programs, potentially living beyond their intended lifespans because they have not been authorized in years and sometimes in decades. For example, the VA hasn't been authorized since 1996; the BLM hasn't been authorized since 1998, as well as other agencies, such as the Federal Election Commission. There is a long list. It is estimated that over $300 billion in spending is in these unauthorized programs.

If we, the elected Representatives, committed to doing our jobs—reviewing, rethinking, possibly eliminating these programs if they have exceeded their lives—the people would be well served.

I recently introduced the USA Act, the Unauthorized Spending Accountability Act, to require these expired ''zombie'' programs to be renewed, to hold the bureaucrats accountable who have become disconnected from their missions. Programs and agencies should not receive taxpayer funding unless the people's Representatives—their voices in government—have authorized them to do so.

The demands on families, on businesses, and on institutions have changed. In some ways, the only place that hasn't changed is Congress. We need to rethink government from the top-down and restore the power of the purse. Article I is just as relevant today as it was at the founding of our country. Our Founders recognized that every individual is made in the image of God. We celebrate the potential of every individual, and our laws must reflect the will of the people. This is the genius of America.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her great words in preserving our Constitution and for the work that she is doing to bring Article I powers back to the House.

We get blamed a lot for the dysfunction in this country about what this body is not doing, and the gentlewoman is so right in bringing this power here; so I thank her for her leadership on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to a stalwart from the great State of Utah, Mrs. MIA LOVE, who is leading a charge and is making quite a name for herself.

Mrs. LOVE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am so excited to talk about Article I. Right now I am working on a project called the Article I Project in order to restore Article I back to the United States Congress.

Today I rise on behalf of all of the Utahans in my home State who have expressed frustration with our regulatory state. For decades, Congress has essentially delegated many responsibilities to executive agencies. As a result, unelected and unaccountable agencies have impacted American lives more than the decisions have of their elected officials. In this Congress, for example, 146 bills have been signed into law after going through the House and the Senate. Meanwhile 3,378 rules and regulations were finalized last year alone, joining thousands of others that ultimately cost the American economy $4 trillion a year.

Our Constitution is designed to preserve individual liberty, but this government instead seeks to increase bureaucratic influence. The American people deserve better. They deserve Representatives of their choosing who are empowered to make decisions. They also deserve to know that if those Representatives fail, they can hold them accountable and bring about change. At the end of the day, that is what restoring constitutional powers is about—giving the American people a voice. It is for that cause, especially, I am proud to fight.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the gentlewoman from Utah, and I appreciate the work she is doing.

Keep it up. We only have a Nation to save.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Constitution is the supreme law of the United States of America. Ours is the shortest Constitution in existence and is the longest-serving—227 years since its ratification in 1789. Our Founders can have many things said of them, but one thing we can all agree on is, through divine guidance, they got this as near to perfection as a document can be.

Our Constitution has created the freest, the largest middle class, the most successful country on the planet. For the first time in recorded history, it has allowed people to become self-determining, it has allowed for personal freedoms never before seen in human history. It grants us unalienable rights, those being life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It allows for personal property rights.

These are the things that allow a Republic, as ours, to flourish and for ideas to be created and expanded upon because they allow for the possibility of that unlimited potential inside each and every human on the planet. It is our Constitution that allows for the way of life we have for which others will risk everything, including life, so as to have a chance at freedom.

So it is a document worth protecting, preserving. It is a document that should be revered by all so we can pass it on to our future generations, as well as the prosperity and the good fortune that was inherited by us, this generation. The price that has been paid came from the blood, sweat, and tears of our Founders, from the people who came before us, and from every military person, including their spouses and families; and each and every Member of Congress takes an oath and a pledge to uphold our Constitution.

Article I, section 1 reads: ''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 lists clearly that Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes, to provide for the common defense, to regulate commerce, to declare war, to establish a uniform rule of naturalization. It ends in section 8: ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

The President's responsibility, as delineated in Article II, section 3, reads that the President is to see that the Laws are faithfully executed. I want to repeat that. The President is to see that the Laws are faithfully executed. This is called the Take Care Clause.

I have only spent 3 years here, but in that time we have watched this body work multiple times to rein in not just the executive branch, but the administrative agencies. We have sued the President and have won two times in the Supreme Court. We have had fights over the power of the purse. We have had Supreme Court fights whether it has been dealing with immigration laws and rules or not enforcing the laws on the books. We have fought the President just on enforcing the laws that are already on the books. We don't need any more laws. We just need to follow the ones we have.

This is not just this administration—this is previous administrations—but I fear where we are going in this next election. If we don't get our House in order, if we don't bring back Article I powers to this House, at that point, when we overstep the boundaries of our Constitution by an executive branch or by administrative agencies, it is too late to try to reel them in. Now it is urgent to do that. To put it off any longer would be buying fire insurance for your house after your house catches on fire. It is too late.

In addition, as I talked about, we have fought overstepping, out-of-control Federal agencies that are wreaking havoc on American businesses and are costing every American, according to the CBO estimates, approximately $14,500.

If I look at the administration's rules and regulations that have come out since 1999 to 2008, there have been approximately 750 rules that have come out. From 2009 to 2015, there have been over 530 rules coming out just from the Obama administration. If I look at the final rules and regulations that were issued just under George Bush, the amount for his 8 years was 2,430. When I look at President Obama's rules and regulations—and we are only 4 months into his last year and term—to date, the Obama administration has had over 28,000 rules and regulations coming out, which are strangling and suffocating American businesses, paid for by the American taxpayers.

I recently introduced H. Res. 693, which asks for a permanent select committee to investigate not just this executive branch, but all future ones so that we can have in place a vehicle to rein in an overstepping administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to a colleague and a classmate of mine from the State of Texas, Mr. RANDY WEBER, who has cosponsored H. Res. 693. I appreciate the gentleman's work on this important topic.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank my friend from Florida (Mr. YOHO) for yielding the floor and for leading this Special Order and introducing H. Res. 693.

Mr. Speaker, as of yesterday, the Obama Presidency was 90 percent over. So let's do a quick recap of just what has happened over these past 7½ years.

First, the President violated the Constitution by unilaterally changing sections of the Affordable Care Act at least 23 times without having congressional approval. That is Public Law 111–148. Even though he said, probably, on some 20 occasions that he didn't have constitutional authority to do things, he still did them.

Two, the President and the Department of Justice were in direct violation of their constitutional responsibility to the Defense of Marriage Act, which is Public Law 104–199.

The President and his department of injustice continue to choose not to enforce Federal drug laws, which are Public Law 91–513, the Controlled Substances Act, and Public Law 100–690, the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986.

The President violated the Constitution by making Presidential appointments to the National Labor Relations Board and to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau while Congress was not in session, so declared by him.

I have read the Constitution, Mr. Speaker. Only the Senate majority leader can decide when the Senate is in session, not the President. I might add that the President was slapped down by the Supreme Court 9-zip.

Further, the President and the department of injustice abused executive privilege in the Operation Fast and Furious scandal by refusing to comply with a subpoena that was issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the United States House of Representatives, thereby violating section 192 of title II, United States Code.

The President violated the law, which is Public Law 89–236, by unilaterally changing our Nation's immigration laws with regard to deferred action, giving illegal aliens access to government programs and tax credits that are funded by our constituents, which is in contravention of our Constitution.

The President and the Department of Health and Human Services failed to enforce Federal law, which is Public Law 111–5, by illegally waiving the work requirement for welfare recipients.

Under this President, the IRS violated the First Amendment to the United States Constitution by targeting nonprofit organizations because of their religious or political beliefs.

The President and the Department of Defense knowingly violated the National Defense Authorization Act, the NDAA of 2014, which is Public Law 113–66, by not providing a 30-day notice to Congress prior to transporting five Guantanamo detainees to Qatar in a prisoner swap.

□ 1800

Some would say in military terms that the terrorists got five nuclear weapons and we got one conventional weapon, which turned out to be a dud.

The President and his administration continue to move forward with his plan to close the Guantanamo detention facility and move the detainees.

By the way, did you know that one out of three prisoners released rejoin their terrorist organizations and wind up at the front lines, seeking to kill yet more Americans?

Folks, it is the duty of the legislative branch to write and pass laws, the judicial branch to interpret those laws, and

the executive branch's duty to enforce those same laws.

The very success of our form of government comes from this simple balance of powers. This critically important founding principle is currently being trampled on by this President while most of our citizens may not even be aware of its damaging implications.

Our Nation's laws are not mere suggestions to be dismissed on a whim. Our laws are binding. If we in Congress allow this or any President to ignore the rule of law, then we allow the foundation of our Nation to be shattered.

I thank my colleague, Mr. YOHO, for introducing this resolution of which I am a proud cosponsor.

Mr. Speaker, there you have it. You know I am right.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER). I appreciate him standing up for the rule of law because, if we are not a Nation of law, everything falls apart, civil society falls apart.

Just last week in my district there was a fight over transgender bathrooms. It is a fight people want to have.

We came up here at the beginning of last week and spoke in front of the Supreme Court. They heard the argument on the President's Executive order on November 20, 2014, to waive our immigration laws and grant 4 to 5 million people here illegally resident status.

That case was heard last week, and there was a large group of proponents wanting the Supreme Court to side with the President. Our President has said over 22 times that he cannot change that law. He has admitted to that.

I thought it was ironic that the people in my district were arguing over transgender bathrooms and the group up here—and I know a lot of them were here illegally—were arguing in the United States of America in front of the Supreme Court, the freest country in the world. The only reason that they can come up and have a voice of dissension is because we have a Constitution.

Our Constitution, when it was formed, wasn't a Republican idea and wasn't a Democratic idea. It was something that came together after 1,000 years from the Magna Carta on up that formed a Constitution that formed the Republic that we have.

When I look at the people arguing—and, you know, it is the Republicans against the Democrats or the Conservatives against the Liberals or whatever group you want to put in there—the only reason we have those arguments is because we have a document that is an American document. It is American ideology that all parties should come together to preserve. That is why this argument is so important.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman, a freshman from the State of Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I commend Representative YOHO for holding this Special Order on executive overreach.

As a lifelong healthcare professional and former businessowner, I believe the healthcare industry is flooded with examples of President Obama's administration overreaching its authority and either ignoring congressional intent or refusing to enforce laws enacted by Congress.

As recent as last Monday, April 18, the FDA issued new guidance related to the Drug Quality and Security Act and compounding pharmacists.

On November 27, 2013, President Obama signed the Drug Quality and Security Act, DQSA, into law. Within the DQSA, several important provisions were related to the oversight of compounding human medications.

In fact, DQSA created two types of compounding pharmacies, 503A pharmacies and 503B pharmacies. 503A compounding pharmacies are small, community pharmacies that only compound small quantities of medication to a very limited number of doctors and patients with very specific needs.

A perfect example of this is a servicemember who has lost a limb in war. Some servicemen and -women who have lost their limbs experience significant amounts of pain that regular medication does not adequately address. Compounded medication helps with this specialized need.

503B compounding facilities are those outsourcing facilities that manufacture compounded medications and ship them all over the country.

When Congress debated DQSA, many statements were made by both House and Senate congressional Members stating that there was no intent for this bill to restrict State pharmacy licensing boards and their local control of small, community pharmacies.

In fact, the FDA was directed by Congress that, in regards to inspection standards, 503B facilities would be the only ones subjected to good manufacturing inspection standards. You would think that that would make sense, that only manufacturing facilities would be subjected to good manufacturing practice standards.

In addition, congressional intent was clear that 503A community pharmacies could continue to provide office-use compounded medication as they had always done. Did FDA adhere to the obvious congressional intent of DQSA related to compounding? No.

FDA's recent guidance states that all medication that is compounded by small, community pharmacists needs to have a specific patient prescription.

Your local dermatologist, who keeps a local anesthetic in the office to remove skin to test for cancer, is going to have to write a prescription, have the patient go to the pharmacist, get their prescription filled, and then schedule another appointment before checking to see if they have skin cancer.

This goes against all congressional intent, to allow State pharmacy boards to continue local control of their small pharmacies. Now, all State pharmacy boards that allow office use have had their powers taken away from them.

The FDA guidance also pointed out that, except under certain circumstances, good manufacturing inspection standards will always be used to inspect all compounding pharmacies.

So pharmacists who provide specialized compounded medication to one patient with a specific need will be subjected to large corporation inspection standards that will cost significant financial investments.

In essence, the FDA has ignored congressional intent related to the DQSA and has ultimately eliminated an entire sector of the healthcare industry that was providing specialized care to patients with special needs.

In fact, the HHS informed my office that, if we continue to pursue this matter and try to rein in the FDA's overreach, we, Congress, would be responsible for the next 100 deaths from compounded medication. This example is just one of many that I have experienced with this administration.

Recently, HHS instituted a rule that would require pharmacy benefit managers to update their maximum allowable cost list every 7 days. These MAC lists control what pharmacists are reimbursed. If they are not updated regularly, pharmacists lose business because they are not reimbursed by Medicare at the present market price.

A recent call with the inspector general of HHS informed my office that pharmacy benefit managers are not complying with this new rule because HHS has not designated anyone to ensure that pricing lists are updated every 7 days.

Mr. Speaker, let me rephrase that. HHS is not enforcing their rules on MAC price updating because no one is assigned to enforce this law. You would think that, if a rule was created, the agency would work to enforce that rule, but apparently not.

Over the last 7½ years, President Obama's administration has shown a complete disregard for Article I of our Constitution and the powers that our Founding Fathers wanted this institution to have.

They interpret enacted legislation against the intent of Congress, they refuse to enforce laws that were meant to bring transparency to the American people, and they choose when congressional direction is applicable law and when it is not.

This body should take a long, hard look at the actions of these agencies. They are not following the law and intent that was created by this body, and action should be taken to remove these bureaucrats so the American people can have the government they deserve.

Again I want to thank the gentleman, Representative YOHO, for bringing this to light. This is a very serious subject that needs to be addressed.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his comments, for his work, and for bringing this to light because, again, these issues that we are discussing are not Republican or Democrat.

This is about the rule of law and maintaining the uniqueness of this institution, and that is something all Americans benefit from. If we lose it, all Americans are going to be hurt by that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), a friend and colleague.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. YOHO for organizing this Special Order hour.

You know, this is one of the reasons I ran for Congress. The abuse of power and executive overreach coming from the White House right now is completely unacceptable.

Like many of my colleagues here tonight, I am a firm believer in the Constitution. I believe it is the duty of the President to faithfully execute the law, not to willfully ignore it for political gain.

A President cannot implement legislation through Executive orders or agency rulemaking. Yet, we have witnessed this administration launch attacks against the Second Amendment, impose burdensome regulations through the EPA and other agencies, and enact many policies without the support of Congress or the American people.

I have spoken to a wide array of my constituents throughout the northern half of Michigan in the time I have been here in Congress. They are constantly telling me about some new regulation that some Federal agency is coming up with that doesn't seem to do anything as far as promoting welfare or improving the environment, but it is simply making it more difficult for businesses to remain open. It is really affecting their ability to hire people.

In my district, one of the big complaints we have had is the EPA attempting to limit the ability to have a wood stove. Well, it gets pretty cold in northern Michigan in the winter, and people save money by cutting their own wood and burning it in their homes. Then the EPA comes out saying that we can't have wood stoves that don't meet this criterion, and it doesn't make any sense for people in my district.

Furthermore, the EPA's waters of the U.S. proposal to regulate ditches to manmade ponds doesn't do one thing to truly protect our water resources. Instead, it overloads small farmers, loggers, and other businesses with needless red tape and compliance costs.

There is a reason that our Founding Fathers created separate, but equal, branches of government. The executive branch and agencies like the EPA are charged with carrying out the intent of Congress. We have made incredible strides in cleaning up our Nation's air and water.

However, what happens when these giant bureaucracies start to feel themselves becoming relevant? Unelected bureaucrats began writing onerous legislation to justify their own existence, and they do this with absolutely no regard for the practical effect that these regulations have on local families and businesses.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

I got a notice from the EPA when I first got up here. It was January 2014, and it was a pamphlet with their new regulations.

In that, what they were talking about is that their new rules and regulations would have minimal effect on air quality and human health, but they are going ahead anyway.

In the example you brought up about the wood-burning fireplaces, we have done a tremendous job of cleaning up the air quality in this country, as other countries need to do, but we shouldn't go after things that aren't going to really have a difference.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Florida.

In my district, although it has been several years, the EPA shut down the construction of a brand-new coal plant. Okay? This coal plant would have been the purest coal-fired power plant in the country.

It ran with new technology, and there is no reason for it being shut down. This plant would not even produce any CO_2. That CO_2 was being captured by the coal plant and used by industry to create other products.

So this administration has taken on a proposal and used the EPA not to make our environment better, but to have a war on coal. I mean, the EPA and the President doesn't talk about making our atmosphere and our environment cleaner. It talks about a war on coal.

□ 1815

That is just the wrong attitude to have, and it really needs to be directed by Congress. It is unbelievable what we have gone through. It can cause economic damage to this country. Right now we are competing with the Chinese who don't have any significant pollution controls on their power plants, and we have invested billions as Americans, each one of us, by paying for more expensive power to really clean up our atmosphere.

How are the Chinese doing that?

Now that we have basically cleaned up our atmosphere, they want to impose even higher and higher standards that actually are causing our business to go down and steel production is going over there where they are polluting even worse.

Mr. YOHO. Reclaiming my time, I think you and I were in a meeting the other day in one of the committees. We had a fellow, he was an attorney who worked under the Reagan White House, and he worked with the EPA. He was saying the EPA went from regulations to clean stuff up. Now it is regulations that you can't. You can't have coal-fired power plants, you can't do this, and it was an agency of can't. I think you were in that meeting. It shows, again, the overstepping of agencies, and it shows how administrations or executive branches rewrite laws or they legislate from the executive branch through the administrative agencies, and we have seen an increase in this.

Again, it is not just this administration, but I think President Obama, this administration has done us a favor by bringing this to light with the 24,000 regulations that are coming out that are crippling the American economy and businesses. If it is doing that, it is crushing the middle class and all Americans.

Mr. BENISHEK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOHO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, the things we are talking about here today really are examples of the Federal Government getting involved in things that they don't have the right to do. I think a lot of it comes from these bureaucrats that are just writing regulations that really you can't comply with, and that is basically the reason that these coal-fired power plants are going out of existence.

Most of these problems have been eliminated by the work that we have done on improving our environment, and I applaud that America has made the investment before any other country in making that happen, but to regulate us to the point that businesses are going overseas and polluting the planet worse because of our policies, because if we did the stuff here, we would do it cleaner.

The University of Michigan has had an environmental research station in northern Michigan in my district for the last 60, 70 years. The scientists at the University of Michigan tell me that most of the mercury that falls from the sky in Michigan comes from China and India, that we have essentially eliminated mercury as a problem in the environment from our industry here. But because we are not dealing with that problem of the Indians and the Chinese doing that, we are ignoring that and actually giving them the ability—by not having to comply with a lot of these rules, the ability to pollute the planet worse than we would if we were doing those things here.

Mr. YOHO. May I add to that?

Mr. BENISHEK. Sure.

Mr. YOHO. We went to a coal-fired power plant in our district, and they were saying in the old days a typical coal-fired power plant would put out approximately 50 pounds of mercury a year. Today it is less than 2 pounds. That is a significant difference from 50 to 2. That is a 48-pound reduction in mercury going into the atmosphere.

What is the significance and the benefit going from 2 pounds to 0, and at what cost do you go forward?

Being a veterinarian for 30 years, I have never treated an animal with mercury toxicity. I think you need to have common sense in regulations, and, of course, the worst place to go for that is government.

I will let you continue.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. YOHO for putting on this Special Order hour. I am very happy to be able to participate in it. I think that we really need to be sure the American people are aware of what is going on and that they make their decisions when they go to the polls based on this information. So thank you very much.

Mr. YOHO. I appreciate the gentleman's participation and his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Republican or Democratic argument. That should not even weigh into this. It is not conservatives versus liberals. These are American ideologies that we all have to come together to preserve, and I can't think of one person more suited to talk about this than somebody I have a lot of admiration for who sits on the House Committee on Agriculture with me. He is from the State my wife is from, the State of Iowa.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for pulling this Special Order together and for his generous introduction, and especially for Mr. YOHO's leadership on the restoration of article I authority and addressing the executive overreach that has become part and parcel of the Obama administration. It didn't begin there, but it needs to end with the next President of the United States and be slowed down in the last months of the Obama administration.

Mr. Speaker, I was just exercising a thought here as I was reviewing some of the executive overreach that we have seen from this President, and it occurred to me to take a look at the Declaration of Independence and review some of what I will call the lamentations of our Founding Fathers. It is to this effect, Mr. Speaker. When we get to the laments, these are the things, the wrongs that have been committed by the King of England.

It says in the Declaration: ''The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations''—that sounds like the history of our current President of the United States—''all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.''

This is from our Declaration, Mr. Speaker. I will just quickly hit some of these.

''He has refused his Assent to Laws . . .''

''He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws . . .''

''He has refused to pass other Laws for the Accommodation . . . of people . . .''

''He has called together Legislative Bodies at Places unusual . . .''

''He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly . . .''

''He has refused for a long Time, after such Dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby''—summarizing that, hindering legislative activity elsewhere.

''He has endeavored to prevent the Population of these States; for that Purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their Migrations hither . . .''

''He has obstructed the Administration of Justice . . .''

''He has made Judges dependent on his Will . . .''

''He has erected a Multitude of new Offices''—that would be his czars.

''He has kept among us, in Times of Peace, Standing Armies . . .''

Well, not quite, but rumors of them do exist.

We could go on and on and on, the grief that King George dished out on our original colonists here at the time of the Revolution, at the time of this Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, but I look at the present times, and it rings to be pretty close—along the way there are echoes of 1776—in the overreach of the President of the United States.

I mentioned them. This is a list from some testimony before the Executive Overreach Task Force, which I have the privilege to chair, and among this list are some of these:

He has appointed policy czars to high-level positions to avoid constitutionally required confirmation hearings—that could be lifted almost right out of the Declaration of Independence.

By modifying, delaying, and ignoring various provisions of ObamaCare, in violation of the law itself—that is a long list of things on ObamaCare that the President has altered outside of the law.

By attacking private citizens for engaging in constitutionally protected speech—utilizing the IRS to diminish that as well.

By issuing draconian regulations regarding sexual assault on campus.

By ignoring 100 years of legal rulings and the plain text of the Constitution and trying to get a vote in Congress for the D.C. Delegate—I had forgotten that one, actually.

By trying to enact massive immigration reform via an executive order, demanding that the Department of Homeland Security both refuse to enforce existing immigration law and provide work permits to millions of people residing in the U.S. illegally.

Now, these all ring like the laments, the charges that were laid against King George in 1776. It is the same tone. It is a similar message. It is going outside the law and outside the Constitution.

By imposing Common Core standards on the States via administrative fiat.

By ignoring bankruptcy law and arranging Chrysler's bankruptcy to benefit labor unions at the expense of bondholders.

And I could continue.

Well, here is one that is of significant interest to my State and I think to Florida and many other States, and that is his imposition of a regulation called the Waters of the United States. That dropped on us on May 27, 2015.

The Waters of the United States said we are going to regulate all the navigable waters of the United States. Oh, and this ambiguous term that is called—let's see. It used to be ''and waters hydrologically connected to them.'' That got litigated into being too ambiguous even for the courts to tolerate. They are the masters of ambiguity. But instead they put the language in that said ''these waters of the United States shall be the navigable waters of the United States and waters that have a significant nexus to the waters of the United States.''

Now, a significant nexus is going to be determined by the administration, another term of ambiguity.

I see some eagerness over here on the part of the gentleman from Florida. Does he have something to add?

Mr. YOHO. The interpretation we got: ''and seasonably wet areas.'' I come from Florida. It is seasonably wet all year long. I mean, we get 57 to 60 inches of rain a year, so everything is seasonably wet in our great State, and they fall into that. The little puddle in my yard, when it rains, it might stand 3 or 4 inches. We are on a sandy soil. When it stops raining, it goes away in 5 minutes, but that could be interpreted as navigable waters, and I am probably 10 miles from a body of water. It is just amazing.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, to the gentleman from Florida, we may have a legitimate competition going on here. The Waters of the United States regulation would put 96.7 percent of my State under the EPA's regulatory jurisdiction. Florida would be a competitor to that number, I would think.

Mr. YOHO. Yes, it would be all of Florida.

Mr. KING of Iowa. All of Florida. I have said that once you regulate waters hydrologically connected to or once you get to define significant nexus, that goes all the way up to the kitchen sink. We know that soil itself, whether it is under water, it can be saturated with water, and just old black Iowa dirt can be 25 percent water, so they have got it all, this overreach of the Federal Government.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned that there would be a competition between the branches of government to sustain their constitutional authority in each branch. They wanted to draw as bright a line as possible between the three branches of government, with the courts being the weakest of the three. They expected that we would jealously guard the constitutional authority. Congress writes all the laws. The President is supposed to enforce all the laws. That should be pretty clear. But

the President has reached across that over and over and over again, as evidenced by this list of laments that I offer, Mr. Speaker.

Does the gentleman from Florida have something to add?

Mr. YOHO. As I traveled as a veterinarian, and I was talking to somebody, we got in a discussion about the Constitution, and they wanted to know why I was so hung up on it. I explained to them that the very people that are fighting to preserve our founding principles that our rights come from a Creator, not from government, that government is instituted by men and women to preserve those God-given rights, and that our core values of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the unalienable rights of those things, that all men are created equal, and they are protected by the Constitution.

I said it is that very document that people are fighting to preserve that give people on the left a voice of dissension or people on the right a voice of dissension. I said: If we lose those very things that made America great, if we lose those, people will lose their voice of dissension. If you don't believe that, go to a country like Cuba, go to China, go to Iran and proselytize. It is not possible.

The amazing thing is that person called me about 30 minutes later and said: You know, we got thinking about that, and that really is what this is about. It is not Republican or Democrat. It is not conservative or liberal. Those are American ideologies that made this country great.

I would hope our friends on the other side of the aisle would come and say: You guys are right, we want to preserve the constitutional principles.

Does the gentleman from Iowa have anything else to add?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Florida for those timeless thoughts. Something that our Founding Fathers discovered was a concept that was relatively new to society at the time, and that is the concept of God-given liberty and God-given rights, natural rights, natural rights that did emerge with Locke, for example, in the United Kingdom, but they hadn't been implanted into culture and civilization until they were implanted in America.

Here we are in this country, everyone that serves in this Chamber takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, as do all the Senators on the other end of this Capitol Building, as does everyone who puts on a uniform to defend our country, and many of them who serve within our executive branch as well. The President is a bit of an exception because he is required to deliver an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and he is required to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

□ 1830

And what he has done, instead, is turn himself into an independent legislative body. He has said 22 times: I don't have the constitutional authority—and I am going to summarize here—to grant amnesty to millions of people in America. That is up to the legislature.

He taught the Constitution at the University of Chicago for 10 years as an adjunct professor teaching Con law. And that was the message, I am sure, that he taught in those classrooms; and it was a message he taught in a classroom out here at one of the high schools in D.C. shortly before he decided to reverse his position and impose this edict of amnesty on the United States, which went down through a long path of litigation for more than 2 years and a week ago last Monday was heard before the United States Supreme Court, at least in the DAPA case—the deferred action for parents of anchor babies is actually what that acronym stands for, in my view.

So I take this oath that I have to support and defend the Constitution seriously. I have the privilege of serving on the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee and of chairing this task force. I congratulate the gentleman from Florida for stepping up to the lead on this issue.

Mr. YOHO. If I may add to one of your comments, because you brought up the philosophers Locke and Howe, philosophers of old, when we look at the American period of time—227 years, roughly, the U.S. Constitution and a constitutional Republic as a country have been in existence, the longest time a republic has been in existence—when you go back to the beginning of human recorded history to today and you look at the American period where we are at today, it is but a dot on that timeline.

Yet that dot represents the largest middle class that has ever been allowed to happen. It is the first time there have been property rights that you can have and the right to pursue life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is only possible because we had a Constitution that preserved those rights. So I would think we could all come together and protect those rights for the next generation, for the posterity of this Nation.

I would like to see if you had any thoughts on that, and then I will close.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I am looking at our job and our destiny here, and I think that our constitutional obligation is to restore the pillars of American exceptionalism. You can identify many of them in the Constitution itself. In the Bill of Rights it is pretty well summarized: freedom of speech, religion, the press, the freedom to peaceably assemble and petition the government for redress of grievances.

The Second Amendment rights, which are the property rights that the gentleman mentioned, I would point out that, in the Kelo decision, which happened about 10 years, the Supreme Court ruled that they could amend the Constitution itself. Well, they didn't say they did, but that was the effect of their decision. ''Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation'' is part of the Fifth Amendment. The Supreme Court ruled that private property could be taken for private use as long as there was just compensation. So they struck the three words ''for public use'' as a conditional clause out of the Fifth Amendment. We had a Supreme Court that amended the Constitution, effectively.

We have a Supreme Court last June that amended ObamaCare by writing words into it; ''or Federal Government'' would be the three words inserted there. And then, the next day, they decided they would create a new command in the Constitution, a command that all States shall conduct same-sex weddings and honor them from other States, as if somehow that were the will of the people or something done under the Constitution.

This is an appalling reach on the part of the Supreme Court. It is even more appalling on the part of the President of the United States, and it is our task to identify what needs to be done and start down that mission of restoring the constitutional authority and this balance between the branches of government.

I am happy to have a chance to say a few words.

Mr. YOHO. Today, in one of our committees, we were hearing about the Attorney General and how she stated that those who speak out against the administration's climate change policy possibly being a crime.

Think about that. They are examining if you speak out against something that is unfavorable to an administration. It is going against freedom of speech, our First Amendment, the very things that we fought for and that everybody who has come before us has fought for. I think this would be something that would scare everybody, if we are that close to losing the very document.

I hold in my hand—and you have seen me do this before—the Declaration of Independence, in total, and the U.S. Constitution, in total. I think we can all agree this is not an epic in volume. I can read this in a day. This is not an epic in volume, but yet it is an epic in ideology of what free men and women can do in a country that honors and reveres this document. It just so important that we come together.

As I stated earlier, I think Mr. Obama has done us a favor in showing us how weak we have become as an institution and how weak our rule of law is. And for us to succeed and continue as a constitutional Republic, we must—we have to—bring those Article I powers back to this body.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Florida for that statement. I absolutely believe that, deeply.

I think one of the important things is that we educate the young people on

what the Constitution says and what it means. We have a President of the United States who was a professional Constitution teacher, who we know knows the history and the text of the Constitution and takes his oath to preserve, protect, and defend it and take care that the laws be faithfully executed and explains it in stop after stop succinctly, in ways that I agree with this President, and then he turns around and, by his own definition—and by his definition is all I am referring to here, Mr. Speaker—breaks his own oath. So we are here now trying to restore the knowledge base of America.

Members of Congress arrive here as freshmen, and they take an oath to the Constitution. They don't know what it means anymore. The Supreme Court thinks they can amend the Constitution; they can manufacture new commands in the Constitution; they can violate Article I authority. And the President can do so at will.

But I would point out that, 13 times, the President of the United States' position has been unanimously reversed by the United States Supreme Court—President Obama, 13 times, unanimously reversed. Another 11 times, he has lost on a 5–4 decision.

So he has stretched this Constitution beyond that. Even his own appointees in the Supreme Court can't stomach it; that is how bad this is. But I want to see the right appointments to the Supreme Court so the whole Constitution is revered, respected, and we see cases go before the Court and, once again, we can predict the Court will rule on the Constitution rather than their political whims.

Mr. YOHO. I appreciate you bringing that up, because you bring up how many times it has been overstepped as of recent, but other administrations have done it in the past. But it sets a precedent from this point forward. If we don't rein it in now, when do you rein it in? Do you wait for the next candidate to come in? And we have had talks about that. If we don't do it now, it be would like buying fire insurance after your house catches on fire. It doesn't work.

So it is so important that we come together as a body. Again, the Constitution is not a product of Republicans or Democrats or conservatives or liberals. The Constitution is not a function of government. Government is a function of the Constitution.

When government steps over the boundaries of the Constitution, it is us—we, the people—the Representatives that were sent up here to hold and rein in the branches that are out of balance. This is all about bringing the three branches of government into balance.

Let me just wind up with this. Mr. Speaker, once again, I would like to thank all the Members who have joined me this evening. Restoring Article I powers is so vital to the survival of our constitutional Republic.

At this very moment, there are individuals seeking the highest office in the land who have stated, if Congress disagrees with them, they have no qualms about taking action on their own, circumventing Congress and disregarding the founding principles enshrined in our Constitution. That should give concern to everybody.

The time has arrived for us to take action to restore this institution to the one the Founders envisioned. Granted, you can say what you want about our Founding Fathers, but they got this right—again, as you and have I have talked about, with divine intervention—and they put in place a way to amend it to make it better, not to get rid of it. It is time for us to stand up for this body, the people's House.

I will leave you with this reminder. All it takes for evil or tyranny to prevail or for our constitutional Republic to fail is for those good men and women to do nothing.

I, Mr. Speaker, and the people that have joined us tonight, our colleagues that participated, will not sit idly by when the very document that has allowed so many people to be free, to achieve beyond their beliefs to a level never before ever achieved in human history, is being marginalized by inaction.

I know my good friend from Iowa feels the same. And if you have any last remarks, you have got about 1 minute, if you want to wrap it up.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank, again, the gentleman from Florida. I appreciate you coming to the floor with this leadership that is here. If no one stepped forward in leadership and we just went along as if somehow the Constitution were going to be restored, it would never be restored. And I would remind people, Mr. Speaker, that it is one thing to give lip service to the Constitution; it is another to exercise it.

Freedom of speech is being exercised here right now. Freedom of assembly is being exercised across this country right now. The right to keep and bear arms, if it were never exercised, the liberals would define it away from us.

Any one of these rights that we have that come from God, defined by our Founding Fathers, is also something we have got to exercise and utilize; if not, over time, the enemies of freedom will find a way to say: Well, it is just an artifact of history.

If we stop exercising our right to keep and bear arms, in a matter of a generation, someone will say it is just an artifact of history. We are going to confiscate your guns. And after a while, they will zip your lip if you don't watch it. We can't let that happen.

So I appreciate this Special Order here tonight with the gentleman from Florida's leadership, and I appreciate my Constitution and the rights that come, especially from God.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from Iowa, and I want to thank everybody that participated.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

CHILD NUTRITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revised and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, more than 60 years ago, Congress responded to the Defense Department's concern that so many children were malnourished, they would be unfit for military service, that they passed the National School Lunch Act as a measure of national security to safeguard the health and well-being of our Nation's children.

Through the enactment of the first Federal child nutrition program, Congress recognized that feeding hungry children is not just a moral imperative, it is vital to the health and security of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I serve as the ranking member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. Our committee is tasked with making sure that all children have an equal shot at success, so it is only fitting that child nutrition programs fall within our committee's jurisdiction.

Just as there is a Federal role in ensuring that all children have access to quality education, regardless of where they live, what they look like, or their family's income, there is also a Federal role in ensuring that every child has access to healthy and nutritious food.

Research has repeatedly shown us that a lack of adequate consumption of specific foods, especially fruits and vegetables, is associated with lower grades among students; and child obesity affects all aspects of a child's life, from their physical well-being to their academic success and self-confidence.

So we have a choice to make. We can put money into these programs now and support healthy eating in schools, or we can cut corners and spend more money down the road on chronic diseases and other social services, putting the well-being of our children and our Nation's future at risk.

Either way, we will spend the money. In fact, researchers estimate that $19,000 was the incremental lifetime medical costs of an obese child relative to a normal weight child who maintains that normal weight throughout adulthood. So it is important to keep

this tradeoff in mind as we talk about reauthorization of child nutrition programs.

The hallmark of a good reauthorization is that it makes progress; it moves us forward; it builds on what works and improves on what needs to be improved. So with this in mind, Democrats are ready to make improvements to the child nutrition programs and to protect the progress that has been made.

For example, we have made progress in creating a healthier school environment for students. The nutrition standards enacted after the 2010 bipartisan reauthorization are working. Around 99 percent of all schools are meeting the standards. Kids are eating better foods. Studies show that kids are eating up to 16 percent more vegetables and 23 percent more fruit at lunch.

□ 1845

Now, unfortunately, many are now advocating that we roll back the standards, and the Republican draft bill released last week makes numerous steps backwards by making less nutritious foods available in schools.

Another example of progress is the community eligibility provision. Enacted in the 2010 reauthorization, the community eligibility provision, or CEP, allows schools to provide free nutritious meals to all students without using the paper applications when a large portion of the students are deemed eligible because they are already receiving certain social benefits.

Schools love this, teachers love this, families love it, and kids love it. So why go backwards?

Again, unfortunately, the Republican bill does just that by making it harder for schools to use CEP, kicking thousands of schools out of CEP and back into the individualized paper application process.

So we are talking about a hugely popular option for schools that improves the health of children, makes everyone's job easier. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. And if it ain't broke, you shouldn't make a special effort to try to break it.

Our work on reauthorization of our school nutrition programs represents a great opportunity to continue to change the way children eat, to expand their access to nutritious meals, and to end the child hunger crisis in our Nation.

So we should ask ourselves if these are goals that we are willing to compromise or whether we will continue on that path that has resulted in healthier schools and communities.

The success of these programs are too many to mention, but it is my hope that we will continue to build on our success and invest in the future of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

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

Mr. Speaker, more than 21 percent of American children live in poverty. More than 15 million children live in food-insecure households. In fact, households with children are more likely to be food insecure than those without.

In my home State of Ohio, 16.9 percent of households experience food insecurity, and Ohio's rate is higher than the national average of 14.3.

Programs that affect child nutrition, such as the National School Lunch Program, the National School Breakfast Program, and the Summer Food Service Program, are essential tools in the fight to end child hunger.

Access to healthy foods during the school day and throughout summer feeding programs is essential to helping children thrive both academically and developmentally.

The Improving Child Nutrition and Education Act would increase the burden on schools with new verification requirements and increased community eligibility thresholds, or CEP.

I represent one of the Nation's most impoverished districts, with nearly 200,000 people living in poverty. Out of 435 districts and the District of Columbia, my district ranks 420th. Only 16 other districts in the United States fare worse than mine.

If passed, the changes to CEP alone could result in children across the country losing access to free and reduced-price meals at school, and that is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

The bill fails to make critical investments in the summer meal program. Meals served through the summer feeding program may be the only ones some children have in a day.

If the sponsors of the bill truly wanted to improve child nutrition, they would invest in summer meals to ensure eligible children do not go hungry during the summer months.

As we move towards reauthorization, we must strengthen and expand child nutrition programs. Our children's health and education are not budget-saving gimmicks.

I firmly believe that any attempt to reauthorize child nutrition programs must improve access to healthy foods year-round. This bill does not even come close to meeting the minimum requirement.

We must engage in bipartisan conversations about how to best meet the needs of all children.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER), a hardworking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in support of my colleagues in urging the reauthorization of this act based on nutritional value and investment in this country's future and our young people.

Specifically, I want to take a minute to talk about the simultaneous issues of extreme hunger and obesity in this country and in my home State of California, which are nothing short of staggering.

Fourteen percent of people in California are food insecure. Twenty-three percent of California's children are food insecure. In my district, 14 percent of the total population is food insecure.

In the United States, three out of four public school teachers tell us that students regularly come to class hungry. Eighty-one percent say it happens at least once a week. Over 15 million American kids struggle with hunger.

On the other hand, American kids who eat school breakfast miss less school, get better grades, and are more likely to graduate from high school.

At the same time, there is a childhood obesity epidemic in this country. Childhood obesity has more than doubled in children and quadrupled in adolescents in the past 30 years, according to the Centers for Disease Control.

In 2012, more than one-third of children and adolescents were overweight or obese. One in three children in California are currently overweight or obese, according to the Pew Endowment Foundation.

Research shows that children living in States with strong school nutrition standards are more likely to maintain healthier weights.

The estimated annual health costs of obesity-related illness in the U.S. is a staggering $190.2 billion, or nearly 21 percent of annual medical spending in the United States.

Childhood obesity alone is responsible for $14 billion in direct medical costs. Ironically, the Federal Government spends $15 billion every year on school food.

The work that we began with the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act in 2010 is having an important and positive effect on both of these problems at once.

School meal participants are less likely to have nutrient inadequacies and are more likely to consume fruit, vegetables, and milk at breakfast and lunch.

Low-income students who eat both school breakfast and lunch have significantly better overall diet quality than low-income students who do not eat school meals.

The school meal nutrition standards are having a positive impact on student food selection and consumption, especially for fruits and vegetables.

Few packed lunches and snacks brought from home meet National School Lunch Program standards and Child and Adult Care Food Program standards.

Children in after-school programs consume more calories, more salty foods, and sugary foods on days that they bring their own snacks than on days they only eat the afterschool snack provided by the National School Lunch Program.

In California, I am pleased to say that we have figured it out for the kids, for their parents, for the purveyors who provide all of this healthy product, and for the students, the school administrators, and rank-and-file staff who distribute these foods.

Over 93 percent of school districts nationwide have met the improved lunch and breakfast standards, certifying them to receive Federally authorized school lunch reimbursement rate increases.

In California, we exceed the national compliance rates with 100 percent of our schools currently in compliance.

These standards are going a long way toward decreasing the health costs associated with malnutrition for both hungry and obese children. We must double down on these efforts, not turn away from them. Our children deserve at least this much from us.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this effort.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a strong child advocate.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for recognizing me. I am really pleased to join the Ranking Member, BOBBY SCOTT, a mentor of mine and a good friend, MARCIA FUDGE, and others about the reauthorization of school meals and the WIC program. They are truly champions for ending hunger among children in this country.

And I believe no conversation could occur about hunger without having the indomitable Mr. MCGOVERN with us this evening.

Mr. Speaker, the Child Nutrition Reauthorization is really a critical opportunity for us to talk about the importance of improving access to healthy meals in schools and for maintaining strong nutrition standards.

For too many kids, Mr. Speaker, the only sure meals that they can count on on any given day are provided in school.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the majority on the other side of the aisle are talking about how to make it harder for children, especially low-income children who are eligible for free and reduced-price meals, breakfast and lunch, to access these programs.

We should be using this reauthorization to address known gaps and to help children connect to these healthy meals. Nearly 10,000 more schools offer school lunch than offer school breakfast programs, and we should be trying to expand school breakfast rather than restricting them.

The Healthy, Hunger-Free Act in the nationwide implementation of the community eligibility program was so insightful. But, yet, we need to do more. Over 162,000 kids in my State qualify for free or reduced meals for lunch, and we need to reach them.

Now, what does the reauthorization that Republicans are bringing before us entail? What does it talk about? It talks about scaling back the successful and proven community eligibility provision which we just implemented nationwide last year and really haven't scaled up to what it could be.

This innovative program actually works. We have proven it. We have metrics that prove that the program increases access and participation for low-income students, and it helps to reduce administrative burdens and costs for school staff.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you have heard my colleagues here talk about obesity. Now, obesity is not just a cosmetic problem. It is a major health problem.

We also last year put new nutrition standards in to ward off obesity. Ninety-seven percent—97 percent—of the schools have successfully met these new standards, and USDA has shown great eagerness to work with those who have not.

Of course, these new requirements require more servings of fruits, vegetables, whole grains, fat-free and low-fat fluid milk in schools while cutting sodium-saturated fats and trans fats.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that, when you introduce these foods to children at a young age, they will start to prefer them and we can really transform their lives.

I want to skip over many of my comments and just add them to the RECORD because I just want to focus on one little disease that is associated with poor nutrition, and that is diabetes.

The burden to individuals and families is gargantuan. You hear of people losing their limbs because of diabetes. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the burden to the economy and to the budget by allowing diabetes to run amok.

Diabetes is a budget-busting disease. It is an epidemic that is affecting an increasing number of Americans, including more and more of our youth.

Right now—right now—in 2014, 29 million people in the United States, 9.3 percent of our population, have had diabetes. That is about 1 in 11 people. According to the CDC, by 2050, that number could be as high as 100 million, or 1 in 3 persons.

□ 1900

The time to stop this is now while we are reauthorizing the child nutrition bill. We can help our children develop healthy eating habits. I have seen kids love avocados, love grapes, and love these things that are introduced to them while they are young. Our investment in school lunch and school breakfast pales in comparison to the cost of treating diabetes.

In 2012, diabetes and its related complications accounted for $245 billion in total costs. Now, that is $176 billion in direct medical costs—think Medicaid and Medicare—and lost wages and work. The CDC estimates that the growth in these—if their predictions hold, if we don't do something, just think, this will go from 1 in 11 people having diabetes to 1 in 3. So we are looking at 2050—2050, I don't think I am going to be around in 2050—this is clearly a clarion call to feed our children properly now.

In the school year 2016, we spent $12.5 billion on the school lunch program and $4.3 billion on the school breakfast program. Compare that with the $245 billion that we have spent on diabetes for just 1 year.

With that, I will add the rest of my comments to the RECORD. I would just say, Mr. SCOTT and Mr. Speaker, that school breakfast, school lunch, and WIC, it is a doggone good deal when you think about it.

Mr. Speaker, child nutrition reauthorization is a critical time for us to talk about the importance of improving access to healthy foods in schools, and for maintaining strong nutrition standards. For too many kids, the only sure meals they can count on on a given day are the ones provided in school.

Yet, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are talking about how to make it harder for children, especially low-income children who are eligible for free and reduced price meals, to access these programs.

The draft Republican Child Nutrition Reauthorization bill is an assault on the programs that help to ensure that our children and get the nutrition they need to be active and engaged learners. A growling stomach does not advance educational achievement. They want to roll back programs that have been proven to help eligible children get access to school breakfast and school lunch programs.

It is reportedly titled the "Improving Child Nutrition and Education Act of 2016" but it really should be the "Increasing Child Hunger and Hobbling Education Act."

We should be using child nutrition reauthorization to address know gaps and help connect more children to healthy meals. Nearly 10,000 more schools offer school lunch than offer a school breakfast program. Participation in school breakfast programs, though improving since the enactment of the Healthy Hunger Free Act and the nationwide implementation of CEP, still lags drastically behind participation in the school lunch program. Only about half of students who eat school lunch nationwide eat a school breakfast. My state of Wisconsin is at the bottom when it comes to the number of schools that participate in school breakfast nationwide. Over 162,000 kids that qualify for Free or Reduced meals are eating lunch, but miss breakfast and Wisconsin loses $22 million federal breakfast reimbursement dollars annually. We need to be discussing how to help the states and schools do better.

Mr. Speaker, we just passed the Every Student Succeeds Act last year reauthorizing federal elementary and secondary education policy. Let me tell you, no child can succeed when they're hungry. Any teacher can tell you that. So can a range of experts who have conducted studies on this issue and found overwhelmingly that hunger does not promote academic achievement.

So what are Republicans talking about doing in this reauthorization:

Scaling back the successful and proven Community Eligiblity Provision (CEP) which just went into effect nationwide last year. This is an innovative program authorized in 2010 that makes it easier for high need schools and school districts to serve free meals to all students by eliminating traditional free/reduced priced applications.

With all the rhetoric about wasteful government spending and duplicative programs, what happens when we have successful and proven federal programs and policies that work like CEP, like SNAP? Republicans want to cut them and roll them back.

This program has been proven—I emphasize that word again—to increase access and participation in the school meals programs for the low-income students while helping to reduce administrative burdens and costs for school staff. School meal programs benefit from the economics of scale. The more kids who participate, the cheaper it is to serve each child. Thousands of schools have adopted CEP and are seeing benefits including the 156 schools in the Milwaukee Public School system. In its first year, MPS reported serving 22% more school breakfasts. School lunches also saw a gain. CEP means fewer kids are going hungry in Milwaukee and nationwide.

Enacting the GOP bill would means that 7,000 schools that now currently participate would be dropped. That is a gigantic step backwards for the health and nutrition of tens of thousands, even hundreds of thousands, of school children who are at key stages of development, physically and academically.

Not to mention the students in thousands of schools currently eligible to participate in CEP but would be kicked off under the Republican bill.

We have put in place new nutrition standards for school meals—97% of schools have successful met these new standards and the USDA has shown great eagerness to work with those that have not to do so. These new requirements require more servings of fruits, vegetables, whole grains, and fat-free and low-fat fluid milk in school meals while cutting sodium, saturated fat and transfats.

Now, some are trying to block the new rules and the savings to our nation both short term and long term for helping kids develop lifelong healthy eating habits.

Let me just talk about the burden to individuals and taxpayers of just one disease: diabetes—a budget busting disease. This is an epidemic affecting an increasing number of Americans, including more and more of our youth.

The number of Americans with diabetes is estimated to drastically in the next three decades. In 2014, 29 million people in the U.S. (9.3 percent) had diabetes (about 1 in 11). According to the CDC, by 2050 that number could be as high as 100 Million Americans (or 1 in 3).

The time to stop this trend is right now when we can help our children develop healthy eating habits that will stay with them for the rest of their lives and a taste for healthy and nutritious foods through the school nutrition programs.

I want to compare our investments in school lunch and breakfast programs and helping to provide nutritious meals that will support lifelong eating habits to young people with what it will cost us to treat diabetes.

Diabetes is an extremely expensive condition for our healthcare system given that it is associated with a number of complicated health effects. In 2012, diabetes and its related complications accounted for $245 billion in total costs, including $176 billion in direct medical costs (think Medicaid and Medicare) and lost work and wages. If the CDC estimates about the growth in cases holds, the cost of just this one disease will grow dramatically over the next three decades. These costs will be picked up by all of us, including through Medicare and Medicaid.

In contrast, in FY 2016, we will spend $12.5 billion on the school lunch program and $4.3 billion on the school breakfast program. Maintaining healthy and nutrition meals and standards and ensuring that all who are eligible can participate in these programs seems like a very wise investment to me.

The GOP proposal would bar schools from including the eligibility requirements for school meals on the school meal applications. Absolutely absurd. What public policy purpose is served by such a requirement other than to make sure people don't know about a benefit to which they are entitled.

I also want to emphasize the need to further strengthen WIC during this reauthorization. WIC works. That's what the research tells us. The program helps improve health and nutrition outcomes for at risk women, infants, and children. WIC breastfeeding rates are rising. We all know the benefits of breastfeeding for both mother and child.

We can make WIC better by increasing the certification period for infants and women, taking steps to ensure that children a better transition by WIC eligible children from the program to the school meals programs Under current law, children that age out of WIC may not be enrolled in school (and participating the school meals programs), risking gains to their health and well-being from having participated in WIC.

How about making WIC work better for our men and women in uniform? Yes, there are members of our military who receive WIC. In fact, I know of efforts in the last year to close a WIC clinic located on a military base in Washington State serving over 700 people including Navy families.

There is room for bipartisanship. The Senate Agriculture Committee reported a bipartisan bill—which while not perfect and I don't support every element—reflects an honest effort to reach across the aisle that is simply nonexistent in this chamber at this point.

And that is a shame. For the children who rely on the school meal programs to meet their nutritional needs. For the schools and school administrators who fight hard every day to put the students under their charge in a position to succeed. For the American taxpayer, who expect us to govern.

I know the will is there on this side of the aisle to work together on things like increasing the breakfast (and lunch for that matter) reimbursement rates. To support grant programs to help increase access to school breakfast which remains woefully undersubscribed compared to the school lunch program. We can provide grants to support innovative and proven models such as Breakfast after the bell and in the Classroom as well as school equipment grants to help offset some of the costs.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentlewoman. The gentlewoman is absolutely right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who is one of our strongest advocates for ending hunger in America.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank my colleague from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for organizing this today and for his leadership on child nutrition programs. I want to thank all my colleagues for being here. This is an important issue. There is no question about that.

We are here because we are outraged. We are outraged at Republican attempts to undermine our child nutrition programs. We are outraged at their lousy child reauthorization bill. It is a terrible, terrible, terrible bill. My friends should be ashamed of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, a nutritious school meal is just as important to a child's success in school as a textbook. Hungry children can't concentrate. They can't focus on their studies. In short, hungry children cannot learn. That is a fact. Everybody knows that. Yet we have a bill that my Republican friends have drafted that will increase hunger and that will actually take food out of the mouths of children. It is outrageous.

Together, our child nutrition programs, WIC, school breakfast and lunch, the Summer Food Service Program, and the Child and Adult Care Food Program provide nutritional support for children year round in places where they live, learn, and play.

Unfortunately, H.R. 5003, which is the Republican reauthorization bill, includes a number of harmful provisions that would roll back years of progress and hamper the ability of children to access healthy meals. As I said, to be very blunt, it makes hunger worse in this country.

Specifically, the bill would undermine the successful Community Eligibility Provision, which some of my colleagues have talked about first, included in the last reauthorization bill that has allowed high-poverty school districts to offer universal school meals to all students. In its first 2 years, CEP helped more than 8.5 million low-income students access free meals.

Instead of building on the success of this program, my Republican friends would severely restrict schools' eligibility for the community eligibility option. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that 7,022 schools currently using community eligibility would lose it under this Republican bill, and another 11,647 schools that qualify for community eligibility but who have not yet adopted it would be prevented from doing so in the future.

As we approach the summer months, it is also important to remember that child hunger gets worse in the summer. Consider this: for every six children who get a lunch in school each day, only one receives a meal in the summertime. Instead of being a carefree time for children who depend on getting healthy, reliable meals during the school year, the summer months can be a time of stress, anxiety, and hunger. But it doesn't have to be this way.

Unfortunately, this Republican bill cuts the successful summer EBT pilot program which provides a temporary boost in food assistance benefits during the summer months for families whose

children receive free school meals during the school year, and it fails to make necessary investments to expand the reach of summer food service programs so that more kids have access to healthy summer meals in their neighborhoods.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this bill rolls back, as my colleagues have mentioned, evidence-based standards that make school meals healthier. USDA estimates that more than 90 percent of schools have successfully—have successfully—implemented these standards.

My grandmother used to say to me when I was growing up that an apple a day keeps the doctor away. I wish she was still alive so I could tell her she was right. Food is medicine. When we eat good food, we eat nutritious food, we tend to have healthy lives. If you eat bad food, if you eat junk food, then you end up getting health issues like diabetes, like high blood pressure, and like obesity. I could go on and on and on.

Why in the world would anybody want to lower the nutrition standards in our school meals to give our kids junkier, less nutritious food? What sense does that make?

If my colleagues who are advocating these reversals of smart policy are doing so only because they want to save a few dollars, then let me tell you something: you are saving nothing.

If we don't get this right, if we don't insist that our kids have access to nutritious, healthier food, the medical costs associated with the health challenges that they will experience are astronomical, as my colleague from Wisconsin mentioned earlier, hundreds of billions of dollars in avoidable healthcare costs as a result of children not having access to good food.

Mr. Speaker, 15 million children face hunger in this country. Instead of undoing the success we have already achieved, Congress should be focused on ways we can strengthen these vital child nutrition programs.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, finally, it is hard for me to understand why we have to be here today, why everything is a fight when it comes to dealing with issues of hunger and when it comes to dealing with issues and making sure our kids get access to good nutrition. It is always a fight. It is always a fight to protect so many vital food and nutrition programs that help our kids. There is either a shocking ignorance about the reality of the poverty that millions of our children face in this country or there is simply indifference. Those are the only two ways I can explain what is going on in this Chamber. Whichever one it is, it is a sad excuse for what my Republican friends are trying to do.

Let's come together. This should be a bipartisan issue. There was a time when fighting hunger and when making sure that our kids had access to nutritious food was a bipartisan issue. George McGovern and Bob Dole worked together in the 1970s to strengthen our food and nutrition programs. But now in this Chamber these issues have become controversial.

It is sad because there are a lot of people in this country who are depending on us to find ways to end hunger in America. They are depending on us to make sure that their kids, when they go to school, have access to nutritious food, and that they have access to nutritious food during the summer months as well.

Why are my friends making it so difficult?

Enough. Enough of this. Stop beating up on the most vulnerable people in this country. Let's come together. Let's reject this awful draft of the Child Nutrition Reauthorization bill. Let's come together and do this right. It is the least we can do.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for all of his advocacy on ending hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), an effective member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the ranking member. I appreciate the time allotted.

Mr. Speaker, in my 24 years as a public schoolteacher, I learned a lot about helping students reach their potential. I learned about project-based learning and STEM education, and I learned about the importance of arts and music in keeping students engaged and excited. But I also learned that there is no lesson plan or study guide that can improve a student's performance if they are hungry. Good nutrition is the foundation to a good education.

With that experience in mind, I rise to express my frustration and sadness with the Republicans' proposal to reauthorize the so-called Improving Child Nutrition and Education Act. The draft bill published last week includes several provisions that would restrict students' access to nutritious food, particularly children in America's poorest neighborhoods.

The proposal undermines nutritional standards for schools despite those standards receiving overwhelming support from pediatricians and public health officials. It weakens a popular program designed to give poor students access to fresh fruits and vegetables in communities where they are scarce, and it increases the burden on poor families to prove that their children are eligible for lunch programs.

But the impact of these provisions is mild compared to what Republicans are proposing to do with CEP, or the Community Eligibility Provision. CEP streamlines National School Breakfast and Lunch Programs by automatically enrolling students who live in areas with high rates of poverty. It was passed with bipartisan support just 6 years ago and it is responsible for feeding more than 3 million students every year.

Now Republicans are seeking to change the CEP formula to kick many poor communities out of the program. Their goal is to save money by allowing fewer students to enroll in breakfast and lunch programs. Not only is this bad policy that will hurt student performance in low-income schools, it is cruel. In my district alone, this would affect more than 6,000 students. Nationwide it will severely damage a program that is critical to both fighting child poverty and closing the achievement gap in education.

There is a troubling asymmetry to conservatives' approach to spending. When it comes to tax cuts for large businesses that cost this country billions of dollars, conservatives are generous with taxpayer money. But when it comes to hungry students in America's poorest communities, that is when it is time to cut back. That is when it is time to be stingy. That is when they turn their backs on people in need.

Earlier this week, Speaker RYAN said that conservatism is just a happy way of life. This brand of conservatism is not a happy way of life for thousands of hungry children who will lose access to food at school. It is not a happy life for the parents of those children who are struggling every day to provide for them, and it is not a happy life for the generation of students who do not have the foundation to reach their potential.

Who could be happy when so many Americans are suffering?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman, Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the leader of the Democratic Whip's Task Force on Poverty, Income Inequality, and Opportunity.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding and also for his long-term and longstanding commitment to child nutrition programs and to our Nation's children.

I have to say to Mr. TAKANO that I am not happy at all, and I don't think many of us are happy at what is taking place with regard to this Improving Child Nutrition Education Act and what is happening to our children who many go to bed hungry at night. So I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership.

Let me just say to Mr. SCOTT, who is our ranking member, it is very important that we recognize the gentleman's leadership and know that he is on this committee fighting each and every day to make sure that this reauthorization bill, which would take food out of mouths of American schoolchildren, does not do that. So I thank the gentleman for his fight on the committee.

Let me say just a couple of things with regard to H.R. 5003. It would turn the clock back on years of progress and prevent children from eating healthy meals every day. This Republican child nutrition bill would roll back critical, evidence-based nutrition standards made in the 2010 reauthorization bill,

which we were very actively involved with.

Sadly, but unsurprisingly, it would also deny eligible children access to the Free or Reduced Price School Meals Program, and it would slash funding for some electronics benefits transfer.

□ 1915

I just have to say that as a young, single mother on public assistance and food stamps, I don't know what I would have done had my children not had school lunches. This was a bridge over troubled waters for me, and my children and I have to thank my government for that helping hand. But today, in 2016, this bill will roll back these programs, which means more hungry kids in our schools and in our neighborhoods.

That is why several of us are sending a letter to the Education and the Workforce Committee outlining our deep concerns with the changes to our child nutrition programs. I hope that everyone on our side of the aisle signs this important letter, and I hope that the majority will read it carefully. It lays out some of the basic problems in this bill. We want to make sure that everyone on the committee and this entire body understands the impact of what this will cause.

When we take away access to these meals, we jeopardize children's health, their educational attainment, and, really, their future. We know that children who have access to healthy meals are more likely to do well in school, have decreased behavioral problems, and come to class ready to learn. That is what we should want for all of our children.

For the children growing up in high-poverty neighborhoods and who lack equal access to healthy meals, these school meals really are a lifeline. We are not just talking about a few students. The numbers are clear. More than 15.3 million children are living in food-insecure households. Let me say that again. More than 15 million kids are at risk of going to bed hungry every night in America, the richest and most powerful country in the world.

We also know that childhood hunger is far from colorblind. Children of color are disproportionately affected by hunger every day. For example, in 2014, one in three African American children and one in four Latino children were food insecure. For children who live in rural communities, food insecurity is coupled with other barriers, like lack of access to transportation to get to summer feeding sites. More than 17 percent of rural households—that is 3.3 million households—are food insecure.

Child hunger and the lack of nutritious food is a problem that affects every child in every ZIP Code. It is endemic in our country, in rural, urban, and suburban schools. Every Member of Congress has constituents who are hungry. This should be a priority for all of us.

I have seen the impact of food insecurity in my own community in Oakland, California, where one in four children at the Oakland Unified School District do not have access to affordable, nutritious food. These families are forced to make impossible choices to feed their children, especially during the summer months when schools are closed. These families are making decisions every day between food and medicine, food and rent, or food and paying the electric bill.

Mr. Speaker, we need real solutions to these very real problems. Let me just mention my legislation, the Half in Ten Act, H.R. 258, that would develop a national strategy to cut poverty in half over the next decade. That is more than 23 million Americans lifted out of poverty and into the middle class in just the next 10 years.

This bill that we are talking about tonight goes just the opposite way. Surely, we can all recognize that ensuring healthy meals for American children is the first step in this ongoing War on Poverty. It should not be a partisan issue. Feeding hungry kids is a moral imperative.

So let's put our children first, and let's strengthen our child nutrition programs rather than cut them. Our children deserve the security of knowing where their next meal is coming from. That is just basic. It is a basic American value.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SCOTT for his leadership and thank him for yielding.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. LEE for all of her hard work on the task force.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), a Member who has been fighting for children as a member of the State legislature, a member of the Los Angeles City Council, and now is a Member of Congress.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SCOTT for working so hard and tirelessly to fight for those young little voices and those families that need food in their children's stomachs every single day. It is a tireless battle; and once again, today, we are trying to make people aware of the disingenuous, misguided efforts that are in this bill. I rise today to express concern over harmful provisions included in the so-called Improving Child Nutrition and Education Act of 2016.

In 2014, more than 17 million American households were at risk of going without having food, including 3.7 million households with American children. We should make every effort possible to help American children access the proper nutrition that is vital to their growth, development, and success in school and beyond.

The provisions outlined in this bill are doing just the opposite by tampering with programs that have been working well, such as the Community Eligibility Provision, the process that ensures that meals can be served to American children in schools. The provisions in this bill will cause too many American children, especially low-income children, to lose access to these vital programs and to have healthier meals.

The Community Eligibility Provision allows high-poverty school districts to offer universal school meals to all students. This bill raises bureaucratic red tape. It will only lead to fewer schools qualifying for the program and more low-income American children going hungry every single day.

Why add burdensome paperwork on school districts and each and every family in them? Instead, Congress should focus on improving and expanding direct certification, an approach that has been shown to improve program integrity.

What this bill should be doing is addressing the barriers faced by eligible families who are currently not even accessing the benefits of the results of these programs because of the lack of awareness. This bill will freeze the progress that we have made on reducing the intake of salts for American children in their food diets. It would allow junk food to be an acceptable snack, which would undermine our children's health and their entire future.

We must do more to improve school nutrition, attack undernourishment, and combat hunger for millions of American children because, otherwise, we are robbing them of the opportunity to reach their full potential both physically and academically.

Once again, I want to thank my colleague from the great State of Virginia for all the wonderful work that he has been doing and for being so tireless in his effort to make sure that the voices of these families and these children are heard not only in the Education and the Workforce Committee, but beyond.

Thank you for bringing the attention of this to the floor. I am glad to be a partner in this effort.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CÁRDENAS very much for his hard work, too.

Mr. Speaker, reauthorization is an opportunity to improve legislation. Unfortunately, the pending Republican bill reduces nutrition standards and kicks kids off the school meal programs. Instead, we should be improving the program and expanding the child nutrition and the school lunch programs.

I thank my colleagues for saying why this is so important.

I yield back the balance of my time.

IDEOLOGICAL EXTREMISM IS SPREADING ACROSS THE GLOBE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROUZER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, upon visiting some of our wounded

troops at Walter Reed Hospital, I entered a rehab area that was full of men and women who had wounds of varying severity. The place was really a place of tough love—men and women struggling with pain and debility, trying to walk again, recover, and learn new skills.

What struck me the most, perhaps, amidst all of this suffering, was the desire, the will, to keep working, to get well, and to maintain an attitude of strength in the face of great adversity.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of speaking with one officer. He had lost an arm and an eye, and he was throwing a ball, a simple little ball, back and forth with his attendant. Now, normally, for us, this is a simple task, but this activity was necessary to retrain his brain for a new type of coordination. He had lost the dominant eye and the dominant arm.

In spite of the many scars that he wore on his face and a really tough road to recovery, he had a great attitude—no bitterness, no anger, no resentments. He believed in his mission, and he believed in his duty. He was impressive and uplifting, and just to be near him was a great privilege, as well as the other men and women who have fought so vigorously and so hard to overcome their wounds at this particular place and throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, keeping you safe depends upon the men and women who are willing to put themselves on the front line for our security. We do remain the strongest country in the world militarily and economically. Unfortunately, though, I cannot report that the world is growing any calmer or more stable or more secure. Ideological extremism is spreading across the globe and, most alarmingly, is manifested in ISIS' twisted Islamic ideology.

In the face of the barbaric onslaught in the Middle East, compounded by the Syrian dictator's war of attrition, Europe is now contending with its worst refugee crisis since World War II, and the Continent's leadership seems ill-equipped to understand their own plight.

Not long ago, Mr. Speaker, the great cities of Europe were secure places of cultural strength. Today, they are targets for ISIS and other terrorist organizations.

And, of course, we stand in solidarity with the citizens of Belgium as we all continue to deal with the shock of the indiscriminate slaughter of civilians in Brussels. Jihadists there orchestrated coordinating bombings at the Brussels airport and the city's metro station—suicide assaults that murdered 31 people in a grim replay of the horrifying attacks in Paris.

This maelstrom of violence is a consequence of reckless open border policies and naive assumptions about the potential for multicultural conversion to Western economic and political freedoms. Although these bombings, these particular ones, in Brussels were probably in retaliation for the capture of the mastermind of the suicide strikes earlier in Paris, Brussels has long contended with a seedbed of warped Islamic aggression, particularly in its Molenbeek neighborhood.

The Middle East conflict and the resulting humanitarian catastrophe prompted some European leaders to embrace very well-intentioned but misguided immigration postures. Now, nations from Greece to Sweden are confronting capacity issues and deadly security risks. No immigration system can remain just and orderly without necessary and robust border protection measures.

It is not fair. It is not fair to the people who are there, who have set up the political systems that are welcoming others, and it is not fair to people who do need to flee the violence and reestablish themselves in other nations. It is simply not fair.

Contributing also to this problem is the decline of a European myth: a romanticized vision of cultural and political tradition. What is taking its place is a new narrative that says that particular countries, individual countries, decreasingly should matter. Supranational entities, like the European Union, are forging a new settlement of administrative conformity to deal with the pressures of globalization.

Originally, the European Union arose from fears of past nationalist movements, such as fascism, that ravaged and sacrificed the Continent on the alter of ruthless ideology. The European Union, importantly and purposefully, serves to check this dark past, while also appropriately facilitating commonalities in commerce, travel, and enhanced understanding. However, the limits of this type of bureaucratic arrangement are reached when identity and self-preservation are at stake.

Unfortunately, the very idea of Europe may be disintegrating.

□ 1930

So what to do?

To turn this around, the Continent should regain a healthy instinct of its respective nations that places an emphasis on the interests of peoples with shared culture, history, and political traditions. The Continent's vibrancy depends on sustaining the dynamism of longstanding local difference while maintaining proper pride in the ideals that bind and animate wider Western civilization.

Nothing exists in a vacuum. The lack of a bonding identity in Europe, complicated by clashing cultural values, has created the Molenbeek neighborhood in other major European cities as well. Self-isolating Muslim communities can help perpetuate an environment of mutual misunderstanding and distrust, breeding alienation, resentment, and hostility. Genuine multiculturalism is an important goal and should be upheld by us all, but it is difficult without enculturation among immigrant populations.

Thousands of Europeans have left the Continent for the battlegrounds of Syria and Iraq. These radicalized fighters, passport holders—hardened by war and dedicated to jihadist militancy—pose a security risk to their countries of origin in the West. Even some so-called Americans have joined the ranks of terrorist organizations that are metastasizing across the Middle East and North Africa. San Bernardino demonstrated to all of us that the United States is far from immune to the cancer of ISIS' expansion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our Nation, for decades, has shouldered a great burden in confronting havoc throughout the world. We will continue to lead the fight against extremism, but we will not do so alone. A general assumption that we will maintain the majority of heavy lifting in combating regional terror, coupled with the lack of will amongst some of our allies, has created a status quo that is no longer sustainable.

As we recover from the shock of the bombings in Brussels, we must reclaim a central principal. Europe must fight. Complacency is no longer possible. The combined effects of a drifting European identity and a lack of appropriate enculturation among certain migrant populations, further compounded by this new migrant crisis, must be confronted with reason and resolve in order to keep Europe and the world safe. Only through this approach will Europe stabilize, regain a sense of vision, and remain a great and important source of a welcoming and cultural strength.

Mr. Speaker, as the world has focused on the death cult created by ISIS, our focus has drifted away from an equally grave threat: the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Although the Iran agreement has, understandably, dominated headlines on this issue of late, North Korea's dynastic and despotic leadership continues its provocations. The country's young, insecure, ego-driven ruler seeks to consolidate his power and standing through destabilizing bravado, and he is backing it up with nuclear weapons development. In a region already roiled by increased Chinese military posturing, particularly in the South China Sea, North Korea's ongoing threats linger as one of the most complicated international dilemmas.

The possibility of nuclear weapon devastation is one of the most serious threats to civilization, itself. Unfortunately, the gravity of this challenge has not received ongoing critical attention in this body as a first order of priority. New intellectual rigor, strategic projection, and next generation ownership are necessary for nuclear security in the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I recall an incident when I was in graduate school. A prominent philosophy professor was visiting the campus, and he was known for a particular expertise.

I asked him: Would you give me a concise summary of the philosophical argument for immortality?

He was very excited by my request, and he actually invited me to his lectures on the topic. I did consider this a great privilege as, again, he was a very renowned professor. He was very kind to eagerly invite me to his class, but I could not really manage the 4 hours necessary to sit through his lectures, so I politely declined.

He then looked at me, and said: Ah, you have asked me a question about immortality, but you do not have the time.

We cannot afford to make the same mistake here on nuclear security—not having the time. We are distracted by all types of considerations, but if we are to bring the probability of a nuclear catastrophe to as near zero as possible, we must make the time. Understanding how nuclear threats have evolved and how to resolve them most effectively is an urgent national priority.

Imagine, just for a moment, one of several scenarios. A terrorist organization collects enough radiological material to set off what is called a dirty bomb in the stadium, perhaps, of a major city. This would trigger widespread harm and panic. A smuggled package on a containership, with no need for a sophisticated weapons delivery system, explodes in a major U.S. harbor, causing widespread destruction and a loss of life. Worse yet, a reckless nation-state actor, such as North Korea's autocratic strongman, launches a missile attack against Seoul or even Los Angeles. Each future scenario is alarmingly feasible. No one enjoys thinking about this, nor do I, but ignoring this problem only amplifies the ongoing threat.

Americans deserve the assurance that our best and brightest minds are fervently engaged in their defense. They should be able to trust that policymakers on both sides of the aisle are working together for innovative and sustainable solutions to nuclear security concerns. In this age of anxiety and sound bite foreign policy, constituents should know, should believe, should have trust that Congress is leading where it matters most.

The leaders who courageously helmed our formidable nuclear enterprise through World War II and the cold war have now passed the baton to a new generation of policymakers and scientists. Now, as our world grows more complex, the challenges of nuclear proliferation have multiplied. The binary concept of mutually assured destruction is no longer relevant in an increasingly unstable geopolitical environment. Nonstate actors play havoc with global treaties and normative rules, seeking to do horrifying harm. Rational responses to deterrence are no longer a guarantee.

Despite all of these challenges and the important issues that come before Congress, nuclear security, ironically, seldom surfaces in our national conversation outside highly specialized forums. The problem is real. The United States and our allies face a stark deficiency: nuclear security as a multidimensional issue with no longstanding constituency supportive of initiatives in Congress. That constituency must be built. This is of grave concern to us all. The constituency must be built.

In light of this problem, the Nuclear Security Working Group in Congress was founded to advance this discussion and help prevent the unthinkable. While the analytical and tactical expertise rightly should remain embedded in the Department of Defense, in the Department of Energy, in the Department of State, and in other executive branch entities, Congress must create an agile policy environment in this age of globalization and swiftly advancing technologies. We also need to awaken citizen concern in order to give momentum and consideration of the time necessary in this body with so many other distractions. Unfortunately, there is very little. The need for broader involvement, I believe, particularly extends to the millennial generation, the coming stewards of our nuclear security.

The community of responsible nations has much work ahead to achieve an ideal nuclear security settlement. Advances in reprocessing technology, nuclear power, and weapons infrastructure, once the exclusive domain of the nation-state, now pose serious proliferation concerns. Although many countries, thankfully, have altogether renounced the pursuit of nuclear weapons, turbulent situations in the Middle East and elsewhere are worsening an already hazardous global nuclear dynamic. A new architecture for nuclear security demands an ongoing effort by the responsible nations of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this fourth and final Nuclear Security Summit, hosted by President Obama recently in Washington, represented another important step in securing loose nuclear materials and in heightening collaboration. We need to sustain this in more international gatherings and multinational efforts to achieve an effective 21st century nuclear security strategy, one that prioritizes common ground on important strategic and nonproliferation priorities in a cooperative campaign to make our world safer.

Looking ahead, Mr. Speaker, in this regard, I anticipate an augmented role for the International Atomic Energy Agency, known as the IAEA, as a primary implementing agency of future verification initiatives. A revitalized spirit of unity, common purpose, and renewed dedication is essential to nuclear security in the 21st century, and we need robust platforms to do so, multilateral ones. Our challenge is that we cannot react to a nuclear crisis. We must act to prevent one—if we have the time.

Given the collapse of the nation-state order in the Middle East, as well as the technological advances and the potential for highly destructive weaponry to evolve in short order, what will our national security challenges look like in the next 20 to 30 years? It is quite serious. The answer lies in as much a values proposition as a military one. On a fundamental level, the question is whether the world can embrace, enculturate, and institutionalize the belief in human dignity and, from there, build out the governing and economic systems consistent with protecting innocent persons. That is the key.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we owe so much to the young men and women who are willing to risk everything in military service to take this integrated approach to international security. Put simply, I believe in the three Ds: strong defense, smart diplomacy, and sustainable development. All are necessary components for international stability and, thereby, our own national security. Closer to home, in order to have a stable society here, we also depend upon economic security.

We need to reexamine some fundamental questions as to what is causing such anxiety in our American culture. Our security problems are compounded by globalization trends that have left millions of Americans in dire need and dire straits of financial vulnerability. I recently saw a presentation by a CEO of a major company. I thought we were getting ready for a PowerPoint with charts and graphs of financials. Instead, this CEO put a picture up of a father with his daughter, a bride on his arm, as they were walking down the aisle on her wedding day. He said this to us: Everyone is someone's daughter. Every person is someone's son.

The point was powerfully made. The understanding of work and the workplace are essential to human dignity and happiness.

I learned a little more about this company. During the financial crisis of 2008, the business lost about a third of its contracts. Reeling from the economic pressure, this CEO pulled all of his employees together and asked: Team, what are we going to do?

□ 1945

He had earned their trust. Because there was an interdependency in that workplace, because there were demands—they had to be profitable, they had to make efficiency gains in order to be competitive—because he created a culture of trust and interdependency, the entire company decided to take a 30-day furlough with no pay. No job was lost. By sharing in that sacrifice, no job was lost. No one person was laid off. Not one job either was moved overseas.

Contrast that, Mr. Speaker, with an Indianapolis-based company that recently announced they are relocating 1,400 jobs to Mexico.

The fallout from this move was captured on a video camera as worker outrage built during the condescending

speech of a company executive, who channeled corporate elitism in his explanation. Basically, he said: It is nothing personal. It is just business.

Seen here and elsewhere across our country, a dehumanizing, abstract, economic construct that elevates balance sheets and projected earnings over the needs of persons is not a sustainable economic model for well-being, happiness, and commitment.

The economy and our society are inextricably intertwined. When this works, it works well. When it doesn't, there are problems. Social fracture leads to economic decline. Economic decline leads to social fracture. Interdependency can fray into downward mobility and decreased earning power.

A market that fails to deliver for the many, improperly prioritizing only measurable efficiency gains, breaks down communities. Creative destruction should not eviscerate the social environments in which people work. More than the loss of one company, economic disruption creates aftershocks that further result in the decline of community.

While the theory that globalization, including so-called free trade agreements, reduces the cost of consumer goods does have truth, people are not only consumers.

A disordered economy that operates solely from the principle of profit maximization can devalue the rich texture of ecosystems that are built and shared by working families, local businesses, local institutions, and community heritage. Trust and commitment are immeasurables that do not show up on the balance sheet.

Government policy here also has to bear some blame. Our convoluted and burdensome Tax Code incentivizes companies to move overseas or retain their earnings there. Escalated healthcare costs don't help either. Beyond government policy, the harsh reality is that the philosophy and the purpose of the corporation has changed, prioritizing short-term earnings, quarterly profit statements, and the stock price over the long-term viability of the business itself and the people within it who grew the business in the first place.

Mix in a new class of aloof CEOs accountable for only spreadsheets and no wonder people in Indianapolis started shouting at the corporate spokesperson when he announced the jobs were moving to Mexico. It is just business.

Mr. Speaker, there is a better way forward. Take the example that I gave of the CEO who called his team together and said: Team, we have got a problem. We have got a big problem. What can we do about it?

The team shared in the sacrifice in order to keep the business viable, in order to maintain profitability, in order to protect the ecosystem built upon trust, shared commitment, and interdependency.

The better way forward is not a compromise. It is a commonsense consensus that a proper balance between globalized business interests and the daily life of most Americans should cultivate a culture of work to benefit the business itself, employees, and customers. Injecting the value proposition that work should have meaning, that companies should strive to protect the persons under their employ, and that product development should be seen as a shared experience provides the very foundation for profitability and long-term survivability of the business itself with innovation and efficiency properly ordered. What is good for persons is good for business.

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

SOLUTION TO FLOODING IN HOUSTON, TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the date was April 14, 1970. The mission was Apollo 13. The message was: Houston, we have a problem.

Mr. Speaker, that was a clarion call from a mission that was in trouble. Tonight I ring and sound this clarion call from the people of Houston, Texas, because we have some troubles. We have trouble that is related to floodwaters in Houston, Texas, that inundated our city and caused great harm and great damages.

Mr. Speaker, I am on a mission of mercy tonight, a mission of mercy on behalf of my constituents in Houston, but also on behalf of all of those in Houston and the immediate area.

I am on this mission of mercy, but I am not without a solution. We have a solution to the flooding problem in Houston, Texas, and that solution is H.R. 5025. It is a bill that will help to mitigate the flood damages. It will not eliminate the flood damages in Houston, Texas.

I am not sure that we can construct a system that will totally eliminate all flood damages in Houston, Texas, but I am sure that we can mitigate, that we can eliminate many, that we can do something about the magnitude of the problem.

I am absolutely confident, Mr. Speaker, that my mother was correct when she informed me that there will be times in life when you cannot do enough. No matter what you do, you won't be able to do enough. But she also went on to explain to me, Mr. Speaker, when you cannot do enough and more needs to be done, you have a duty to do all that you can.

I am here tonight to let this Congress know that we can do more to help in Houston, Texas. We can do more to mitigate the flood damages that we have in Houston, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 5025, would accord $311 million. This money would be for projects that have already been approved that are related to flood control in Houston, projects that have not been completed.

This bill would authorize this funding up to 2026. This bill is needed in Houston, Texas, for many, many reasons. I shall share but a few, then I will yield to a colleague, and then I will say more.

This bill is needed because it would not only mitigate the flood damages, but it would also help us with jobs. For those who are interested in jobs, this bill would create 6,220 jobs. The people who acquire these jobs will pay taxes. These taxpayers will help us, in turn, by helping with some of our fire, our police, and schools.

There are many ways that these tax dollars will be used, including a good deal of them sent to Washington, D.C., to help others across the length and breadth of our great country.

This bill will save lives. I will say more about that, and my colleague may say something about this as well. But I think it is important for us to note now that this bill will have a meaningful, powerful, significant impact on Houston, Texas.

I am proud to tell you that this Congress has been helpful. We have already accorded for one project $212 million, but we need $34 million to complete the project. This is the Brays project in Houston, Texas. We need $34 million more to complete it.

This project is in an area where we do get flooding, in the Meyerland area. This project would help prevent homes from being flooded and cars from being damaged. This is a great project.

We just need to finish the project. The project was authorized in 1990, and it is projected to be finished in 2021, Mr. Speaker. While I do want to make sure we complete it, I do think it is taking us a bit too long to complete the Brays project.

Mr. Speaker, the Golden Gate Bridge with all of its majesty only took 4 years, approximately, to complete. The Hoover Dam, a great monument to what we can do to channel water and turn that water into electrical power, only took 5 years to complete. For the Erie Canal, we didn't have the advances in technology that we have today; yet, the Erie Canal took 8 years to complete.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke of Apollo 13 just a moment ago. Well, it only took us 8 years, Mr. Speaker, to place a person on the Moon. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if we can place a person on the Moon in 8 years, we can complete these projects in less than 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored at this time to yield to my colleague, who is a cosponsor of this piece of legislation, who serves us well in the Congress of the United States on the Energy and Commerce Committee, a real stalwart when it comes to serving his constituents and standing up for the people of our city, our county, our State and indeed our country, the honorable GENE GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me, and I also thank him for last Friday, when I was able to be in your district there along Brays Bayou in the Westbury area and the Meyerland area and see it.

That happened in your district in southwest Houston, but it also happened in north Houston and east Houston. It was not as much as some of the tragedies in other parts of the county, but we have hundreds of homes that have been flooded.

On April 18, the city of Houston in Harris County, Texas, was subjected to paralyzing flooding that claimed the lives of our citizens and required the rescue of 1,200 more. Approximately 2,000 housing units were flooded, and we are currently working to figure out where to house these folks who cannot return to their homes.

This is the second major flooding disaster Houston has experienced in the last 6 months, and the city is expecting additional rain and thunderstorms this week. Residents of our congressional districts, as well my colleagues' member districts, have been severely affected, and we must stop the needless loss of life.

The President has recognized the significance of the catastrophe and fulfilled a request for disaster declaration. Now it is the job of Congress to help our constituents.

I have worked closely with my neighbor and friend, Representative AL GREEN, to introduce the Tax Day Flood Supplemental Funding Act. The legislation would provide $311 million to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for construction and, in many cases, completion of our bayous and flood control projects.

Flooding is not new in Houston, but we have learned how to control it. Our bayou system has saved countless lives and millions of dollars in damages since being created.

Unfortunately, due to the consistent budget pressure, the Army Corps of Engineers cannot adequately fund these projects that need to be finished. This bill would ensure that our Federal, State, and local authorities have the resources necessary to expedite the flood control projects we know protect people and property.

Additionally, I want to make sure folks on the ground have the information they need to get back into their homes.

If residents are subject to flood damage, please report flood damage by calling 311. Download the Houston 311 app and visit Houston311.org to submit flood damage reports.

Residents must file an insurance claim with their home or their auto insurance company for damages they have incurred.

Failure to file an insurance claim may affect your eligibility for the Federal assistance because, by law, FEMA cannot provide money for losses that are covered by insurance.

Also, it is important to know that, if Spanish-speaking households have children that are U.S. citizens or legal permanent residents, FEMA will assist you.

Before submitting your application, folks should have the following information ready: their Social Security number, their home and auto insurance information, flood damage information, personal financial information, and personal contact information.

You can apply by phone for FEMA assistance. You can call 1–800–621–3362. Again, that is 1–800–261–FEMA, 1–800–621–3362.

FEMA can offer two types of assistance: housing assistance, temporary housing, money to help repair or replace your primary residence.

Nonhousing needs include medical, dental, funeral costs, clothing, household items, tools, home fuel, disaster-related moving and storage and replacement of disaster-damaged vehicles.

After 24 hours, you need to follow up with FEMA. A FEMA inspector should contact you within 10 to 14 days.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, we can help the victims in our neighborhoods, and we must help them. I urge this body to pass this emergency funding legislation so we won't have this tragedy again while we are trying to get people out of the water and back into their homes and back into a regular life.

Again, I want to thank my colleague for having this Special Order tonight. Again, our office and all our congressional offices who are impacted across Houston—whether they be Republican or Democrat—are here to serve you and serve our constituents. I thank my colleague.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for sharing the time with us tonight. I especially thank him for coming in to the Ninth Congressional District, his neighboring district, and being of assistance to my constituents because, as we do this, we really assist each other.

I would want to, if I may, magnify, amplify what the gentleman said about this not being partisan. That wasn't his exact terminology, but this really is not a partisan effort. This is something that impacts people. Democrats and Republicans have been impacted by these storms. Rich and poor alike have been impacted by these storms. It doesn't matter what your gender is. It doesn't matter what your nationality is. If you have been in Houston, Texas, when these storms have hit, you have been impacted by these storms.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I do think it is appropriate that we say more about these storms to give some indication as to what we have to cope with in Houston, Texas. Houston, we do have a problem, but, again, we also have a solution, H.R. 5025.

So let's say just a bit more about the problem. Let's talk about the damages in terms of cost. In 2015, we had the Memorial Day flood, and in 2016, we had the tax day flood. I am going to compare the two, and in so doing, you can see not only do we have damages occasionally, it appears that we are starting to have these damages quite regularly.

The damages and costs for the 2015 Memorial Day flood: Approximately $3 billion in damages. Mind you now, this bill will cost $311 million. We had $3 billion in damages just for the Memorial Day flood alone in 2015. A billion is still 1,000 million—1,000 million. So we had 3,000 million dollars' worth of damages from this Memorial Day flood in 2015.

The tax day flood of 2016 brought us $5 billion as an estimate of damages. $5 billion. All of these are estimates. Nobody knows the exact number. There was $5 billion in 2016, another $3 billion in 2015. That is $8 billion. Mr. Speaker, the $8 billion happens to be about 25 times—25.72 times—the $311 million.

The point is, why don't we spend the money upfront?

You have heard the phrase ''pay me now or pay me later.''

Why not pay the cost to prevent some of this flooding as opposed to the cost of repairs after the floods have taken place?

It is interesting to note that these appropriation dollars that we are talking about are going to be spent. These are not dollars that will never be spent on these projects in Houston. What we are trying to do is not allow the projects to be prolonged such that other things are impacted in our city. We want the projects to be completed as expeditiously as possible, and there will be many more reasons why I will call that to your attention in just a moment.

One will be deaths. With the Memorial Day flood, our research indicates that approximately four people were killed. Four people lost their lives in floodwaters or as a result of flooding. In 2016, with the tax day flood, that number doubled to eight people losing their lives.

We have an opportunity to do something to save lives. There are other things that can be done to help us save lives as well, but these things, working with these projects that the Corps of Engineers already has on its docket, has on its agenda, is working on, finishing these projects can indeed help us to save lives.

Let's talk about the rainfall so that you can get some sense of how much water inundates our city. In 2015, we had 11 inches of rain. That is a lot. In 2016, we had 17 inches of rain. In 2016, that amounted to about 240 billion gallons of rain. That is a lot of water in one place at one time.

The rescues. My colleague alluded to people being rescued. In 2015, we had 531 water rescues. In 2016, 1,200 high-water rescues took place.

This is a good point for me, Mr. Speaker, a good place for me to commend the newly elected mayor of Houston, Texas, the Honorable Sylvester

Turner, who is doing an outstanding job, a stellar job. He just arrived on the job, but he has really done well with the circumstances that he has had to deal with, so I commend him.

I also would like to mention now the homes that have been damaged. In 2015, the estimate is that about 6,000 homes were damaged with the Memorial Day flood. With the flood in 2016, the tax day flood—called tax day because it was the last day to file your income taxes. In 2016, on tax day, we had 6,700. Seven hundred more homes approximately were estimated in 2016 than in 2015. As you can see, we have a problem in Houston.

Well, let's talk about vehicular damage. In Houston in 2015, the Memorial Day flood, we had about 10,000 vehicles damaged. 10,000. Imagine being on your way home and you have this water to inundate the city. That means that you cannot continue to traverse the city. You have to take shelter. You have to stop. You try to get your water into a place wherein you have high terrain. Unfortunately in Houston, most places are at sea level and a good many are below sea level. As a result, when we have these types of conditions, we will have damages that will occur, and many cars will be a part of these damages.

In 2015, approximately 10,000 vehicles. In 2016, approximately 40,000 vehicles damaged. In 2016, 40,000 vehicles. Now, if it takes about $10,000 per vehicle to repair these vehicles or to replace the vehicles, $10,000 per vehicle, that is approximately, in a hypothetical sense, $40 million. So the cost, Mr. Speaker, for vehicle repairs alone exceeds the amount that we need for the bill to take preventive measures such that we won't get as many cars in this condition. I say as many simply because I will reiterate what I said earlier, we will never eliminate all of the flooding. We can never do enough, but we do have a duty to do all that we can. We can spare a good many people from being stranded in vehicles; a good many who lose their lives, I might add, as well.

Loss of power, meaning electrical power. In 2015, we had 88,000 customers lose power. That is a lot. 88,000 people without power. Surely we have had more than this in many other places. I am not saying that this loss of power would in any way compare to some of our other circumstances that we have had to cope with in different places in our country, but I do want you to know that this happens whenever we have these conditions. So year after year after year, the number adds up because while we had 88,000 customers in 2015, in 2016 we had 123,000 people lose power. We had 88,000 the year earlier; 123,000 this year. It adds up.

Houston has a problem, but Houston has a solution. The solution is H.R. 5025, a bill that would accord $311 million to complete projects that are already being worked on in Houston, Texas, money that is already going to be spent by virtue of the projects having been appropriated.

So we have to do this. Why not do this now or as quickly as we can, save lives, save money, and create jobs?

Let's now talk about FEMA assistance. On the Memorial Day flood of 2015, $57 million was paid out from FEMA to persons who suffered flood damages. For the tax day flood, we have yet to determine this because we are still in the process of getting FEMA into the city to assist us.

If I may say so, I want to thank the President of the United States of America, the Honorable Barack Obama. I want to thank the Governor of the State of Texas. I thank the Governor for immediately responding and asking the President to declare certain areas in the State of Texas disaster areas.

The Houston area has been declared a disaster area. Harris County is one of the areas so declared. Harris County happens to be, for the most part, within Houston, Texas. Houston is over 600 square miles. It literally almost consumes Harris County.

So we have to realize that the Governor did a great thing, in my opinion. He is a Republican, by the way. And the President did a great thing, in my opinion. He is a Democrat, for edification purposes. These two people—one Republican, one Democrat—worked to make sure that we get FEMA in, that we get all of the aid that we can into the area as quickly as we can so that people can receive assistance.

There are people who are going to need shelter. It is estimated that out in the Greenspoint area—this is the area where my colleague, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, happens to be the representative from—1,800 apartments have flood damages. 1,800. We have got some 400 workers at the time I received this intelligence out there helping to make repairs. These workers are going to be paid for the jobs that they are doing. That is additional cost.

We had more than 150 families who needed accommodations. They will need these accommodations for perhaps as much as 3 weeks. This could end up costing us an additional $150,000. These are all costs that we can mitigate, that we can reduce. We may not eliminate them, but we can reduce these costs.

In the Meyerland area, this is an area that was hit hard when we had the Memorial Day flood, and now when we had this tax day flood—we are talking about within a year—we have people who are just moving back into their homes—just moving back into their homes—and they are flooded again.

This area and the people of this area have sent out a clarion call for help. They have sent the hew and cry not only to the Congress, but also to the Corps of Engineers, also to the county commissioners. They want the city council, the State to do something about this problem.

Houston has a problem, but Houston has a solution. H.R. 5025 is that solution.

In that Meyerland area that I am speaking of there lives a family, the Tice family. I want to express my gratitude to the Tice family because when we set out to visit with people in the area and call these problems to the attention on a city-wide basis by publishing these problems, that Tice family opened the doors of their home to us so that we could come in and meet at their home. They didn't have to do it, but I am appreciative that they opened the doors of their home. I am especially appreciative as it relates to this family, Mr. Speaker, because this family, the Tice family, has a son who is being held captive in Syria as I speak. This family is suffering the problems associated with somebody that they love dearly, their son being held captive in Syria, and they get flooded. Fortunately, this time they barely escaped, but they had to do mitigation. They had to raise their floors. They had to do things so that they would not get flooded.

I am calling on us in the Congress to please, let's help the many families who will suffer again. This is not going to be the last time that I will come to the floor with this bill if we don't get the help this time. I assure you that within the foreseeable future, we will have a similar circumstance.

How do you know, AL GREEN? How do you know you are going to have a similar circumstance?

Well, I know because between 1996 and 2014, we had 86 days of flooding and/or flash flooding in Houston, Harris County. That averages to four to five days of flooding each year. This is not—N-O-T—this is not a problem that is going away.

We can resolve it this time with H.R. 5025 or I will be back to the floor, and I will be calling this problem to our attention again; we will be talking about more damages to homes; we will be talking about cars that have been flooded and in need of repair; and we will be talking about, unfortunately—and I pray that I am entirely wrong—we will be talking about lives that have been lost; and we will be talking about how we could have then, how we could have now, how we could have done things to avoid some of these consequences.

□ 2015

These consequences can be mitigated, and it is up to us to take the affirmative action to do so.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank the cosponsors of this legislation, H.R. 5025. Many have signed onto it. I think that, in a few short days, we have nearly 50 cosponsors, and we will be asking others to sign on to H.R. 5025.

In thanking the leadership, I am asking that we have an opportunity to, please, let us, at some point, either

bring the bill to the floor or let us incorporate it into some of the supplemental relief that we will be according persons in the immediate future.

Houston has a problem, but H.R. 5025 can be a great part of the solution.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. LAWRENCE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for April 26 and today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 28, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5167. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations; Connecticut River, Old Saybrook, CT [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0806] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5168. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation, Daytona Beach Grand Prix of the Seas; Atlantic Ocean, Daytona Beach, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2015-1108] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5169. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Chesapeake Bay, between Sandy Point and Kent Island, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2015-1126] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5170. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Safety Zone: Santa Cruz Harbor Shoaling, Santa Cruz County, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0194] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5171. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River Mile 95.7 to 96.7; New Orleans, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0189] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5172. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Chincoteague Bay, Chincoteague, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0483] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5173. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Charleston Race Week, Charleston Harbor, Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2015-1055] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5174. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Hudson River, Tarrytown, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0226] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5175. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Bucksport/Lake Murray Drag Boat Spring Nationals, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; Bucksport, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0009] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5176. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Urbanna Creek, Urbanna, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0174] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5177. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations; Port of New York [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0038] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5178. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tonnage Regulations Amendments [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0522] (RIN: 1625-AB74) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5179. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations; Connecticut River, Old Saybrook, CT [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0806] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5180. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River 321.4 to 321.6; Quincy, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0155] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5181. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Commercial Fishing Vessels Dispensing Petroleum Products [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0195] (RIN: 1625-AC18) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5182. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Victoria Barge Canal, Bloomington, TX [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0952] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5183. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Little Calumet River, Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0148] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5184. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Saginaw River, Bay City, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0934] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5185. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Sunken Vessel, North Channel, Boston, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0127] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5186. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Newtown Creek, Queens, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0100] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 706. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4901) to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 88) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term ''Fiduciary''; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 2, 2016, through May 9, 2016 (Rept. 114–533). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 5073. A bill to establish EUREKA Prize Competitions to accelerate discovery and development of disease-modifying, preventive, or curative treatments for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia, to encourage efforts to enhance detection and diagnosis of such diseases, or to enhance the quality and efficiency of care of individuals with such diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 5074. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal funds to any State or local educational agency that denies or prevents participation in constitutional prayer in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FARR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 5075. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to commission a study of the health impacts of airplane flights on affected residents of certain metropolitan areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 5076. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that pass-through businesses do not pay tax at a higher rate than corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 5077. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. TROTT):

H.R. 5078. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a study on the economic and environment risks to the Great Lakes of spills or leaks of oil, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. COOK, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 5079. A bill to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to require that, in California, certain off-reservation gaming proposals shall be subject to the full ratification and referendum process established by California State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 5080. A bill to prevent gun trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 5081. A bill to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. REED, Mr. DOLD, Mr. YODER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. JOYCE, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 5082. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deferral of inclusion in gross income for capital gains reinvested in economically distressed zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5083. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the appeals process of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5084. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to reserve a certain number of burial plots at Arlington National Cemetery for individuals who have been awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 5085. A bill to reform the screening and eviction policies for Federal housing assistance in order to provide fair access to housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5086. A bill to more accurately identify and transfer subsurface gravel sources originally intended to be made available to the Ukpeagvik Inupiat Corporation in exchange for its relinquishment of related property rights; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5087. A bill to remove the Federal claim to navigational servitude for a tract of land developed due to dredging disposal from a harbor project in Valdez, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRAT (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H. Res. 707. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the Committee on Appropriations to maintain proposed and historical budget authority and outlays for each category of spending; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Res. 708. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the immigration policies of the United States should reduce automatic removal and detention, restore due process for immigrants, and repeal unnecessary barriers to legal immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5073.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 5074.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: ''To reulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 5075.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 5076.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 5077.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, including those under Title 50, are carried out to support the national security interests of the United States, to enable the armed forces of the United States, and to support the President in executing the foreign policy of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in pertinent part, that ''Congress shall have power . . . to . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States''; ''. . . to raise and support armies . . .''; to ''make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water''; and ''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 5078.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 5079.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to regulate commerce with Indian tribes.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 5080.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. REICHERT:
H.R. 5081.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. TIBERI:
H.R. 5082.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I
By Ms. TITUS:
H.R. 5083.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution
By Ms. TITUS:
H.R. 5084.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution
By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:
H.R. 5085.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:
H.R. 5086.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:
H.R. 5087.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 194: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. REED, Mr. LANCE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 303: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 335: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 411: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 446: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 509: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 525: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 542: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 546: Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 556: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 581: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 656: Mr. SANFORD.
H.R. 664: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 672: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 711: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 771: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 842: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 923: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 953: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 969: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 973: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1170: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1179: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1197: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1220: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1221: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1356: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1427: Mr. LONG, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1594: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1608: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RIGELL, Ms. MENG, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1655: Mr. POCAN and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 1688: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1761: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1769: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 1818: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1859: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1961: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2090: Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2096: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 2121: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2170: Mr. COHEN and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2189: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 2237: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2274: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2350: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 2404: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2515: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2590: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2633: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2658: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2726: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HANNA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 2739: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2759: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2793: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2799: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2805: Mr. TIPTON and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2844: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 2858: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2890: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2896: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2903: Mr. MULVANEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 2920: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2938: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2980: Ms. PINGREE, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3048: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 3084: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 3209: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 3222: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 3229: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3237: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 3268: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 3299: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 3308: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 3381: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3394: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 3520: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3523: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 3643: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 3691: Mr. KIND and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3706: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3722: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 3742: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 3799: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3815: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3832: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 3851: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 3860: Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 3865: Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 3870: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3880: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 3882: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3920: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 3929: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BARTON, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 3974: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3982: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 3990: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4016: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 4063: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. TIPTON,
H.R. 4065: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 4070: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4114: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 4118: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4301: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 4352: Mr. PERRY and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4365: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 4371: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 4381: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4443: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4447: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4460: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 4471: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 4474: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 4479: Mr. POLIS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. WALZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 4480: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4584: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 4600: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4621: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4640: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4646: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4653: Mr. POLIS and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4681: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4715: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 4731: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4739: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 4740: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4751: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 4760: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 4764: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 4766: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 4773: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4774: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4792: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 4796: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 4816: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 4828: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HENSARLING,

Mr. BRAT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 4842: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 4843: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. MESSER, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 4869: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 4876: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 4904: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 4907: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 4912: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4928: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 4941: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 4948: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 4954: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4955: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 4956: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 4960: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 4969: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4980: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 5011: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 5015: Mr. COLE, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 5031: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 5044: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. LEE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 5046: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 5047: Mr. JONES and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 5056: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 5067: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. VALADAO.

H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. STIVERS.

H. Con. Res. 130: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H. Res. 14: Mr. SALMON, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 154: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H. Res. 494: Mrs. WAGNER.

H. Res. 534: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H. Res. 540: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 586: Mrs. DINGELL.

H. Res. 605: Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 637: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 650: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. LANCE.

H. Res. 668: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. VELA.

H. Res. 694: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 2016 No. 65

Senate

The Senate met at 10 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.

Almighty God, the fountain of all wisdom. Nothing is impossible to You. Forgive us when we sometimes have anxiety about the future because we fail to remember what You have done in the past. Thank You for Your wisdom that guides us on life's journey, empowering us to walk with integrity. Today, enlighten our Senators, show them Your ways, teach them Your paths. May Your great love so encompass them that discord and confusion will be dispelled. Lord, let Your peace and tranquility guard their hearts and minds. Deal graciously with them, encouraging them to cast their cares upon You, receiving Your loving mercy and protection.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote with respect to the Alexander substitute amendment No. 3801 occur at 12 noon today; that the cloture vote on H.R. 2028 occur following disposition of the substitute amendment; and that the 10:30 a.m. second-degree filing deadline for both the amendment and the underlying bill be at 11 a.m. this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. We have no problem moving the vote to noon, but I want everyone to be clear that we would be happy to have a vote to pass this bill right now. The only thing holding up the bill is, of course, the amendment of which the Presiding Officer is well aware.

We would be happy to move right now with the amendments that have been agreed to—the managers' package we agreed to the night before last—and finish this bill now.

I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we have seen important progress in this appropriations season, with the committee reporting out one-third of the 12 funding bills already, each with unanimous backing. So let's continue our work to make progress on the bipartisan energy security and water infrastructure funding bill before us.

This appropriations measure will have positive impacts across the country and promote American priorities such as energy innovation, waterways infrastructure, commerce, and public safety. It is the product of much research and deliberation. It shows what can be achieved with the return to regular order.

We know it would not have been possible without the dedicated work and leadership of the Appropriations Committee and the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee. It is good to see this significant headway we have made thus far. With continued cooperation, we can pass the first appropriations bill of the season and continue our work to move through more of these individual funding measures.

OBAMACARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it has been 6 years since the flawed health care policies of ObamaCare were signed into law. Six years later, my office continues to receive stories from Kentuckians who are reeling from the negative effects of this partisan law.

For instance, take the heartbreaking story from one middle-class husband and father of two from Covington who suffered a heart attack at the age of 42. Under ObamaCare, this Kentucky dad has seen his health care premium triple and his deductible increase to, as he put it, a ''ridiculous'' amount. He said he struggles to afford his medicine—which he says costs upward of $1,000 a month—as he and his family struggle to survive week to week.

Put simply, he says, ObamaCare is a ''terrible blight on the health care system'' that has resulted in more ''expensive, watered down, unaffordable health care for the middle class.'' Unfortunately, too many American families have had similar experiences under this administration's partisan law because from the start this health care policy was built on a mountain—a mountain of higher costs and broken promises, which only seem to grow larger by the day.

When it comes to ObamaCare, costs in the exchange are higher than its champions expected. A recent study found that ObamaCare exchange individual market enrollees experienced higher medical costs than people insured through employer-provided coverage: 19 percent higher in 2014 and 22 percent higher last year. When it comes to ObamaCare, it simply does

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

not work like its champions promised either. As a result, we have seen increasing numbers of insurers pull out of the ObamaCare marketplace altogether.

Just last week, we learned that the Nation's largest health insurer will join the list, withdrawing from all but a ''handful of States'' next year, including Kentucky. What this means is that Americans in my home State and across much of the Nation are likely to face even fewer health insurance options. According to one analysis, if this insurer withdrew from the exchange market altogether, nearly 2 million marketplace enrollees would be left with only 2 insurers, while more than 1 million more would be left with only 1.

Fewer choices could also mean even higher premium costs. As one expert put it, either insurers will drop out or insurers will raise premiums. This only adds to the many Kentuckians who have already seen their premiums spike under ObamaCare, like the retired police officer whose premium increased to nearly $5,000 a year, which he ''simply cannot afford'' or the Kentuckian whose rate tripled, leaving him uninsured and leaving him to pay a fine at the end of the year.

Not surprisingly, the insurance industry's chief spokesperson—who is a former top Obama administration official, by the way—is bracing the public for even more premium increases in the year to come. The administration's answer? More money from taxpayers. Whether they call it a risk corridor or a premium subsidy or a reinsurance mechanism, the source is still the same, the American taxpayer.

So the bottom line is this: Americans continue to be unfairly hurt by a health care law that was forced on them through backroom deals and is literally littered with broken promises. Too many have seen their premiums and deductibles skyrocket. Too many have suffered from tax increases and lost coverage. Now too many are set to face even fewer choices and significant price hikes in the year to come.

Middle-class families have endured the broken promises and failures of ObamaCare for far too long. It is past time for Democrats to own up to the many disappointments of this law and help us move toward better health care policies for our country.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks, the time until 12 noon be equally divided between the two managers or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is too bad my Republican friends continue to attack ObamaCare. It is working. The ranks of the uninsured are as low as they have ever been. More people are getting access to health care, and they are healthier. More people are healthier because they can go see a doctor or go to a hospital when they need to.

The Republicans need to get over it and accept the fact that ObamaCare is here to stay. If they are so concerned about it—they have no plan of their own—maybe they could give us some ideas as to how it should be changed. We hear nothing other than criticism of a program that is doing so much to change America forever.

WISHING CAPITOL POLICE OFFICER PAT MILLHAM A SPEEDY RECOVERY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to take just a minute to talk about the tragedy that struck the Capitol Police yesterday. At 5 a.m., United States Capitol Police Officer Pat Millham was working out in the gym. He suffered a massive heart attack. Those who were present in the gym at the time rushed to his aid. They used a defibrillator three times before his heart started beating again. He was then flown to a nearby hospital and had surgery late last night.

He was revived. That is very good. He is a 28-year veteran of the Capitol Police. He has served in a variety of very important positions: a member of the criminal investigations unit, academy instructor, and he even worked on the hostage negotiation team.

He is an outstanding police officer by all accounts. The Department has recognized his performance and honored Officer Millham with the Service Medal and Commendation Award. He is well-liked by all of his colleagues and has a great sense of humor. He is currently a member of the Department's mountain bike patrol that we see around here. There are not a lot of mountains, but there are a lot of hills around this Capitol complex.

He is in very good shape. That is what you have to be to be a patrol officer on a bicycle. That is what makes what happened yesterday so shocking. I cannot imagine what a difficult time it has been for Pat and his wife Heidi and their two children at college, Skylar and Savannah. Heidi recently retired from the United States Capitol Police.

I hope they know the entire Senate and House family wishes Officer Millham a speedy recovery, and I express my personal appreciation and admiration to all of the Capitol Police for all they do and all the personnel who make the Capitol Police jobs functional. We look forward to having Officer Millham back at full health very quickly.

Mr. President, where are we on what is happening on the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2028, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Alexander/Feinstein amendment No. 3801, in the nature of a substitute.

Alexander amendment No. 3804 (to amendment No. 3801), to modify provisions relating to Nuclear Regulatory Commission fees.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided between the two managers or their designees.

NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION DRUG TAKE-BACK DAY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we have recently been talking quite a bit—because, frankly, unless we talk about it people won't know what happened—about how productive we have been over the last year and a half in advancing legislation that benefits the American people, which is, of course, the reason why they sent us here.

I say we have been talking about it, because if we don't talk about it, maybe they will never learn, and even if we talked about it, some of them may never believe it. But the fact of the matter is that we need to talk about what we are doing here for the people we represent.

Of course, nothing happens in the Senate or in Congress or in Washington unless it is done on a bipartisan basis. But leadership matters. Leadership matters.

We have seen with the new Republican majority in the 114th Congress, under Senator MCCONNELL and Speaker RYAN now, that we have been able to pass some important legislation. This includes legislation to combat the epidemic of opioid abuse throughout our Nation. We passed an important piece of legislation called the Comprehensive

Addiction and Recovery Act to deal with it.

But I want to talk about another aspect of the prescription drug problem or issue and reflect on some bipartisan legislation we passed 6 years ago—obviously, with people on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers—when we came together to tackle another issue related to prescription drugs. This had to do with the fact that many prescription drugs are filled. They will sit in medicine cabinets and perhaps be subject to pilfering by people for whom they were not prescribed or be disposed of in a way that is bad for the environment. We found that the growing use of prescription drugs for nonmedical uses is particularly a problem among teenagers. When people take drugs for recreational or other purposes that have not been prescribed for them, unfortunately the consequences can be fatal.

We noticed that some State and local law enforcement agencies have had success with drug take-back programs. The programs allowed people to turn in their leftover prescription drugs, limiting the chances that these drugs would get into the hands of someone who doesn't need them or that they would hurt them.

I remember in Austin, TX, shortly after we passed this legislation in 2010, going to one of the locations where the take-back program was in use, and people were bringing garbage sacks full of prescription drugs they had in their home. In some instances, they had a relative who had been ill and passed away. They had all of these prescription drugs that were sitting there, and they didn't know what to do with them. Do you flush them down the toilet? Do you put them in the garbage can? What do you do? Fortunately, we provided a mechanism for people to deal with these unneeded drugs.

We focused our efforts on making it easier for Federal agencies to take and dispose of some of the most dangerous drugs, including opioids, and finding a way to encourage more communities to do the same.

The legislation we passed in 2010 was the Secure and Responsible Drug Disposal Act, and it gave law enforcement officials the flexibility they need to be able to build these programs. Like most legislation nobody has ever heard of, it passed Congress unanimously. But just because we didn't fight like cats and dogs doesn't mean it is not worthwhile. I am thankful that this week we will be able to highlight the importance of legislation like this to address our Nation's prescription drug epidemic.

Today, folks on Capitol Hill can hand in any unused prescription medication they have as part of Federal take-back day. That is today. On Saturday, we will get a chance to see this in action across the country through the National Prescription Drug Take-Back Day. Take-back days not only highlight the problem of prescription drug abuse, they help local communities take control of the problem by rallying the community to turn in drugs that are either unwanted or expired and to make sure they are safely disposed of.

I look forward to going back home to Texas for national take-back day this weekend, where I will have a chance to join local law enforcement and city leaders in Dallas and Austin and Walgreens pharmacy—all working together to help highlight this important initiative. I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO RELATIONSHIP

Mr. President, separately, I want to talk for a moment about another matter of importance, and that is the importance of our Nation's relationship with our neighbor to the south. Coming from Texas, which has 1,200 miles of common border with Mexico, I often observe that this is a relationship from which we cannot get a divorce. We are bound together as countries, contiguous countries, and frankly our well-being depends in part on how well Mexico is doing. We know that Mexico, like the United States, has its own unique challenges.

As the largest exporting State in the country, Texas exported $95 billion worth of goods to Mexico just last year—$95 billion to Mexico just last year. In fact, Mexico is our largest export market, and it is the second largest export market of the United States. The truth is, Mexico and its economy are very important to our economy and how we do as a country.

In today's globalized world, we must continue to support our economic partnership with Mexico and find ways to build on it and certainly not do anything to undermine it. That is why I prioritized efforts such as the Cross-Border Trade and Enhancement Act, legislation I have introduced with my colleague in the House, a Democrat by the name of HENRY CUELLAR. I worked with him a lot on border-related and especially trade-related issues. This bill would help reduce wait times and upgrade infrastructure at our border ports of entry.

I bet most people don't realize that the single largest land port of entry into the United States is Laredo, TX. If you come with me to Laredo sometime, you will see semis and tractor-trailers stacked up literally for hours trying to get across the International Bridge, engaging in the kind of trade that helps support American jobs and helps our economy.

It is important that we move goods and people more efficiently, safely, and legally, and grow our trading relationships with partners like Mexico. The fact is, 6 million American jobs depend on binational trade with Mexico—things we send there and things they send here. A lot of the jobs that used to go to China because they could produce things in a manufacturing process that was cheaper because of lower wages and the like—because of the benefit of the proximity of Mexico, many of the maquiladoras and other manufacturing facilities in Mexico are integral to North American manufacturing.

Our relationship with Mexico, as complicated as it can sometimes be, goes well beyond impressive trade statistics. Mexico is a key partner for the United States as we work to keep our country safe and to help them deal with the challenges they have from a law enforcement standpoint.

Mexico is critical to our joint goals of countering and interdicting illegal substances entering the United States from across the border. We know the supply is huge, and unfortunately the demand in the United States is huge, and our Mexican friends always remind us of that. Every time we are critical of them, they say: Well, if it weren't for the demand in the United States, the supply wouldn't be there. They have a point.

We have also worked with Mexico in trying to stem the tide of illegal immigration. I know most people may not quite accept that, but the fact is, Mexico has stepped up and dealt with immigration across its southern border from countries such as in Central America—some of the most challenging environments in this hemisphere. We have seen that manifested in the tens of thousands of unaccompanied children who come from Central America, across Mexico, and into the United States, ending up on our doorstep. But Mexico has worked with us to try to stem that flow of illegal immigration from Central America.

We have worked together to try to help make sure our border is not an easy target for terrorists and other bad actors seeking entry to our country.

There is no doubt that these shared challenges are just that—challenging. But what should be crystal clear to all of us is that we can't address them without working with Mexico. We can't ignore it. As I said earlier, we can't get a divorce. We have to work this out because our futures are joined together in many important respects. That is why I say that the success of the United States depends in part on Mexico's success, and we should diligently look for ways to grow that partnership for the good of both countries. One practical way we can do that is by confirming a U.S. Ambassador to represent us in Mexico City.

Roberta Jacobson was nominated last summer, and I believe she is qualified to represent us in this key relationship. Our bilateral relationship is simply too important to the people of Texas and to the people of the United States to leave this position unfilled. We have to get somebody representing the United States in Mexico City to advocate on behalf of the United States for all of the reasons I mentioned earlier—trade, security, immigration. Otherwise, I don't think we are going to be able to make the kind of progress we all would like to see, and we certainly can't afford to let our relationship with Mexico go stagnant. That is one of the risks of not having an ambassador there.

I was really glad to hear my friend, the junior Senator from Florida, call the U.S.-Mexico relationship one of the most important ones we have. He said that yesterday on the floor. I share his optimism that this impasse over the confirmation of Ms. Jacobson can be resolved soon. I certainly think it is time we come together to move her nomination forward. Here in the waning days of the Obama administration, it is very important that we have this important ambassadorship filled for all of the reasons I mentioned earlier.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. 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. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time in quorum calls until 12 noon be evenly divided between the two parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. 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. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, in a few minutes we will be voting on whether to end debate on the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. Most of what we have to say about it at this point is very good news. This is the first appropriations bill of the year. It is the earliest date an appropriations bill has been acted on in the Senate since 1974. If it goes through in the regular order, it will be the first Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill that has done so since 2009. More than 80 Senators have contributed policy suggestions and amendments to the bill on both sides of the aisle. In addition to that, we have dealt with 17 amendments on the floor. Now we are ready to end debate and move in our process toward a final solution on the bill.

I believe this bill was put on the floor because Senator FEINSTEIN and I have a good history of working together, and the expectation was that we would find a way to do that. Let me say the problem—and I will leave time for Senator FEINSTEIN or the Democratic leader or perhaps Senator COTTON or others who may want to say something.

An issue has arisen over an amendment offered by Senator COTTON. He did that after the administration made an announcement over the weekend that it would be purchasing heavy water from Iran. Heavy water by itself is not much. It is just water. It is in drums. It doesn't hurt anybody. It is not dangerous. It is distilled water, and it is used primarily for two reasons: one, for scientific instruments—we use it for fiber optics and other scientific reasons—and it can be used to make plutonium. So it was a part of the agreement between the United States and Iran.

Senator COTTON—and I will characterize his amendment with his permission—sought to do two things. One was to say you couldn't use any appropriated funds for the fiscal year 2017—the one we are working on now—to buy more heavy water from Iran. The second thing he sought was to do something about Iran's business of selling heavy water. What would the implications be about that for our own national security? Remember, this is a decision by the U.S. Department of Energy that was announced over the weekend without any notification to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee or to the Intelligence Committee or to the Armed Services Committee. So you have a U.S. Senator who is on the ball, and he says: OK, this is an issue I would like to do something about.

Our friends on the other side have raised an objection, especially Senator FEINSTEIN, for whom I have the greatest respect. So today, in talking with the Democratic leaders, I asked: May I talk with Senator COTTON and see if he will modify his amendment in a way that might be acceptable so that we can go on with the appropriations process and not blow it up?

It was blown up last year because we put controversial water language in the bill, and instead of bringing it to the floor and voting on it and letting the President veto it and then bringing it back, the Democrat majority decided we just wouldn't bring the bill to the floor.

This year I talked to the Democratic leaders. They wrote Senator MCCONNELL a letter, and we all agreed to try to have an appropriations process. What they said to me was, no controversial riders in committee. So I went through my whole committee with Senator FEINSTEIN, and we persuaded many Senators to leave their controversial amendments off the bill in committee, and we said to them: You can bring them up on the floor when they have 60 votes. If you can get 60 votes, you can put it in the bill, and if the President of the United States doesn't like it, he can veto it. Then it takes 67 votes to override it.

Here we are, early in the process in April, moving ahead, and all of a sudden I understand that the Democratic minority is going to block us from going forward because they don't like the Cotton amendment.

Let me say this, Mr. President, and I will stop my remarks. I think Senator COTTON has acted responsibly. He acted as soon as he knew about the Department of Energy's decision. He has listened to the objections that were raised by the other side. He has amended his own bill. He has offered for it to be adopted by voice vote. He has offered for it to be voted on at 60 votes.

As I said, he has modified it. He has completely taken out the part that could limit American businesses from getting licenses to buy heavy water from Iran. That is to be discussed at a later time. He has left in only the part that says you can't use fiscal year 2017 money to buy heavy water from Iran. But the Department can use prior year appropriated money, and it can use revolving fund money. It can buy all the heavy water Iran has if this President or the next President wants to. I think that is a very reasonable step, and I would ask the Democratic leader and the whip and Senator FEINSTEIN, all of whom I work with very well and for whom I have great respect, if they are determined to block the bill at noon. But let's keep talking about this because I think it is the basic constitutional framework of our U.S. Senate to do our job on appropriations, and Senators should be allowed to offer germane amendments.

When confronted with an objection on the other side, if they say ''well, 60 votes'' or ''voice vote'' or ''I will modify my amendment,'' that ought to be respected, and we should go ahead. Then if the President at the end still feels he wants to veto the bill, that is the way our process works. He vetoes it.

If we don't do this, we are going to end up with an omnibus bill. Senators won't have a chance to participate in it, and then the President will have to veto it in an omnibus bill at the end of the year. That is not the kind of process that earns the respect of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have the deepest respect, without any question, for the Senator from Tennessee, who is my friend, and, of course, Senator FEINSTEIN is already legendary as a figure in Democratic politics and politics of this country. But I have some reservation, for lack of a better description, about my friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee talking about the appropriations process.

I was on the Appropriations Committee from the first day I came to the Senate, and I loved my service on the Appropriations Committee. For the last 8 years under President Obama, the Republicans have done everything they could—I am trying to find a pleasant word—to mess up the appropriations process—everything.

For those who understand the Senate, everyone should know we didn't ask that there be cloture on a motion to proceed. We are as cooperative as we can be on everything we have done during the time we have been in the minority, which is more than a year now.

I would suggest to my friend that cloture will not be invoked on this bill

in 2 or 3 minutes. If there is some proposal that the Republicans want to come back with that is reasonable and doesn't have a poison pill in it, fine; we are willing to move forward on this. For someone to give me the statement ''Well, you know, it is germane''—the world is germane on this bill. I did this bill for 15 years. I did it. I know what is in this bill. Just about everything is germane. They have all kinds of defense stuff, energy and water—it is a big, big important bill, and this amendment by the Senator from Arkansas is nothing more than an effort to sidetrack the work we are doing here.

The Republicans are in the majority. I hope that it doesn't last that long, but that is where we are. It is up to them to move this process forward. We have tried our best to cooperate.

I suggest to my friend from Tennessee to see what happens and come back with something this afternoon. We have said on many occasions over the last 24 hours, we will vote right now on final passage of the bill—as it stood before this amendment was offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, as the Senator from Tennessee has said, the administration announced that they were purchasing heavy water from Iran on Friday night. On the first legislative day back on Monday, I proposed an amendment which is germane to the bill and thereby entitled to a simple majority threshold vote.

I have offered to give a voice vote to the Democrats so they don't have a record vote. I have offered to put it at a 60-vote threshold because there are 60 Senators who do not believe that the U.S. taxpayers should be subsidizing Iran's heavy water industry.

This morning, as Senator ALEXANDER said, I offered to revise my amendment, yet here we are. The Democrats are going to vote no on cloture, objecting to an amendment that is not pending and is not included in this legislation.

I, too, do not want to see the appropriations process end. I want to pass this bill. I want to move on to the next appropriations bill, and I am committed to continue working in good faith with the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from California to try to reach some solution, whether on this bill or any other, that we can move forward on in an orderly fashion and pass all of our appropriations bills, as well as ensure that the U.S. taxpayer is not subsidizing a critical component of Iran's nuclear industry, which, I may add, we are not required to do under the nuclear agreement with Iran.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. May I speak for a few minutes prior to the cloture vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, we have the Democratic leader on the floor and the chairman of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee. I want him, particularly, to know how very much it has meant to me to work with him to try to reverse the deterioration of order of this body.

That deterioration of order was the inability to pass an appropriations bill on its own and go back to what is called regular order. I have watched the Appropriations Committee lose prestige over the years. I have watched something happen that never happened in the early years. Members would vote for a bill in committee. They would come out, and they would sustain it on the floor.

So the Appropriations Committee gained, I think, a prestige and an honor in this body. I think it has been very wounded. So the ability of Senator ALEXANDER, my chairman, and myself to try to restore that order by sitting down and working out problems—and seeing that he gives, I give, we put together a bill, and we believe that bill can get through this body and that we can conference that bill successfully—is a really big deal to change the nature of this body, and we can show that we can get our job done.

Well, into this climate, which is so amicable and so positive, comes an amendment. I go to the White House. I pick up the phone. I call the Chief of Staff. I say: This is an amendment. It may affect the Iran deal. I would like to know what the administration's position is. The word back is that the administration will veto this bill if these words are in it.

So I began to learn a little bit about heavy water—what it is and what it is not—and how this all came about. So I understand the administration's problem with it, because it destroys something they are trying to do with the Iran agreement; that is, to show Iran a legal pathway with which it can proceed to go into the family of nations in a moderate way.

Iran happens to have a foreign minister whom I have known for at least 15 years. I know he believes in this Iranian agreement. I know he wanted to take Iran in another direction. I know it because he proposed an earlier plan when he was Ambassador to the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask unanimous consent for such time as I may consume. I will be short.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no objection if I can have the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. So, to make a long story short, this body discussed the joint agreement. We agreed that the President should go ahead and implement this agreement. Now, there are difficult problems because Iran is emerging and wanting to come into the family of nations in a positive way. They have to get this heavy water out. The heavy water is out. It is sitting in a store room in Oman.

Iran desires to sell it, just as India sells heavy water. Canada has sold heavy water to us. That heavy water is used for peaceful purposes, as the chairman said, for fiber optics, for medical research. Our National Labs are interested in it, and there are many companies that would use it to improve fiber optics and that kind of thing.

So it is a way of removing proliferation from the country. This is suddenly on our Energy and Water bill. I believe we have the votes to not enter into cloture at this time. I guess what I want to say is my very deep regret to my chairman. I don't want it to end this way. I want us to continue to work together. I truly believe that there is more in the interests of this country that we can do appropriations bills in regular order, with concurrence on both sides of the aisle, than the value of this amendment.

This amendment has raised hackles all over. So why can't it be left for another day? Why does it need to be on an appropriations bill? Why can't we have the ability to do one bill in this body that does not have a poison pill on it, to set an example for future bills? This was the bill—Senator ALEXANDER and I both know that—that was supposed to do that. Why can't a Member see this? Maybe he is a new Member. Maybe he does not understand what the years have been like.

Why can't he wait for another time? I have been here 24 years. I have waited for another time plenty of times, because someone said: Your amendment won't go well with the bill. Don't do it now. We may help you later.

I did it. Why destroy our chances? Because that is exactly what is happening.

So I just want Chairman ALEXANDER to know how very sad I am that we are at this point. I believe it is not necessary to be at this point. I believe we could show that we could do it. I would say that if cloture is not granted, we stand ready to continue to work to try to get a bill. But I would so appreciate it if a new Member could recognize this and say: Oh, I wanted to do this. It is my right to do it.

All of that I admit, but what you are doing is going to disturb our effort to produce a series of appropriations bills without poison pill riders.

I will predict that there will be more on other bills. Our effort, which the majority leader began with the Democratic leader—was to be able to put together a process where we could produce bills.

Please, think about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I will make brief concluding remarks and then we can vote. We are not debating the Iran agreement here today. This is the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill of the Appropriations Committee. We are not even debating the Cotton amendment. It is not even part of the bill. Senator COTTON has filed an amendment that could be part of the bill if the Senate decides to adopt it in our debate after we adopt cloture. He has done that.

Just to repeat, over the weekend, the U.S. Department of Energy, without any consultation with anybody in the Senate that I know about—without the Intelligence, Armed Services, or Foreign Relations Committees—decided it was going to buy heavy water from Iran. The Senator from Arkansas introduced an amendment on the subject.

My understanding of the way the Senate is supposed to work is that we save the controversial amendments for the floor. If you can get 60 votes, you pass them. Then, as Senators, if the issue is an important issue about which we disagree, we vote on it and we accept the vote. Sometimes we win, and sometimes we lose.

We also listen to each other. So if the other side says this is an especially difficult issue for us, we try to accommodate that. So the Senator from Arkansas has said that he will take 60 votes, although he is entitled to 51. He can force a 51-vote vote on this issue if he chose to do that, under parliamentary rules.

He said: I will take a voice vote. He does not have to do that. Then this morning he said: I will modify my amendment. I will eliminate all of the part about licenses. That is the second sentence of this very simple amendment. We will reserve that for discussion by the Armed Services, Foreign Relations, and other committees. So all that his amendment says is that you can't use money from this fiscal year to buy heavy water from Iran—except that the Department of Energy has potentially millions of dollars it could use from other years to do that, and it has a revolving fund it could use.

In effect, if this President or the next President wanted to continue to buy heavy water from Iran, it could do so. So I think the Senator from Arkansas is entirely within his rights, whether he has been here 2 years or 20 years. I think he is entitled to come up and ask for a vote. I think he has bent over backwards in offering three or four different ways to accommodate the concerns of the others.

I think it would be a real shame if we came up with yet one more reason not to have an appropriations bill after we have done all of this work, 80 Senators have made their contributions, and we have adopted 17 amendments.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 3801 to Calendar No. 96, H.R. 2028, an act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, Jerry Moran, John Boozman, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, Roy Blunt, Orrin G. Hatch, John Hoeven, John Thune, Thad Cochran, Roger F. Wicker, Mark Kirk, John McCain, Lindsey Graham, Johnny Isakson, Pat Roberts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 3801, offered by the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, as amended, to H.R. 2028, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

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 50, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 64 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Ernst	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rounds
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Daines	McCain	Wicker
Donnelly	Menendez	

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Heller	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Kaine	Sasse
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Lee	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	McCaskill	Udall
Coons	McConnell	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Fischer	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	
Gillibrand	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Sessions
Sanders	Toomey

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 46.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I think we have come up with yet another definition of obstruction today. Our Democratic friends are going to prevent the passage of an energy and water appropriations bill because of an amendment that is not yet pending to the bill in yet a new way to blow up the appropriations process.

Our Democratic colleagues were great at dysfunction when they were in the majority, and they are pretty good at it when they are in the minority. No matter what the issue—no matter what the issue—there is some new and creative way to try and throw a monkey wrench into the gears.

I heard over and over and over again that there was broad support on both sides of the aisle for getting the appropriations process moving again. The Senator from Arkansas has been extraordinarily reasonable. He has offered to modify his amendment. He has offered to consider it in some other context. Our chairman, Senator ALEXANDER, has been working on this for 24 hours. It ought not to be this hard to pass an energy and water appropriations bill that would be good for the country and that most of us support.

So I just moved to reconsider my vote, and we need to continue to talk about this because this is a ridiculous place for the Senate to be—ridiculous. We are all adults. We have all been elected by the people of our various States to come and act responsibly.

We are not going to give up on this bill, and when we finish this bill, we will go to a couple more appropriations bills. I think we have a collective responsibility in the Senate—Democrats and Republicans—to work our way past this snag and figure out the way forward, so we will have time to do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to say a word in response from the Democratic side.

First, I cannot think of two colleagues I admire more than Senator ALEXANDER and Senator FEINSTEIN. They are honorable people. It has been a pleasure to work with them and even to consider issues where we opposed one another because I knew it would be done in a professional and courteous way. They have spent more hours than I can calculate constructing one of the most important appropriations bills—the Energy and Water appropriations bill.

This bill was brought to the floor first by Senator MCCONNELL for good reason. We wanted to set a template, a model, for finishing the appropriations process, and I respect that. I have been honored to serve on the House Committee on Appropriations and now on the Senate Appropriations Committee, and I think it is a very important assignment. It has been many years since we have done our work in the way it was supposed to be done.

Without a budget resolution, we took the budget agreement, moved forward with the bills. There were countless opportunities for the minority, the Democrats, to slow down this process, to make it more difficult, to make it more complicated, and to demand votes and delays of 30 hours after 30 hours. We did not do that because we were trying to be positive and constructive.

I will not reflect on our experience in the majority, but I would say in response to the Republican leader, they broke the record in terms of filibusters on the floor of the Senate when the Republicans were in the minority. We don't want to go back to that era and we don't want to ''get even.'' That isn't what this is about.

There were basically two or three things guiding us in the process that I thought everyone signed up for, and I believe they did. One of them was balance between defense and nondefense spending overall; second, that each one of the bills hits a number that can be explained and rationalized based on the budget agreement; and third, the contentious issue of poison pills. These are subjects that are so controversial that if they are included in a bill, it becomes impossible to either pass it on the floor or expect the President to sign it.

So we thought, if we are going to exercise our opportunity with an appropriations process that works, those three things have to apply. I give credit to both Senator ALEXANDER and Senator FEINSTEIN for producing a bill in subcommittee that met those tests and didn't include any great controversial items, going through full committee with exactly the same outcome, and bringing it to the floor.

We were this close to the finish line—this close to the finish line—when yesterday the Senator from Arkansas, as is his right to do, offered an amendment. That amendment was offered around noon yesterday and the whole conversation changed. It was an amendment related to the Department of Energy, yes, but it was an amendment of great controversy because it was an amendment related to the President's agreement with Iran to stop them from the development of nuclear weapons.

Everyone knows what that was about. Every Republican opposed the President's agreement and four of ours on the Democratic side. It was a highly controversial and volatile subject for many months and continues to be on the Presidential trail. To bring this amendment into the bill at the last moment, as it was, is to invite a debate and a controversy which was not in the bill up to that point.

Now, was it the right of the Senator from Arkansas to do it? Yes. But I would just say that my experience in appropriations is, you would say to your colleague who had the right to offer an amendment: Let me just say in advance, this is going to slow down—it may even stop this bill. After all the work we have put into it, please don't offer that amendment, and if you do, I will have to oppose it.

Those are the basics for kind of going forward on a bipartisan basis to bring this bill to a conclusion.

We just had a procedural vote, and a few Republicans joined us, but the overwhelming majority of Democrats said we can't move forward on the bill until we resolve this basic question: If Senators will be allowed to offer amendments on the floor that are relevant to the bill and are controversial, we invite poison pills up to the very last moment when a bill can be considered.

There has to be a better way. We have to prove to America that we can get things done in its best interests. That means some Senators cannot offer every amendment they would like to offer. That is just part of the restraint which we ask of Members who are consciously trying to help us be constructive in the Senate.

I hope we can get back on track. The conversations are civil, as they should be between honorable people who are trying to work this out, and they need to continue. The underlying bill is very important. It is important to my State and to many other States. But let's finish this bill in the right way, in a bipartisan fashion, in a calm fashion, not in a confrontational fashion. We can do that. I am sorry we can't do it this morning. I hope we will all work together to achieve that goal as quickly as possible.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I would like to compliment my colleague from Illinois. He hit the nail on the head. I will be brief.

The Republican leader said this is a new level of obstruction. I don't know if it is a new level of obstruction; he has been pretty good at it over the years. But certainly, if we wanted to obstruct these bills, we wouldn't have let the motion to proceed go forward. We would have done 17 other things that were done time and time again in the past.

The way to stop this, I would say to the Republican leader, is very simple: Either prevail on Senator COTTON not to offer his amendment—no one is doing that. He has a right to do it. But in the old days, as Senator DURBIN said, the way the appropriations process worked, the chair of the subcommittee would say: Don't offer your amendment because it will be defeated and we will help defeat it because it will blow up the bill. Plain and simple. That is still an option.

We didn't offer the Cotton amendment. We could have offered our version of Cotton amendments to blow up this bill. We did not. Whether or not that was his intent—and I will not doubt the sincerity of my friend from Arkansas. But it was offered by the other side, and the onus is on the other side to fix this. The way to fix it is one of two: Either prevail on the Senator from Arkansas to pursue his goal here—that is certainly his right, but don't do it using the appropriations process as a hostage to move forward on his bill—or tell him that if he offers the bill, Republicans will vote against it as well. Then we can move forward.

That was how it used to work. When I was a junior Member and I wanted to offer amendments, some of them controversial, I would go to our chair or ranking member—depending on whether we were in the majority or minority—and say: I want to offer this amendment. The chair would consult with the other side, and they would come back and say: We, the majority/minority, cannot support this amendment. Then I wouldn't offer it. It would lose. That is the way the process used to work.

I don't begrudge any individual—the centrifugal forces in our politics have pulled things apart, so it is much harder for Members on both sides of the aisle to do it. But let's not turn that around. The obstruction and the failure to deal with obstruction is not coming from this side, it is coming from the other side, and they have an onus to fix it.

One more point before my good friend—and I love him—from Tennessee comes forward. Whatever we did, the President said he was going to veto this. So the idea that this bill would go forward and we would spend all this time on it and then have the President veto it—that doesn't accomplish the goals that I know my good friends, the chair of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee, want to pursue. The onus is on us to do it before we get to that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of Senator SCHUMER, Senator DURBIN, and Senator FEINSTEIN, for whom I have great respect.

The people who can figure this out are on the floor, and we ought to be able to, is the bottom line. I suspect a big part of the problem is timing. The administration apparently decided to do this over the weekend. We are in the middle of this bill. Senator COTTON would say that he moved as quickly as he could. And there is no question that this is an issue which raises lots of temperatures on both sides of the aisle. There is no doubt about that.

We have to have a balance. Senators have a right to take important issues and present them in an appropriate way here in the Senate. In just this bill, there are several times when I was one of only one or two or three Republicans who voted for amendments just so we could get the amendments through and we could keep the bill going. I know how that works, and I intend to keep doing it.

But I would say to my Democratic friends: I hope we can put our minds together and think of some way to allow Senator COTTON to make his point, to achieve what is an important objective and do it in a way that, A, is acceptable to the Democratic side, and B, doesn't have the problems that are associated with the timing. This came up on us all of a sudden. There are several reasons for that which we don't need to go into, but let's see if we can't work it out. I would certainly like to do that. I would like for Senator FEINSTEIN and myself to be able to set a good example for the rest of the Senate and get our bill through.

The only other thing I would say that is a little different from what the Senators from New York and Illinois said is that I don't really agree that if the President threatens a veto, we should stop our work. I think we would only be here about half a day a week. It is fine for the President to veto a bill if he feels he needs to, and he can send it right back. We consider that and we consider that it takes 67 to override it, and what often happens is we take something out or change some provision and send it back to him. So just because the President says he will veto a bill I don't think means the Senate should stop its work.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Of course.

Mr. SCHUMER. I understand that every time the President says ''veto,'' we shouldn't freeze in our tracks, but it would be a lot better if we could avoid that situation because we want this bill to pass and be signed into law.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I agree with the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I will not weigh in on this issue, but I might later. I am here for a different purpose. I did serve previously in the Senate several years ago, and this is my second time back. My experience with the amendment process was a pleasant one then. Any Senator at any time could offer an amendment to any bill, and it would be discussed and debated and voted on, and we accepted the fact that it was either a yea or a nay. It was part of a process that sometimes started here, sometimes started in the House, but it is a process that goes through many iterations.

So to determine that something at one step in the process takes the bill down ignores the fact that this bill will go over to the House of Representatives; they will debate it, and they will add things and subtract things; and then we will go to a conference to resolve the differences even before it gets to the President's desk.

Unfortunately, what has happened here is that on anything the President of the United States doesn't like, he simply says: I am going to veto it, so drop it.

So I agree with the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, in saying that if that is the process and the way this Senate is going to operate, we might as well just close the place down. We can maybe show up just to show people that we showed up for work. But we are not going to accomplish anything on this floor if that is the case.

The responsibility falls not just on us to do the job we were elected to do but also falls on the President to not try to torpedo a bill—there are multiple dimensions—because one amendment gets passed with the will of the Senate, including bipartisan support, but the President doesn't like it and therefore shuts the whole thing down.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Madam President, I am here for the 40th-something week to talk about the waste of the week, and I will do that now. The other issue is being very ably handled by Senator ALEXANDER, who is a veteran here and knows how to work through these conundrums.

With a Federal debt that is over $19 trillion and growing, it is fitting to take a long look at every penny the Federal Government appropriates to ensure that hard-earned taxpayer dollars are not wasted. I have been down here week after week with examples of waste.

Today, for my 41st edition of ''Waste of the Week,'' I would like to bring attention to an app the Transportation Security Administration paid IBM more than $47,000 to develop. ''App'' is a new word in our lexicon. We all carry around these new devices with which we can push a bunch of buttons and, by certain applications, access or do things that make life easier: monitor traffic on the road, getting the latest ballgame scores, checking on the weather. I have a whole bunch of apps on here.

I heard about an app that had been developed for the Transportation Security Administration called a randomizer app, and it does just two things. Very simply, it points an arrow to the right or to the left. Now, we might say, why would anybody need an app—a device—that randomizes an arrow to the right or an arrow to the left? Well, let's take a look at this picture here.

This is obviously a TSA agent. We have all been through this. This is a line at the airport. Those of us who go home every weekend—I go back to Indiana on Thursday night or Friday—are very familiar with these lines because we have to go through the security process.

This is a TSA agent using this app. As we can see, it is a screen and it has a big arrow.

When you walk through Reagan National Airport to go home every week—as I know the Presiding Officer does to go back to Iowa—there are several lanes you can go down. Almost always there is a transportation security agent or someone associated with the process standing at the beginning of the lines and, with an arrow, saying ''Take this one'' or ''Take that one.'' Well, I don't know about the details, but for some reason, they didn't want that to be an individual decision, so they called up IBM and said: We need to develop an app that will allow us to have a screen that has an arrow pointing to the left or to the right. And it needs to be random; it can't be controlled by this person.

For whatever reason, it needs to be random. OK. Maybe there is a rational reason TSA needs to do that for security purposes, and without divulging what that is or knowing what that is, I won't get into that, but obviously it doesn't take a lot of money to develop a screen that has an arrow to the left, an arrow to the right, and a little bit of software running in the background randomizing so that you can't figure out whether it is going to be left or right. It does it all by itself.

I wondered, how much would this cost? So we did a little research. What we found is that this is such a simple application that it can be developed by a developer of apps within a 10-minute period of time.

So taxpayers paid $47,000 to build an app that had an arrow pointing one way or the other. Now, $47,000 is minuscule compared to what we waste around here, and I have a chart here that shows well over $160 billion of waste, fraud, and abuse tallied up during my 40 visits to the Senate floor to talk about the various ways the government wastes taxpayer dollars. But this one baffles me because something which is so simple and which takes 10 minutes to produce costs $47,000—well above the average income for the average worker in Indiana and in many cases significantly more than the TSA agent who is holding it is paid annually for the work they do.

So here we are once again. People might ask: Well, could we have done this in an easier way? Well, how about flipping a coin? That is random. Tails, go in this lane; heads, you are in this lane. How about drawing from a hat? The TSA person standing at the line can have a hat with a whole bunch of slips of paper in it that say ''left'' and ''right.'' Go ahead, put your hand in, and pull it out.

What does it say?

Left.

That is over there.

What does it say?

Right.

That is over here.

Maybe we can do what I do with my grandkids. I put my fists behind my

back, and I will have one or two fingers extended. They all get excited and so forth. The brother is elbowing his little sister so she won't win, and the third child is crying, maybe, because they are not letting her play.

So I say: OK, Charlie, is it a one or a two?

Two.

Charlie: Yay, I won.

His sister starts crying.

No, no. You are going to get your chance.

All right, Maggie, you pick a one or a two.

Anyway, we may go through each. I have 10 grandkids, so this takes a long time when we have family reunions.

Any one of those processes could be used, and I don't think it would cost $47,000. It wouldn't be $4.70. It is just something we could do.

I used to serve as the lead Republican on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security. I know how difficult it is for the Homeland Security Subcommittee to fund the critical elements they need to fund and the programs they need to fund in order to keep us secure. Every penny counts, and every dollar counts in this regard.

This type of egregious waste has got to stop. Perhaps it is time for TSA to precheck—we are all familiar with precheck, another thing we have to go through—these programs before we fund them. As we continue to determine funding levels for various government programs and agencies, we must remember projects such as TSA's randomizer app. This is yet another example of why minimizing waste, fraud, and abuse will go a long way to restore trust in government decisions as to how our tax money is spent.

I just realized I missed out on naming one of my grandchildren who I play this with, and that is Avery—the sister of Charlie—who wants to make sure that she is in the game also. I will not go through the other seven. I will save those for another time.

Let me note that we add more money—ever more money and examples of taxpayer waste. We are up to $162,277,955,817. This is big money. It is nothing to laugh about. This is a small example. We have had examples in the billions of dollars. We owe it to the taxpayer. We owe it to the hard-earned tax dollars that are earned by hard-working taxpayers to be as efficient and effective with the spending of their money as we possibly can. Once again, this is the waste of the week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

FIGHTING WILDFIRES

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, according to the Forest Service—and we checked with them this morning—there is right now an 11,000-acre fire burning in the Shenandoah National Park in Virginia. This is just April, not the time when one normally thinks you are going to have fires when the fire season is on. But there is a fire burning in the Shenandoah National Park in Virginia that has already cost more than $3 million. This is the second largest fire in Shenandoah National Park history.

I have come to the floor this afternoon to once again make the case for the Senate, on a bipartisan basis—Democrats and Republicans—to come together to fix this dysfunctional system of fighting fire in America. I am going to describe it, but let me talk first a little bit about the consequences.

In the American West, we used to talk about the seasons in a way that Americans had done for decades and decades: harvesting crops in the fall, skiing in the winter, fishing during the spring salmon runs, and camping in the summers. We fought fire during the wildfire season. But when Americans in the West talk about the seasons now, they are talking about the seasons of yesteryear. That is because the wildfire season raging across our forests and special places is no longer limited to a single time of the year.

Fighting fires has become a continuous battle virtually year-round throughout the country. That is why this fire burning in the Shenandoah National Park ought to be a wake-up call once again to everyone to understand how important it is to fix this broken system of fighting fire, because the funding system for doing so is leading to dysfunction throughout the Forest Service and contributing to the breakdown of the national forest management that is needed to prevent catastrophic wildfires in the first place.

According to the Forest Service, 1.4 million acres have already burned across America this year. That is more than twice the 10-year average for this time of year. These numbers show, in my view, how important it is that urgent action be taken to fix the way we fund wildfire fighting operations. This is something that Senator CRAPO and I have been working on for some time.

With the support of scores of organizations, well over 200, a significant number of bipartisan Senators and a significant number of bipartisan House Members have all joined in this effort, because it is not just the West that has been impacted. Forest Service work in States that manage timber sales, stream restoration, trail maintenance, and recreation get shortchanged when money has been diverted to fighting wildfires.

I was particularly struck last year when we had the good fortune of having the senior Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, join as a cosponsor of our legislation. The reason he did so is because this absolutely dysfunctional system of fighting fires has resulted in important priorities for New York State not being in a position to secure the funding they need. That is because the rising costs of fighting fires keeps raiding all these other programs in the Forest Service that are needed to help prevent fires down the road.

The raids take place two different ways. Certainly, in my part of the world, we are very troubled by the fact that you have prevention getting short shrift. Then it gets really hot and dry. We have lots of thunderstorms in our part of the world, and all of a sudden we have an inferno on our hands. Then what happens is the agencies end up borrowing from the prevention fund to put the fire out, and the problem gets worse because you have repeatedly shorted the prevention program.

This is what is called fire borrowing, and it happens not just in the West. That is why the senior Senator from New York wanted to be a cosponsor of our legislation, because programs that were important in New York State, thousands and thousands of miles away from the forests of eastern and central Oregon—those were a problem for programs he cared about and to secure their funding as a result of this dysfunctional system, just like it has been for people in the West.

It is time for the Congress to find a solution to ensure that, one, wildfires can be fought; and, two, to control the cost of fighting these wildfires by better preparing our forests and making them healthier.

I am very pleased that the chair of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the committee I had the honor of chairing in the past, Senator MURKOWSKI, and Ranking Member CANTWELL are committed to working on this issue, and I wanted to once again reaffirm my commitment. I know Senator CRAPO shares this view to work with them to find a solution to wildfire funding that can pass in this Congress.

I certainly have some ideas, and I am very interested in welcoming my colleagues' ideas and I have been for some time.

For example, last year in the summer, it was pretty clear that it was going to be a tough fire season. What I and others essentially sought to do was to find a way to get our colleagues working together to try to find some common ground and get this resolved. We couldn't quite get it done. We are now going to be at this day in and day out, week in and week out. Senator CRAPO and I will be working with our colleagues and their staff on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and on the Budget Committee and with Members from the other body to find a solution that works for all sides of the issue.

We saw last summer that this was going to be a problem. A big group of us got together and said we have to get it resolved. We couldn't quite thread the needle. This time we have to make sure that gets done. There are not a lot of certainties in life, but the fire season is one of them, and the Congress simply cannot let this problem continue.

I wanted to come to the floor, particularly today, to take note of the fact that the fire in the Shenandoah

area ought to be a wake-up call to everybody. If they are having one of the biggest fires they have ever had this early in April, that is a signal of what is to come. It has been the story of summer after summer. Now we are learning, as I indicated earlier—and it appears it is not just in the West—that we are thinking about the seasons and talking about the seasons of yesteryear because now it is fire season all year round.

My colleague is here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator from Oregon.

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the most important words in the crafting of our Constitution are the first three words: ''We the People.'' With those three words, the Founders described what the government of our new Nation was all about.

As President Lincoln later summarized, it is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. In fact, even in the crafting of the Constitution, the Founders put special emphasis upon those three words, putting them in supersized font before all the details that were to follow.

Periodically, I will come to the floor to talk about issues that are closely related to the ''we the people'' vision of our Constitution and our responsibilities under the Constitution. This week, I rise to address the responsibility of the Senate and its advice and consent role under the Constitution.

The President's duty is to nominate a Supreme Court nominee when there is a vacancy. That responsibility is written very clearly into the Constitution. It says that ''he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint . . . Judges of the supreme Court'' in article II, section 2 of our beloved Constitution.

The Senate then has the responsibility to provide advice and consent, as required, and over time it has been understood that we need to vet the nominee, determine whether the nominee is fit to serve in the post he or she will serve in, which is particularly important in the Supreme Court. That is how this esteemed Chamber, our beloved Senate, has operated for more than 200 years.

In fact, we need to go back now and understand how this design was created. I have come to the floor before and read from Hamilton's Federalist Paper 76 that summarizes a conversation that was taking place over the nomination process. Some folks—in crafting the Constitution—thought that responsibility should be solely with what they referred to as ''the assembly,'' which is this body, the Senate. The reason they argued that is, it would be a balance to the power of the President in the executive branch if the assembly, the legislative branch, were to make the appointments. However, they then realized that those appointments would probably never get done because there would likely be a lot of horse trading and the most qualified person probably wouldn't be nominated. Instead, it would most likely be the friend of one Senator traded for the friend of another Senator, and that didn't make sense. They said: No, it would make more sense to invest the responsibility for the quality of the individual in a single individual. As the expression goes, the buck stops here. It stops at the President's desk. The President would have the responsibility to nominate individuals to serve in the executive and judicial branches and will bear the public responsibility for the credibility and quality of those nominations, but in that conversation, they also thought that was too much power for the President to have. What if the President starts to appoint friends or those with little experience or those of unfit moral character? There needs to be some kind of check, so in that regard then came the role of the Senate to give advice and consent. In order to do that, the nomination would go before this body for debate and then this body would vote on that nominee.

The words that were the key words Hamilton used in describing the responsibility was to determine whether the individual was ''of unfit character''—fit character, unfit character. Did that nominee have the qualifications necessary for the job and the personal characteristics required to fulfill the job effectively?

Well, here we are and President Obama has fulfilled his responsibility under the Constitution. He has nominated Judge Merrick Garland. We now have our responsibility in the Senate to vet this nominee, examine Judge Garland's record, examine any aspect of his writings or his previous court decisions, and determine whether Judge Garland is a fit character or unfit character. That is our responsibility in the Constitution.

A number of my colleagues across the aisle—my Republican colleagues—have said: We don't want to fulfill our responsibility under the Constitution. We are just going to ignore the responsibility that has been vested in the Senate of the United States. They are in the majority, and a nomination can't go to a committee for a hearing and determine whether an individual is of fit character or unfit character without the majority making it happen. The nomination can't come to the floor without a majority vote in committee so it can then be put forward for our consideration. Unfortunately, the job strike of the majority party in the Senate—failing to fulfill its responsibility under our Constitution—is now imposed on this entire body.

If we were within the usual timeline, we would be holding a hearing on Judge Garland this week. Since 1975, the average time from nomination to committee hearing has been about 42 days, but instead the leadership has said: We are not going to honor our responsibility. I find that deeply disturbing. Each and every one of us stood before this body and took an oath to fulfill our responsibilities under this Constitution, and that is what we should be doing right now.

I say to my colleagues: Do your job. After a bit of reflection on the importance of how our government functions, one would think there would be a bit of reflection upon what we owe to maintain the integrity of our institutions and that this decision to go on a job strike would have been reversed.

I have talked to colleagues who are, quite frankly, somewhat embarrassed because they have been asked to toe the line, and they don't feel it is right that they should be, in fact, failing to fulfill their responsibility, but there is a lot of pressure on them. We need to set aside political pressure when it comes to the integrity of our institutions.

Since the 1980s, every person appointed to the Supreme Court has been given a prompt hearing and a vote within 100 days of their nomination. This chart shows three different phases as to the vacancies. Sometimes those vacancies have been longer or shorter in terms of before a nomination occurs. The red bar shows the start of the nomination process and the green bar shows the time before a vote is taken, which is the period of consideration. In every case, the red and green bar together are 100 days or less. This dates all the way back to Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

It has now been 100 days. How many days are there between now and when the next President takes office? What is the math? Well, there are 268 days. So for anyone who comes to this floor and says there isn't time, that individual is making a case with no foundation because the record shows that from the time the nomination was made until a vote, time and time again—under Democrats or under Republicans—it has been less than 100 days. Yet we have more than 260 days left before the next President takes office.

There are other folks who have come to the floor of this Chamber and have invented this new principle called the job strike during the last year that a President is in office. They act as if there is something in the Constitution which gives this Senate permission not to do its job during the last year a President is in office. Well, I encourage my friends to pull out and read the Constitution, find that clause, and bring it to the floor because it does not exist. The Constitution anticipates that each of us will fulfill our responsibilities throughout the entire length we serve until we exit office, that a President will serve and work through all 4 years of his or her term, that a Senator will serve and work through all 6 years of his or her term. There is no vacation in the Constitution for the last year. There is no special permission to fail to do your constitutional

responsibility in the last year of a term. That simply doesn't exist.

Many Supreme Court Justices have been confirmed in the final year of a Presidency, and so for those who come to this floor and argue that there is some historical precedent, that precedent doesn't exist either. Republican and Democratic Presidents have issued nominations regardless of the party in control of the Senate and the Senate, regardless of the party of the President, has done its job in case after case after case throughout time. Until this moment, the Senate has vetted the nominees, individual Senators have met with the nominee, the nominee's record has been exposed, thereby giving the public the opportunity to give us their input, and we would have voted in committee and on this floor.

(Mr. BARRASSO assumed the Chair.)

If we look to the recent past, Justice Kennedy was confirmed in the last year of President Reagan's final term. By the way, the Senate was controlled by Democrats. The Democratic leadership didn't say: We are going to go on a job strike and not vet the candidate and not hold a vote and not fulfill our responsibility. No, they honored their responsibility under the Constitution and so should every Senator today.

This is a black mark on the record of the Senate. Think about what it will lead to. For example, let's say the job strike we are engaged in is purely for political reasons in an effort to pack the Court with more conservative Justices. Let's say it succeeds in delaying a nomination until the next Presidency, and the next President nominates someone on the far edges and way out of the mainstream, then what does each party do? Do they say: Well, the other party worked to pack the Court and refused to do their job, and, now, because the consequences would be so destructive and so partisan to the Court, we will refuse to do our job but only because of what preceded it? That is not a conversation we should ever have. That is not a dialogue we should ever have in this Chamber of action to politicize the Court, pack the Court, followed by reaction to try to blunt the impact of the initial action, followed by reaction, back and forth. This will deeply undermine the integrity of the Supreme Court of the United States. Let me tell you, the Court is already in trouble. The activist Court decisions of the far right, trying to write legislation through Court decisions to change the fundamental understandings of how our Nation operates, have already deeply politicized the Court.

Citizens United turned the fundamental premise written into our Constitution on its head. Our Constitution was written all about, ''We the People.'' Jefferson talked about the mother principle; that we could only claim to be a republic to the degree that the decisions reflected the will of the people and that in order for that to happen, citizens had to have an equal voice. His vision was one of the town's square, where there was no cost to participate. Everyone had a chance to stand and have their say.

Lincoln talked about the equal voice principle for citizens. The fundamental premise in a republic is to express the will of the people. People have to have the ability to participate in roughly equal proportion, but now the town square is for sale. It is the television, the Internet, the Web sites, the radio, and our Court has decided it is OK for the very rich to buy it up and destroy the equal voice principle that our Founders so cherished.

This activist Court on the far right has decided to undermine those important first three words of the Constitution: ''We the People.'' This has produced a great cynicism in America because once this massive concentration of money buys up the town square, buys up the airwaves, influences elections, it is no longer ''We the People,'' it is ''we the powerful'' and ''we the privileged.'' Wouldn't it be wonderful not to have had the Supreme Court decisions that have undermined the integrity of our Supreme Court, but we have them and now the majority in this body wants to further damage the Supreme Court, further politicize the Supreme Court, and that is a huge mistake. We should go in the other direction. We should invest in the integrity of the Supreme Court. That doesn't mean a nominee gets automatically passed through this body because we have a job under the Constitution. We have a responsibility to vet the nominee. We have the responsibility, as Hamilton said, to judge if the nominee is unfit or fit. But how can you have that judgment if we do not hold hearings? How can you have that judgment if the committee does not vote? How can you have that judgment if there is not a debate on the floor of the Senate? How can you have that judgment if there is not a vote on this floor?

So I say to my colleagues: End your job strike that is so out of sync with the tradition of the Senate. End your job strike that is so damaging to the Supreme Court's integrity. End your job strike that is so damaging to the ''we the people'' principles of our Nation. Do your job. Do your job. Hold the hearing. Meet with the nominee. Exercise your vote. Do your job.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF MERRICK GARLAND

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the nomination of Merrick Garland to the United States Supreme Court and to urge my colleagues to grant timely consideration to the President's nominee.

I recently had the pleasure of meeting Chief Judge Garland, as have many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I encourage all Senators to meet the nominee because I suspect that they will find, as I did, that the rumors are true; he is an exceptionally qualified nominee.

Since joining the DC Circuit, Chief Judge Garland has been recognized as one of the best appellate judges in the Nation. His reputation for working with colleagues to identify areas of agreement and to craft strong consensus decisions is well earned.

After meeting Judge Garland and discussing the way that he approaches his role as a judge and as a chief judge, I am pleased to agree with my colleague and friend Senator HATCH, who described Judge Garland in 1997 in this way:

> I believe Mr. Garland is a fine nominee. . . . I know of his integrity. I know of his legal ability. I know of his honesty. I know of his acumen. And he belongs on the court.

Senator HATCH is right. He was talking about, of course, the DC Circuit—the second court in the Nation, really.

Before Judge Garland was nominated, the White House reached out to me and to many of my colleagues, especially those on the Judiciary Committee, to ask the type of nominee whom I hoped President Obama would put forward or whether I had any particular names in mind. I didn't. My only recommendation was that the President nominate someone whose intellect, experience, and demeanor would be apparent during a hearing and would cause the American people who watched the confirmation hearing to say: I want nine of those on the Supreme Court. This is what I told the White House.

Now that I have met Judge Garland, I will set about the task of reviewing Judge Garland's full record and all of his opinions. I will set that aside, but the American people deserve to meet him and decide for themselves whether he is qualified to sit on the highest Court in the land. The American people deserve a hearing.

In my view, confirmation hearings also serve a broader purpose. Hearings aren't just an opportunity for the public to get to know the nominee and discover how he or she views important issues; open, public hearings provide an opportunity for the American people to learn about the Supreme Court's jurisprudence and to demystify the Court's role in our democracy. Hearings also allow our constituents to see and judge for themselves how and whether their government is working, whether we are doing our jobs.

Before any of us knew whom the President would nominate, Senate Republicans wasted no time in refusing to fill the vacancy until after the election. The majority leader said that ''this vacancy should not be filled until we have a new President.'' The Republican members of the Judiciary Committee gathered behind closed doors

and vowed to deny the eventual nominee a hearing. Many Republicans refused to even meet with the nominee. They said it didn't matter who the President nominated. This was about principle.

This type of obstruction marks a historic dereliction of the Senate's constitutional duty. Since 1916—for the past 100 years—the Senate Judiciary Committee has fulfilled that duty by holding hearings. Nonetheless, Senate Republicans stood firm in their opposition.

But within a day of Judge Garland's nomination being announced, some Republicans began to change their tune. Once they discovered that the President had nominated a consensus candidate—a judge who had earned the praise of so many Republican Senators during the course of his career—their calculus began to change.

Now my Republican friends are tying themselves in knots trying to explain to the American people how they plan to move forward. Quite a few Republican Senators broke ranks and agreed to meet Judge Garland privately while nonetheless maintaining that the Senate should not grant the nominee an open, public hearing. It would seem that some of my colleagues believe they—not the public and not their constituents—deserve the opportunity to meet and to question the nominee.

A few Republicans said that they would consider Judge Garland and even vote to confirm him in the lameduck session—but only if Democrats win the White House. That is a very odd sense of what the principle is here. I guess the thinking behind that is the Republicans are afraid that should the election not go in the direction they prefer, then the people shouldn't decide. They should decide unless they decide the wrong thing. That is the odd principle that I have heard in the Judiciary Committee when we have had business meetings, where members come in and make a statement and then leave. I hear a lot of contradictory stuff. Obviously, the theory is that should a Democrat be elected to the White House, they might eventually face a nominee who hasn't earned quite as much bipartisan praise, so then we will do Garland. That is absurd. That has nothing to do with principle. This has nothing to do with principle, and it never did. This is about politics.

The Supreme Court is too important, too central to our system of democracy to let it fall victim to partisan politics. It has been just over 1 month since President Obama nominated Judge Garland to fill the vacancy caused by the death of a Justice. During that month, the effect of allowing a vacancy to persist has been made clear. The eight-member Court has deadlocked twice, handing down two 4-to-4 decisions. Permitting a seat on the Supreme Court bench to remain vacant means that, in some cases, the Court is not able to fulfill its core function of resolving the splits among the courts of appeals and serve as a final arbiter of our laws. The Court isn't able to do its job.

I think we have to go through our history and look at when Justice Marshall was appointed in the last weeks, I believe, of that administration.

I hope my Republican colleagues are finally coming to the understanding that they have an obligation to fill this vacancy. Members of the Senate and of the Judiciary Committee in particular have an obligation to do our jobs, to get to work.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFEND TRADE SECRETS BILL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, this afternoon the House of Representatives is poised to pass the Defend Trade Secrets Act, bringing this critical proposal one step closer to becoming law. Over the past few months, Senator COONS and I have witnessed a groundswell of support for our bill, which will strengthen the ability of American companies to defend their most valuable information from theft.

Businesses, both large and small, and lawmakers, both Republican and Democrat, have rallied around our legislation, providing the impetus we need to pass this key intellectual property bill. Passage of the Defend Trade Secrets Act marks not only a watershed moment for the intellectual property community, it also represents a victory for the American people.

To appreciate the significance of this legislation, we must first understand the importance of trade secrets in American industry. Trade secrets are the lifeblood of our economy. In simple terms, trade secrets are the groundbreaking ideas that give businesses a competitive advantage. They range from unique production and manufacturing processes to food recipes and software codes.

This critical form of intellectual property is not only invaluable to individual business owners, it is also directly responsible for creating millions of jobs in our country. But a lack of Federal legal protection leaves trade secrets vulnerable to theft and oversight that cost the economy billions of dollars each year.

Two years ago, Senator COONS and I set out to fix this problem together. From the very beginning, we sought the input of business owners and job creators so that we could better understand the obstacles facing American industry and chart a path forward for reform. The Defend Trade Secrets Act is the culmination of our work.

Under current law, companies have few legal options to recover their losses when trade secrets are stolen. For example, if a disgruntled employee steals a Utah company's confidential information and leaks it to a competitor in another State, attorneys must navigate a complex labyrinth of State laws just to bring suit. This cumbersome process can take weeks, which is an eternity in a trade secrets case. During this time, the likelihood that valuable intellectual property falls into the wrong hands increases every day, as does the potential for permanent damage to the company.

Our bill solves this problem by creating a uniform Federal law that businesses can turn to when their trade secrets are stolen. This Federal standard keeps companies from getting bogged down in State laws by allowing business owners to take their case directly to a Federal court. Essentially, our legislation removes an unnecessary and time-consuming layer of bureaucracy, buying businesses precious time to recover stolen information. By providing America's businesses with the ability to protect their most valuable information in Federal courts, they will be better equipped to safeguard trade secrets and increase their competitiveness.

The President has expressed strong support for our legislation, which he intends to sign into law shortly after it passes the House.

The Defend Trade Secrets Act is not only a win for the intellectual property and business communities, it is also an example of what Congress can accomplish when we put party politics aside and find common ground. Indeed, it is always easy to make things look hard, but it is impossible to make things look easy.

Today's House passage of the Defend Trade Secrets Act truly embodies countless hours of negotiations and hard work. I wish to recognize those who made passage of this bill a reality, including Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, Representative DOUG COLLINS, and Representative JERROLD NADLER. They were indispensable in shepherding this legislation through the House.

I also wish to thank Senators GRASSLEY, LEAHY, GRAHAM, FEINSTEIN, FLAKE, WHITEHOUSE, and many others for their contributions to this bill. Likewise, I thank my dear friend Senator COONS for joining me in coauthoring this bill. He has been an invaluable partner throughout this process.

Enacting meaningful public policy in the midst of a toxic Presidential campaign is no small accomplishment. With the imminent passage of the Defend Trade Secrets Act, our Nation has cause for celebration.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. 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.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I actually come to the Senate floor to talk about the urgent need to help make college more affordable for American families.

Earlier this year, I launched a comment form on my Web site encouraging people to share their struggles to afford college and how their student debt is affecting them. Since then, I have heard from so many students and families from my home State of Washington and across the country. By sharing these stories, I hope we can all come together to work on ways to bring down college costs and make sure students can graduate from college without the crushing burden of student debt.

I recently heard from a young woman named Katy. She is a junior studying psychology at Gonzaga University in Spokane, WA. Katy said she always knew that attending college was going to be financially difficult, although it never occurred to her to let that stand in her way. Because her parents were not in a position to help her out financially, and because she couldn't afford to make regular tuition payments, she has had to take on a large amount of student loans, and she wasn't able to live with her parents, so she has also had to plan and pay for room and board for all 4 years.

Now, here is a typical workweek for Katy. Katy works 12 hours a week as part of the Gonzaga Student Body Association. At least 2 nights a week, and usually on weekends, she makes hundreds of calls on behalf of the Gonzaga Telefund. On most weekend nights, she is not out with her friends and family. Instead, she is babysitting for some extra cash to put toward her textbooks. On top of all that, she is also a math tutor, which, until recently, was a paid position before the department's budget was cut, but she has kept tutoring anyway as her way to give back. That is just who she is. Of course, that is all on top of being a full-time student as well.

Let me be clear. Katy is very glad to be investing in herself and her future. She knows it is tough work and she appreciates that, but she, like millions of other students, is just looking for a little relief. In her own words, she admits ''it's a constant stressor thinking of how to pay for life while at college, and how I'm going to pay for all of this after I graduate.''

Students like Katy aren't alone. Across the country, the yearly cost of tuition and room and board at a public 4-year institution is 5½ times what it was in the early 1980s, and to afford those skyrocketing pricetags, people are turning to student loans to cover the cost. Today, Americans across the country hold a total of $1.3 trillion in outstanding student loan debt.

In my home State of Washington, the average college student owes more than $24,000 in student debt. Think about what that debt means for our students. These students are doing everything right. They are investing in their futures. Many of them are the first in their families to go to college, but when it is time to look for that first job, just starting out, they are already in the red.

I have been so glad to work with other Senate Democrats on legislation actually called ''In the Red'' that would help students like Katy. Our bill would give students the chance to attend community college tuition-free. It would make sure the amount of Pell grants keeps up with the rising cost of college, and it would let borrowers refinance their student debt to today's lower rates. Our bill is fully paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes that only serve to benefit the biggest corporations and the wealthiest few.

This issue for me is personal. When I was young, my dad was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis. Within a few short years, he couldn't work any longer. Without warning, my family had fallen on hard times. I have six brothers and sisters, and thankfully all of us were able to go to college with help from what is now called Pell grants, and my mom was able to get the skills she needed to get a job. She had been a stay-at-home mom. She needed to go to work, and she got that job through a worker training program at Lake Washington Vocational School with government help.

Even through those hard times, our family never lost hope that with a good education, we would be able to find our footing and earn our way to a stable, middle-class life. This country has never turned its back on my family, and today we can't turn our backs on the millions of families just like mine who need a path forward to afford college and pay back their student debt.

I hope we can pass this bill and pave the way for lower college costs and less student debt. I hope we can work together to give students and families some much needed relief. Let's make sure they know we will never let up and that we will always have their backs.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

VENEZUELA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I wish to speak about two separate topics. The first is Venezuela.

Venezuela is a country in our hemisphere in total crisis, total chaos, and that is because of a number of things: failed leadership, failed economic policies, a complete societal breakdown, human rights abuses, and now a de facto political coupe that has plagued the country for about 15 years. This all started with Hugo Chavez and has now continued with Nicolas Maduro, his successor.

Let's talk about the first cause of the disaster that has now befallen the people of Venezuela—failed leadership. For over 15 years now, Venezuela has been ruled by two strongmen who have mismanaged the country with an iron fist, have squandered its vast wealth and natural resources, they have imprisoned political opponents, they have corrupted all of the country's political institutions to ignore the will of the people and to entrench their power.

By the way, this failed leadership has only gotten worse because the successor to Hugo Chavez is a completely incompetent person. On top of the fact he is a strongman, he is incompetent. He does not know what he is doing. The result is this very wealthy country, with a highly educated population, is being led by someone who, quite frankly, isn't qualified to lead anything, much less a nation of the stature of Venezuela.

The second cause is failed economic policies. Venezuela suffers from shortages across the board. For example, there are shortages of medicine and medical equipment, which means—and this is not an exaggeration—people are literally dying because their doctors cannot prescribe drugs that aren't available, and the hospitals and the clinics don't have the equipment needed to conduct surgeries. When you speak to medical professionals in Venezuela, they will tell you there are simple medications that could save the life of an individual, but they can't do anything about it. I had someone tell me today they asked a doctor: What do you do when one of your patients is about to die? And he said: Nothing. We comfort them as they die. We don't have basic medicines to deliver to them.

Unlike the case of Cuba, by the way, where they are saying it is because of the embargo by the United States—which of course is ridiculous and is another topic for another day—there is no embargo on Venezuela. There are no sanctions on Venezuela and its people. So as a result, there is no explanation for this.

The supermarkets are bare. The shelves are completely bare. People there cannot buy food or even basics such as toilet paper, toothpaste, toothbrushes—anything.

In addition to the government's political censorship effort, its economic policies also help censor in the sense that there are shortages of paper that independent newspapers need to print their editions. So here is another Machiavellian move the government has made. There is a shortage of paper, and so they make sure the independent press has no access to paper. If you don't have paper, you can't print a newspaper.

Things are so bad in Venezuela, economists earlier this month compared Venezuela to Mugabe's Zimbabwe of 15 years ago. The reason that is an

unbelievable comparison is because, as I said earlier, Venezuela has one of the largest, if not the largest, oil reserves in the world; they have a highly educated population; they have a well-established business class of professionals; and last year their economy shrank by 5.7 percent, and this year it will shrink by another 8 percent. This is a country that now has rolling blackouts—an energy-rich country that has rolling blackouts. It has gotten so bad that today their so-called President, the incompetent Nicolas Maduro, announced that government employees are only going to work 2 days a week, Mondays and Tuesdays. Government offices will be open only 2 days a week because they aren't turning on the lights. This is the state of one of the richest countries in the world and one of the richest countries in our hemisphere.

They have had a total societal breakdown. Economic misery begets desperation, and we are seeing that reflected in the lawlessness that plagues Venezuela. Crime rates are among the highest in the hemisphere, particularly the murder rate. It stems from the top, at the highest levels of leadership. When an incompetent thug is running a country—someone whose government intimidates opponents by using what they call colectivos, which are nothing more than street gangs, to ride around on motorcycles, causing all kinds of mayhem, shooting and attacking people—it only contributes to the lawlessness. Caracas, Venezuela, which is a beautiful city, is one of the most dangerous places in the world, comparable with war zones in terms of the murder rate. It is basically every man and woman for himself and herself in Venezuela.

They have atrocious human rights abuses. Since the government's crackdown on demonstrators and political opponents began in February of 2014, dozens of innocents have been killed, thousands have been beaten and targeted for intimidation, and hundreds have been jailed, including Leopoldo Lopez, who has been a political prisoner now for more than 2 years.

We need to demand the release of all 115 political prisoners in Venezuela and respect their rights and those of their families. I heard another horrifying story today. Most political prisoners are men. When their wives go visit them in prison, their wives are strip searched by male guards as an ultimate act of humiliating them. This is the situation in Venezuela.

Last, but not least, we have a de facto political coup by the Maduro regime. This country faces a real political and constitutional crisis. Maduro has stacked the country's supreme court with his loyalists, and the supreme court is basically nullifying every law the Congress there passes.

The opposition won the election in the last cycle. By the way, they won because the discontent with the government is so massive that they couldn't steal the election. It was so big that not even they could steal the election from them, so they sat this new Congress. He has stacked the supreme court, and the supreme court is literally nullifying law after law—doing it not for judicial reasons but for blatantly political ones.

Maduro basically ignores the law. The congressional branch there will pass a law with a veto-proof majority, and he just ignores it. Imagine passing a law out of the House, out of the Senate, and sending it to the President. He can't veto it, and so he just ignores it or refuses to do it.

That is the situation in our own hemisphere. The result is an incredible disaster—of deep interest to us, by the way, because of all the uncertainty it is causing in the region. So what can we do about it? First of all, it is in our national interest. The current situation is happening in our own hemisphere. It threatens to destabilize the region. It creates more pressure on our neighbors and our strategic allies, such as Colombia, where Venezuelans have been fleeing to. This creates migratory pressures on the United States. The lawlessness is fueling organized crime, including drug cartels, which senior government officials in Venezuela have established links to, which impacts our entire region.

For these reasons and more, the United States has an interest in making sure Venezuela does not spiral further out of control.

The first thing we should do is we should be active at the Organization of American States as it considers the situation in Venezuela, and they should ask that voting members recognize the humanitarian and political crisis in Venezuela.

The United States should ask our allies in the region, countries that receive an extensive amount of aid from this country—Haiti, Colombia, the Central American nations, our neighbors up north in Canada, among others—to support this effort. Right now we are about to give hundreds of millions of dollars to countries in Central America, in the Northern Triangle, the Alliance for Prosperity. I think that is a good idea, but we should ask them to support what I hope we will try to do at the OAS. The same with Haiti. We have poured millions of dollars into Haiti's reconstruction. We should use that as leverage to ask them to support something happening at the OAS.

What has happened in Venezuela is nothing short of a coup d'etat, a de facto coup, and the Organization of American States—if it has any reason to exist anymore, it should be to defend democracy in the region. It is the reason we have an Organization of American States. We will soon find out whether that organization is even worth continuing to exist if it cannot pronounce itself collectively on the outright violation of democracy in a nation that purports to be a democratic republic.

Sanctions. We have to impose sanctions on human rights violators—not sanctions on the people of Venezuela, not sanctions on the government, on human rights violators, many of whom steal money from the Venezuelan people and invest it in the United States.

On the front page of the Miami Herald yesterday was a story that one of the individuals linked to the petroleum industry with the Government in Venezuela, a billionaire—and you become a millionaire with these links by basically stealing the money—is the secret developer behind a major development in Miami, FL, in my hometown, in my home State. Travel to Florida, come down there, and let me know—any of my colleagues—and I will show you where these people live, and I will show you the money they have stolen from the Venezuelan people, and they are living the high life on weekends in Miami. You will see them everywhere. That is why we imposed sanctions on them. There will be an effort here, I hope, in the next day or so to extend those sanctions for another 3 years.

Finally, I hope the United States uses our megaphone to highlight the corruption in the institutions of the Government of Venezuela. That should not be tolerated.

There is also a humanitarian component to this. We should help make sure the Venezuelan Government is not stealing or otherwise standing in the way of the Venezuelan people getting the medicines and food they need.

For far too long, the issues in this hemisphere have been ignored by administrations in both parties, by this administration. We can no longer ignore this. I hope we give Venezuela and the Western Hemisphere the attention and the priority they merit. It is in our national interests to do so.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. President, I want to briefly discuss the issue of Puerto Rico and the debt crisis Puerto Rico is facing. The island faces a major deadline coming up. A $422 million debt payment is due on May 1, which is this Sunday. If this deadline isn't met, it is going to cause some serious problems, and not just for the people of Puerto Rico—who, let's not forget, are American citizens—but also for millions of others throughout the United States. Today I will focus on one example of an American community that would be very negatively impacted, and that is the city of Jacksonville in my home State of Florida.

Jacksonville is a port city, so its residents, businesses, and families depend in large part on trade. A recent article in the Florida Times-Union detailed exactly how close the relationship is between Puerto Rico and the shipping industry in Jacksonville.

In 2009, as much as 75 percent of the goods coming in and out of Puerto Rico flowed through the ports in Jacksonville, which brought about $1 billion worth of economic impact to the city. In just the past year, between October and March, JAXPORT has seen a 32-

percent increase in cargo tonnage from the island. But this trend is likely to reverse if fiscal conditions in San Juan do not improve soon.

If Puerto Rico misses its payment on May 1 and its debt crisis further escalates, its economy is going to stagnate even more than it already has, and the harm is going to be passed on to any community like Jacksonville that has a significant economic stake in the island's well-being. We have already seen a massive exodus of professionals and others from Puerto Rico because of a lack of economic growth. They will likely continue leaving and heading to Florida and other places on the mainland, which will further cripple the island's economy and reduce the demand for trade.

So what can we do about all this? Some have suggested that Washington can deliver a silver bullet solution to help Puerto Rico out of its debt. This simply isn't true. The reality is that nothing Washington does will be effective until Puerto Rico and its government leaders turn away from decades of failed policies. Their tax rate continues to be too high, government regulations are stifling, and they are spending more than they take in. I don't care if you are an island, government, business, or family—if you spend more than you take in and you do it for long enough, you are going to have a debt problem. That is what is happening here in Washington, and that is what is happening in Puerto Rico. Anytime your economy isn't growing, you are going to have a further problem, and no restructuring is going to solve that until they restructure the way they spend money. Bankruptcy protection isn't going to solve it, either, at least not without serious fiscal reforms from San Juan. Otherwise, if we grant bankruptcy protection, Puerto Rico will simply go bankrupt again not far down the road.

That does not mean Washington should do nothing. All of us need to realize that this is an American crisis. It is taking place in an American territory. It impacts the people of Puerto Rico, who are American citizens. The impact will not be contained on the island; it will spread to cities like Jacksonville and other communities throughout the mainland United States.

So we need to take the irresponsible leadership in Puerto Rico seriously. We need to urge them to get their affairs in order. But we should also look closely at what we can do here in the Senate, which may mean taking up some of the ideas currently being worked on by House leadership. We can also help Puerto Rico by doing the same things necessary to help the rest of the American economy. This means passing pro-growth policies at the Federal level, including tax and regulatory reform. It means we need to stop spending more money than we take in.

In closing, the leadership in San Juan must view the deadline this Sunday as a wake-up call. They must show their willingness to get their fiscal house in order. If they don't, our options in Washington will be very limited and won't have support from taxpayers.

But I think this is a wake-up call for us. The notion that somehow this issue with Puerto Rico will figure itself out is not true. The notion that somehow this issue with Puerto Rico is not that important, that we can put it to the side because it is not a State, is not true. Puerto Rico is a territory of the United States. Its people are U.S. citizens. Its people, by the way, on a per capita basis serve in the Armed Forces of the United States at levels as high or higher than any ethnic or geographic group in the country.

The people of Puerto Rico deserve our voice, and they deserve our action. I commend leaders in the House for trying to do something responsible on this. I understand the majority leader has said that once the House acts, the Senate will look at it very carefully. I know we have leaders here doing that as well. I urge that work to continue. We cannot ignore this crisis, and neither can the leaders in San Juan. I hope we can find a solution sooner than later for what Puerto Rico is facing with its fiscal crisis, which this Sunday we are going to be reading about when they miss their debt payment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATO

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, we haven't discussed foreign policy issues on the floor for a while. It is not because all is quiet on the eastern front. It is not. As we know, what is happening in the Middle East and in Europe—the migration issue, Syria, across Northern Africa—is that there are major issues that are ongoing and that affect the United States in a number of ways, not only economically but strategically, and leave us vulnerable to threats to ''take down America'' in one way or another.

Obviously, we are in the middle of a heated campaign, which hopefully will be resolved in terms of our nominees in a short amount of time. But we do have to recognize the next President, whoever that President might be, is going to be facing some extraordinary challenges relative to foreign policy and national security issues. Making America great again—whatever it is that defines phrase—a new leader will have to deal with a number of very difficult challenges.

This past Monday, President Obama delivered a speech in Germany in which he discussed the future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO. He said that NATO must be prepared to carry out its traditional missions while at the same time meeting the newly emerging threats to the alliance.

That was revealing to me and, frankly, welcoming because we have not heard anything from the President along those lines in my memory, but his recognition and his statement in that regard defines where we are; that is, we need to be prepared to carry out traditional missions through NATO while at the same time meeting the newly emerging threats to the alliance. We see these newly emerging threats to the alliance we are in almost every day.

The President also noted that Europe has been complacent about its own defense and called on our allies to do more. I welcome this renewed attention to NATO. It also gives us the opportunity to respond to those who believe NATO has outlived its usefulness, is too expensive, and should be done away with. Such a view needs a rebuttal.

It is not necessary nor correct to claim that NATO has no problems or its role has not changed or its future is clear. NATO does face challenges and has—in defining its mission, securing its resources, and providing the leadership that the world requires. But to deny that alliance's obvious value is, in my opinion, a major mistake. Such a judgment surely cannot be based on any real understanding of what NATO is or what it has accomplished, much less of what it can become and, candidly, what it must become, given the level of crisis and conflict so present in Europe, the Middle East, and in Africa.

I have been a strong supporter of the alliance and the transatlantic security relationship throughout my public life. NATO's proud past and enduring importance were a constant presence during my service as a U.S. Senator and as U.S. Ambassador to Germany for 4 years following 9/11. Since returning to the Senate, the alliance has remained a keen interest to me.

Contrary to the notion that NATO has served its purpose and is no longer needed or is no longer a viable organization, NATO has survived and thrived for half a century because it has proven itself to be an adaptable, flexible, and effective organization.

I think many of us know the alliance began all the way back in 1949 with the principle motive of protecting Western Europe from the threat of Soviet aggression. But many forget that the founding document, the Washington treaty of 1949, does not mention the Soviet Union. Instead, its founding treaty laid out the core values of the West, which values the alliance was designed to protect.

I want to state that again. What was trying to be accomplished through this alliance of NATO, all the way back to 1949, was a values-based organization that enabled the alliance and gave the

alliance those values which the alliance was designed to protect. It is exactly because the alliance was and remains values-based that it has been able to adapt to a changing strategic environment with newly defined missions and membership. The vital and permanent need to protect our shared values survived the collapse of the Soviet Union and the threat it represented and has enabled the alliance to define and confront the major threats and modern threats that we face today.

As NATO adapted to the post-Soviet world, the clearest proof of its foundation as a community of values was the process of enlargement. At the beginning of that process, few in the administration or Congress saw NATO enlargement as having very much to do with actually enhancing the military capabilities of the alliance. When the first countries were proposed for membership via the Partnership for Peace program, it was not only because of the military contributions those newly democratic nations could bring; rather, the most explicit motivation for extending the prospect of membership to the countries of what we then called Eastern Europe was to persuade them to make the political and economic changes that would make them worthy and complimentary allies. We were trying to cement in the democratic revolutions that occurred in these former Soviet-controlled states and make those changes permanent.

We were extending NATO's democratic values—along with its security umbrella—and we required prospective members to accept them and institutionalize those democratic values. That process continues today. NATO was and remains a political instrument of enormous persuasive power with historic consequences.

But are shared values enough to maintain the vitality and the relevance of a military alliance? For those new member countries themselves, the appeal of alliance membership was the vast military capabilities of the club they were about to join. They sought actual enhanced security in a still dangerous world, not just a political partnership of values.

Now, in the wake of renewed Russian aggression, most especially in Ukraine and its illegal annexation of Crimea, the objective military capabilities of the alliance have become even more relevant. This renewed threat resulted in NATO, in effect, hitting the pause button on redefining NATO's post-Soviet missions. For many alliance members on Russia's periphery, it was ''NATO—Back to the Future.''

Russian behavior has once again provoked profound anxiety among our allies on Russia's periphery, especially the Baltic states, Poland, and Romania. In response, NATO has taken on new missions intended to reassure our allies, discourage Putin's aggressive designs, and renew NATO's urgent relevance. All of this has a heritage for NATO's founding in the Soviet era, but it also is a new and, in many ways, more complicated response. While Russia is not the enemy it once was, it certainly is no friend to the NATO nations. It is perhaps a necessary partner in some places, but it is a dangerous obstacle in others.

In restating and reinforcing NATO's role in opposing Russian aggression, NATO needs to be creative and firm, active and present. It cannot be done on the cheap. This renewed mission emphasizes again the persistent issue of lagging resources. It has long been a problem that the great majority of NATO membership countries do not meet the alliance standard of the 2 percent of their GDP, gross domestic product, for defense.

Although it is true that robust defense of the transatlantic region does require a greater commitment of resources than most European countries have been willing to accept in the past, it is not true that U.S. taxpayers have simply been required to make up the difference.

The Department of Defense says that the direct U.S. contribution to NATO is about $500 million a year, the largest share of NATO's budget, clearly, but not out of line with our comparative gross domestic product—compared to other European nations. It is true that NATO relies on the national assets of its members for operations, and in that regard, our portion is the largest. But our portion reflects our spending for the entire military, which has global responsibilities. In other words, if there were no NATO, those military expenditures presumably would be the same, if not larger, since our allies are contributors to our collective security as well.

In any case, the growing anxiety about Russian behavior seems to be generating some real progress on this resources front. Secretary General Stoltenberg said this week that five NATO members now meet the 2-percent requirement, while it was only two countries just a few years ago. Further, defense spending has increased in real terms in 16 of the 28 countries since 2014. Clearly, it is a wake-up call for NATO. What has happened on their borders, the periphery of Russia, has awakened NATO to the belief that it needs to strengthen our military, strengthen NATO's resources, and for those countries to live up to their obligations in providing the necessary resources.

Nevertheless, and having said this, we cannot be relaxed about meeting the resources gap. Despite the recent uptick, there has been a long and dramatic decline in European defense budgets for two decades before 2014, not to mention a significant absence of constituent support for defense expenditures in most NATO countries.

It is a battle of these nations who are dealing with slow or no growth—GDP stagnant—to come to the decision to meet the 2 percent obligation that they have under the NATO treaty. They have other issues at home, migration simply being one of them, and a number of other domestic issues that have restrained them. But now the threat has become more real, and now the realization of how to address the threat has become more vital and necessary.

In his June 2011 farewell speech on NATO's future, Defense Secretary Bob Gates famously said that our European allies were and had been ''apparently unwilling to devote the necessary resources or make the necessary changes to be serious and capable partners in their own defense.'' He declared that NATO faced ''the real possibility of a dim, if not dismal, future.''

But the response to this danger, now especially in the wake of Russian invasion and annexation of a neighbor—this is not the time to call for NATO's abandonment, but to press ahead in validating NATO's relevance, then finding the necessary resources. I believe that process is under way, as I have just described.

Given the new threats to NATO's eastern border states, our allies are finding greater support for making larger commitments to their own security. Another pressing reason to solve the resources problem is the host of new requirements this modern alliance needs to face.

Since the period of enlargement and the euphoria of democratic revolutions, NATO has made repeated attempts to define its new missions. The most recent strategic concept of January 2010 makes the alliance's newly global and political roles more explicit. It has identified numerous new transnational threats that a modern military and political alliance must confront. These include nuclear proliferation, cyber threats, terrorism, political instabilities, and missile capabilities.

No one can argue that these global threats are not the core of modern security challenges. Similarly, no one can dispute that the most effective and powerful alliance in world history should and must organize itself to confront them. And most certainly, no responsible leader should look at these threats and conclude an alliance built to confront them should be abandoned. Let me restate that. No responsible leader, now or in the future, should look at these threats and conclude that an alliance built to confront these problems and challenges should be abolished. Modern NATO activities extend well beyond Europe. These include combating piracy off the Horn of Africa, operational and training support for the African Union in Ethiopia, air policing of Europe's borders against Russian incursions, growing cyber defense alliance capabilities, expanded special operations capabilities and activities, development of a NATO response force for rapid reaction operations on land and sea, expanded joint intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance operations, and expanded

joint exercises to improve the alliance and member-state readiness. That is a big challenge, but that challenge is one that needs to be addressed.

In terms of more traditional warfighting, NATO has taken on missions in Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Libya, and continued challenges will need to be addressed. It is not yet clear to me whether ISAF, the Afghanistan mission, will go down as a success or not, but it is clearly in the balance and needs to be carefully monitored.

It is clear that the Libya operation revealed numerous alliance shortcomings and was not a model of alliance coherence and cohesion. Rather, Libya was an example of failure at the political level to define the new NATO. The correct response to both, new challenges and admitted failure, is better leadership, better vision, and creative new thinking, along with the resources to carry out those goals.

I have suggested that these could be best applied in response to the Syria disaster, especially with the humanitarian catastrophe and the migrant crisis. I proposed that NATO could have helped member-state Turkey get control of its Syrian border to stop the flow of jihadists into and out of Syria.

It is clear to me that the uncontrolled flood of refugees from Syria could best be handled by creating safe areas in and near Syria so that the Syrian people can remain there under safe and humane conditions. Building on NATO's Bosnia experience, the Alliance could be critical to providing the security for such areas on the ground and in the air. This would not be fighting the war in Syria but protecting the populations of U.N. designated areas. Difficult? You bet, but it has been done before, and NATO is the only possible organization that is in a position to do it.

Although I emphatically believe that NATO continues to have enormous value to U.S. interests and global stability, I do concede that it needs a new vision of its role. That is clearly a work in progress and will have some false starts and failures along the way. How it turns out will not only be a function of resources, as I have discussed, but also an issue of leadership. On that score, I have some concerns. Frankly, I am worried.

The Obama administration seems to be guiding us toward a dangerous deference to others to address emerging global security challenges that are and will be threats to our own national security. The most alarming example is our acquiescence to Russia's vigorous engagement in Syria. Russia basically hijacked our paltry efforts to bring the Syrian disaster under control, inserted its military forces to change the dynamic on the ground, and guided the political process toward their ends. It has all been a sad display of American incompetence and impotence. The United States and its allies are paying the price for this failure of engagement.

After reading President Obama's recent and lengthy interview on foreign policy that was published in the Atlantic Monthly, I can tell he has not drawn the correct conclusions from the foreign policy failures in recent years in Libya, Syria, Ukraine, Russia, and elsewhere. For me, we have abdicated America's traditional leadership role. For the alliance, I fear this could be the beginning phase of our disengagement from Europe, which, if it continues, will be at our peril. Without firm U.S. leadership of NATO, we will begin to see the commitment of our allies weaken. They simply do not have the muscle or the financial capability to support a NATO coalition without U.S. leadership. Without the right kind of leadership, the importance of the transatlantic security relationship and the continued robust presence of U.S. forces in Europe will begin to lose advocates, as perhaps has already occurred among those who do not support our efforts.

If Americans come to see NATO's value in financial terms—bang for the buck—we will lose sight of its real value in the proper terms of national security, American reliability, and the eternal appeal of our community of values—in other words, the values beyond price that must be preserved if we are to prevail against our adversaries.

With that, 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. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PERDUE. 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.

FUNDING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about why all of us are here. The primary role of Congress is to responsibly fund the Federal Government. To do that, we must set clear national priorities that we can financially support. All too often, the process of setting, and then sticking to these national priorities has become a purely political exercise, not a function of governing. It is the No. 1 complaint I hear when I travel back to my home State of Georgia.

Coming from the business world, I clearly see two interlocking crises we face as a country. First, we have a global security crisis. The world may be more dangerous right now than at any point in my lifetime. Interlocked with that is our national debt crisis that threatens the ability we have to defend our country today.

As we begin the appropriations process, let's take an honest look at what we are appropriating for. One of our top national priorities is to provide for the national defense. It is one of only 6 reasons 13 Colonies got together in the first place; that is, to provide for the national defense. However, under Presidents Carter, Clinton, and Obama, we saw three different periods of disinvestment in our military. Our 30-year average of defense spending has been 4.2 percent of GDP. Following the Carter administration, the Reagan administration recapped the military. Then, we had another decline. You see the buildup in the surge in Afghanistan and Iraq, behind two wars.

We have been at war for 15 years. I believe in many cases we have burnt out our equipment, and in cases we are beginning to do that with our personnel, with longer tours and more difficult assignments in this hybrid war we are facing today.

Then you see under this administration a further decline, now to 3.1 percent of GDP. This is the lowest point since the Vietnam War, and the irony of that is that we are still spending $600 billion of $4 trillion total spending of the Federal Government on our military. The irony is the 30-year average of 4.2 percent, which is a hundred basis points below what we're currently spending—that's almost $200 billion—in a $19 trillion economy.

The question is how do we determine the priorities to keep a strong military? To make sure we can fulfill one of six reasons we came together as a country.

We are about to have the smallest Army since World War II, the smallest Navy since World War I, and the smallest and oldest Air Force ever. How can this be? The world is more dangerous right now than at any time in my lifetime.

We see increased aggression from traditional rivals, Russia and China. We also see the rise of ISIS, partly because of our own intransigence. They have to be stopped now, or we are going to have to deal with them later here. Boko Haram, Al Qaeda, ISIS—all of these threats are beginning to be interconnected and pose threats not just in the Middle East, but around the world.

Finally, we have nuclear threats from rogue regimes, like North Korea and Iran, and emerging, game-changing technologies, such as cyber threats, which nations like Russia are using for hybrid warfare right now in Eastern Europe. There is an emerging arms race in space. This is why our women and men in uniform need to have the tools and resources to complete their missions around the world.

This fiscal crisis is jeopardizing our ability to actually fund the missions being asked of our military today. Let me give two examples. JSTARS is a

fleet of planes, 16 in number. These planes in total have over 1 million hours of service. They were used when the Air Force bought them to start with some 30 years ago. They were flown by commercial airlines, such as Air India and Pakistan Air, around the world. Today they fly missions providing critical intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance—ISR—ground targeting, and battlefield command and control capabilities to all branches of our military in multiple regions of the world. The problem is they have outlived their useful life and they are being replaced—or the theory was that they were going to be replaced. But because of our intransigence in Washington, the funding is not there to replace them. So we are now facing potentially 8 years where we will not be able to fulfill their mission.

These are the planes that provide oversight for our men and women who are in harm's way—in Afghanistan, Iraq, in Southern Command, where we are intercepting drugs, in the Far East. Wherever the men and women in American uniforms are facing danger, JSTARS is there protecting them in ways no one else can in the military. All of these planes have to be replaced, and the sooner we get started, the better. They will not be able to fulfill their mission over the next 8 years.

This chart shows the declining availability of the current fleet—down to zero by 2023. It also shows that under the current plan, pending DOD approval and funding, the replacement fleet doesn't even start coming online until 2023—a start date that is now in jeopardy because of the current administration's budget request.

JSTARS' recap is the No. 4 requisition priority for the Air Force, behind the long-range strike bomber, the new tanker, and the F–35. We are not going to be able to fulfill the mission of these airmen and soldiers over the next 8 years unless we do something about it right now—and even then, it might be too late.

This is a picture of a 1957 Chevrolet. Some of you will remember what this is like. I remember this car. This is a collector's item. Some of my friends own this car. This car is of the same genre, same age as many of the airplanes we are now flying around the world. That is great, but imagine if you had to drive this car—this was your everyday car and you drove it to work every day back and forth; you depended on it to get you to work every morning and to get you home every night. What would you do if you had to drive it to the west coast and back every week? Imagine what the maintenance time loss would be for breakdown. Imagine what it would be like traveling those distances without all the modern conveniences, such as satellite radio—Sirius, Pandora. What about the safety factor? These are antiques. The point is that this is a direct analogy of what we are doing with our military today in a very dangerous world. That sounds ridiculous, but you know we have another example, and that is our marines around the world, who are the first to hit a crisis.

In Moron, Spain, we have a contingent of marines and one of their missions is to protect our embassies in Africa. Post-Benghazi, that takes on a new level of importance. These marines do a great job. They are the very best of what we have in America. They are ready to go. The problem is that because of budget constraints, their fleet of airplanes, the V–22 Ospreys, is getting cut in half, and that fundamentally cuts their ability to complete their mission in half. So they will not be able to fulfill the mission they have today the way they are supposed to because of our own intransigence.

So, what is causing this great disinvestment in our military? Well, there is only one answer: the national debt. These two crises interlock in a way they never have before. It used to be that defense hawks and budget hawks were separate people. Today, I am living proof that they can embody themselves in the same person, because I am both. We have to be. We no longer have the luxury of debating both issues separately.

In the past 7 years, Washington has spent $25 trillion running the Federal Government. That is bad enough, but the problem is that we borrowed $9 trillion of that $25 trillion. That is 35 percent. The Congressional Budget Office says that over the next 10 years we will borrow 30 percent of that. What that means and why that is important is that fundamentally, all of our mandatory spending—some $3 trillion—is mandatory, so our first dollars go to that. The problem is that all of our discretionary spending—all of USAID, our foreign programs, and our expenditures—are fundamentally borrowed under that scenario, and that is where we are today. Can you imagine that? With this level of borrowing, every dime we spend on foreign aid—I just want to reiterate—foreign aid, domestic programs, and military—we are borrowing that money today because we haven't faced up to this crisis.

First we have the period here under President Bush. In 2000 our debt was $6 trillion. We added $4 trillion on the back of two wars. In 2008, we had $10 trillion in debt. Now we see we have another $9 trillion in the last 7 years. We will be close to $20 trillion by the time we are through.

The yellow here is what the Congressional Budget Office says we are about to face. If we do nothing from today, we will add another $9 trillion to this Federal debt—close to $30 trillion.

I am a business guy and I know the capital markets are under great stress today. The danger of this is this is totally unmanageable. If interest rates were to reach their 50-year average of just 5.5 percent, we would be paying $1 trillion in interest on a $4 trillion total budget. There is no way that is possible. That is about twice the amount we spend on our military.

Our debt crisis is directly impacting our ability to protect our Nation and project power around the world. This puts in jeopardy our very ability to deal with global threats as they come up every day, and believe me, they are coming up every day. Without a strong economy, without dealing with our debt crisis right now, we can't adequately fund our military to confront the growing threats we face. That is a fact.

It used to be that fiscal hawks and defense hawks, and I have said this, but today I see that more and more people who are one or the other are beginning to come together and recognize the other problem. They are interrelated in a way they have never been.

Believe me, we need a strong defense. I believe we need to be responsible for our Federal finances and the needs of our people here at home. The safety net needs to be maintained. Social Security needs to be saved. These are things we can't ignore, but we have to start dealing with our priorities today. That is why we have to find a way to come together—Democrats, Republicans, conservatives, whatever—and make sure we protect our economic and our national security priorities. We need to get in a room and iron this out. They are not that complicated. We can find the solutions.

As former Admiral Mike Mullen said in 2012, ''I believe that our debt is the greatest threat to our national security. If we as a country do not address our fiscal imbalances in the near-term, our national power will erode.''

That was 5 years ago, and what have we done since then? Nothing but add debt.

Last year, Congress passed a budget resolution. We laid out a conservative vision for what spending levels we should undertake and cut $7 trillion from the President's budget. We passed a budget, but because our budget process is broken, we didn't pass most authorizations. We passed appropriations in committees, but we weren't able to get them to the floor and vote on them. So we ended up with a CR at the end of the year, and that led to a grand bargain, which I opposed, and an omnibus that added some $9 trillion to our national debt. That was used to fund the government, in the absence of any appropriations bills having been approved. That pushed us to a first-quarter omnibus that really most of us wanted to avoid. At the end of that, eight people got in a room over a weekend and decided how we are going to spend $4 trillion. That is not what our Founders had in mind. That means that the topline spending levels were set by a so-called grand bargain, which I voted against, because it increased spending and would add over $9.5 trillion over the next decade to our national debt.

This mounting debt crisis will not fix itself—quite the contrary. It will only

grow worse because Social Security and Medicare are going to demand more and more funds from the general operating fund because of the imbalances in those two items. If we don't get serious about solving this debt crisis right now, we will not be able to fully support our national security and our domestic priorities.

Recently, Richard Haass, a former top State Department official, said in a Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing, ''Our inability to deal with our debt challenge will detract from the appeal of the American political and economic model'' as we try to influence young democracies around the world. He continued: ''The result will be a world that is less democratic and increasingly less deferential to U.S. concerns in matters of security.''

We must create restraint and fiscal sanity in Washington. In the private sector, you fix a business by first drilling down and finding the underlying problem. The way that Washington funds the Federal Government, the time it takes to complete the federal budget, and the fact that the current process allows Members of Congress to put off making tough decisions are the real problem. In business, this would never be allowed. In your personal home, this cannot be tolerated, but somehow we are able to do it here year after year. This process has only worked four times in the past 42 years.

It has been encouraging to hear the Senate Budget Committee chairman, Senator MIKE ENZI, and the House Budget chairman, Congressman TOM PRICE from my home State of Georgia, make this a priority for this year. I believe they are making great progress. Both are having hearings to find out if there are models around the world that do it better than we do. We are finding those examples, especially at a time when we cannot allow the process to break down and result in more continuing resolutions, omnibus bills, or short-term funding fights that don't solve anything.

We must also reduce redundant programs, roll back the regulatory regime, and focus on growing our economy through overhauling our archaic Tax Code, and unlocking, finally, our Nation's full economic and energy potential.

Finally, we have to save Social Security and Medicare and tackle the biggest problems of our overall health care costs. To do this, Washington needs to stop pretending that these crises will go away on their own and that the national debt will somehow solve itself. It won't. In fact, it has already done irreversible damage to our credibility and capability on the world stage. Our mounting debt crisis is already raising questions from our allies around the world about how we will be able to stand by our international commitments.

I just got back from a trip to Europe and the Middle East. The No. 1 point raised to us by leaders, heads of state in those countries, was that America needs to lead again. To lead again, we need to get our financial house in order.

Our debt crisis and a failed foreign policy has served to confuse our allies and embolden our enemies. It threatens our ability to defend our country, period. Also, the interest payments on our debt is affecting our education, infrastructure, and more—here at home in the programs that are necessary. Imagine if we didn't have that unproductive responsibility of unnecessary interest. Every Member of this body knows we need to act now.

My question is, why aren't we acting? The challenge is to stop talking about it theoretically and start putting solutions into practice. That is why Georgians sent me to the U.S. Senate, and that is why I will continue fighting on this every day.

Let's not lose sight of Congress's No. 1 responsibility. We are charged in the Constitution under article I to responsibly fund the Federal Government and to ensure that the 6 reasons why 13 Colonies got together in the first place can actually be realized.

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. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCORPORATION TRANSPARENCY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here today to highlight law enforcement legislation that would help crack down on human trafficking, terrorism financing, money laundering, Medicare fraud, the narcotics trade, tax evasion, public corruption, and a litany of other crimes in the United States and around the world. These crimes all involve money, and the United States has become a favorite destination for criminals looking to hide it.

Earlier this month, the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists published the first of the so-called Panama papers, a leak of 11.5 million confidential documents from a Panama-based law firm that sets up shell corporations and tax shelters for wealthy clients. The documents we have seen so far show that, along with the Caribbean islands you might expect, several American States are popular places to form shell corporations.

Our friend Senator Kent Conrad, who used to be chairman of the Budget Committee, was fond of using this floor chart showing what is called the Ugland House building in the Cayman Islands. This little building claims to be the place from which an astonishing 18,000 companies do business. As unimaginable as it may be to have 18,000 companies claiming to be doing business out of that one little building, I am sorry to say that there is a building just a 2-hour drive from the U.S. Capitol Building that serves as the official address for a quarter of a million companies, many of them shell corporations.

A shell corporation is a company that serves no economic purpose and doesn't conduct any real business. Shell corporations exist primarily to hold legal title to bank accounts, real estate, or other assets, often obscuring the true human owners. While people can form shell corporations in just about any country, many American States make it especially easy to do so, perhaps even easier than getting a library card. You may actually need to go down to a library to sign up for a library card, but you can form a shell corporation with a few clicks of a mouse and payment of a small fee.

There is another reason that the United States has become so popular for shell corporations. Currently, none—zero—of the 50 American States require the disclosure of the beneficial owners—the real human beings who own the companies. Instead, corporate records can identify the owner as just another faceless shell corporation, or the owner could be identified as a professional agent paid to sign the needed forms and never speak of them again or a lawyer who refuses to disclose who his client is under attorney-client privilege. Behind this easy-to-establish veil of secrecy, criminals can and do use these shell corporations to open bank accounts, transfer funds, and even to hide the ownership of expensive assets.

This building shown here is at 650 Fifth Avenue in New York City. The Iranian Government used a string of generic businesses to obscure its ownership of this Fifth Avenue skyscraper. Profits from this enterprise helped fund Iran-backed terrorism for decades, until a U.S. Government investigation finally uncovered the scheme in 2008.

How could a state sponsor of terrorism own a piece of the New York City skyline and profit from owning that piece of the New York City skyline for so long without anyone knowing? Let's look at how Iran used anonymous shell corporations to hide its involvement.

On paper, 650 Fifth Avenue was owned by a partnership of the Alavi Foundation, a New York-based charity, and the Assa Corporation, a New York shell company. Assa Corporation was, in turn, owned by yet another shell company, Assa Company, Limited, and formed in the Isle of Jersey, a notorious banking center and tax shelter. The Isle of Jersey company was in turn owned by individuals representing Bank Melli, the Iranian Government's financial arm, and there is the connection to Iran.

So to the public, that building—worth about half a billion dollars—was

owned by a charity and a faceless shell company. Because there is no requirement in the United States that States keep track of the real owners of a company formed under State law, New York State only knew that the Assa Corporation was owned by another shell corporation. Ultimately, investigators were able to connect those dots and tie Iran to the structure from a clue in the corporate records kept on the Isle of Jersey.

How is that for irony? A notorious tax shelter actually had better ownership records than we have in the United States. Once Iran's investment and involvement was uncovered, the Department of Justice moved to seize and sell the building and to distribute the proceeds of that sale to American victims of Iranian-backed terror. After years of legal appeals, the victims look close to receiving this compensation.

Of course, Iran isn't the only criminal enterprise hiding behind American shell companies. Other recently uncovered examples of enterprises hiding behind American shell companies include a Mexican drug cartel using an Oklahoma corporation to launder money through a horse farm, a crime syndicate setting up a web of corporations in eight States as part of a $100 million Medicare fraud scheme, and a human trafficking ring based in Moldova that hides their crimes behind anonymous corporations in Kansas, Missouri, and Ohio.

According to the Rhode Island State Police, corporate secrecy in my own State has complicated their investigations into real estate fraud, illegal prescription drug distribution, and sales tax evasion.

In January, just months before the Panama Papers hit the headlines, ''60 Minutes'' aired a segment showing just how easy it can be for criminals to hide money in the United States. The program featured an investigator with the anticorruption organization Global Witness. That investigator pretended to represent a corrupt African leader, and ''60 Minutes'' brought a hidden camera along into his meetings with lawyers in New York.

The investigator, presenting himself as representing the corrupt African leader, made clear that his client wanted help using suspicious funds to buy a mansion, a jet, and a yacht in the United States and to hide his ownership of these assets. Of the 16 lawyers who met with the undercover investigator, only 1 turned him away. It seems the others were comfortable helping a corrupt foreign official hide money in opaque American shell corporations.

While the underlying criminal schemes may be colorful and complex, the answer to this shell corporation problem is simple and straightforward. The Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act would direct States to require applicants forming corporations and limited liability companies to include basic information about the actual human beings who own the company.

The States would maintain and periodically update this information, and it would be available to law enforcement officers who present valid court-ordered subpoenas or search warrants. It is simple. Have each State keep track of who actually owns companies they charter and ensure that information is available for Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies through proper processes.

Transparency in business ownership is not a novel idea. Every member of the European Union will be transparent by 2017. The United Kingdom and the Netherlands have even announced plans to make their corporate ownership registries available to the public. With the light of corporate transparency about to shine on criminal assets hidden in Europe, their shell corporations will not be effective for these purposes. So that money will be looking for new dark homes.

America should take swift action to make sure these assets don't find new hidden homes in opaque American shell corporations. We are supposed to be an example to the world, not the place where the world's corrupt and the world's criminals hide their cash and their assets.

The Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act enjoys broad support from the national law enforcement community, including the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI, and the U.S. Marshals Service Association, as well as the Rhode Island State Police.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to finish my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Chuck Canterbury, president of the National Fraternal Order of Police, explains it this way: ''When we are able to expose the link between shell companies and drug trafficking, corruption, organized crime, and terrorist finance, the law enforcement community is better able to keep America safe from these illegal activities and keep the proceeds of these crimes out of the U.S. financial system.''

Of all places, the United States should not be a safe haven for criminals, foreign or domestic, to hide their illegal assets. We could take a simple major step in fighting money laundering, financial fraud, and terrorist financing by passing this bill. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to cosponsor it and to help us get it passed.

I thank the Chair. I appreciate the extra time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

NOMINATION OF ROBERTA JACOBSON

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, it has been nearly 9 months since the United States had an ambassador to Mexico. The President's nominee to that post, Roberta Jacobson, is eminently qualified, as all of us know, to serve in that position. However, she has been waiting for the Senate to confirm her since the Foreign Relations Committee reported her nomination to the Senate in November of last year with a vote of 12 to 7.

Yesterday I took to the floor to talk about our important trade relationship with Mexico. That is not the only reason finalizing this nomination is so critical. The bilateral work on migration, security, and border issues of the United States and Mexico requires top-level leadership at our Embassy in Mexico City. It is critical for the United States to have an ambassador to ensure cooperation on border security issues and to identify threats to our national security.

We continue to engage Mexico in disrupting organized criminal networks that facilitate human trafficking. According to Mexico's National Institute of Migration, Mexico apprehended more than 190,000 migrants in 2015, including nearly 19,000 unaccompanied minors, children, better known as UACs. This is a significant increase from 2014, when 127,000 migrants, including just over 11,000 UACs, were apprehended.

It is clear these complex issues require top-level diplomacy, and we would benefit from an experienced leader who can navigate the nuances of these regional relations. In addition to these migration issues, the United States and Mexico need to address security challenges from transnational drug trafficking. As we hear all too often, we are witnessing an increase in heroin use leading to rising levels of violence and heroin-related deaths.

While the United States and Mexico are cooperating on a strategy to fight heroin, this represents a priority that requires the leadership of an ambassador. We need someone in place as our top diplomat in Mexico with experience with Mexican security and with law and to engage the most senior Mexican Government officials on the narcotics issues.

In addition, there are specific ongoing cases that necessitate having an ambassador in place to ensure that our Nation's interests are being represented. As I said yesterday, Mexico represents one of our most important bilateral relationships. It is clear the longer the United States goes without having an ambassador to Mexico, the greater our partnership will suffer.

There is simply no reason to go any longer without an ambassador to Mexico when we have someone as qualified as Roberta Jacobson. I come with good news; that is, it is my understanding that a deal—an agreement—is in the works that will ultimately lead to the

successful confirmation later this week. As such, I will not be making a unanimous consent request today, but I intend to come here as long as it takes, to keep up the pressure and to monitor this process, to ensure that it has a successful resolution.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, earlier this month, the Governor of Iran's central bank, Dr. Valiollah Seif, spoke at the Council on Foreign Relations in Washington and he made three primary claims. First, he said sanctions did not, in fact, lead Iran to agree to the terms of the nuclear agreement between Iran and the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, the EU, Russia, and China. He said sanctions did not force Iran to agree. Second, he said Iran's nuclear program has always been entirely peaceful. Third, he said that the United States and our European allies have not honored our commitments under the terms of the nuclear deal also known as the JCPOA.

Today I wish to push back against all three of these claims.

First, on sanctions, Governor Seif said: ''Contrary to baseless allegation[s] that some people made, sanctions did not and could not force [Iran] to engage into a negotiation with our P5+1 colleague[s],'' the nations I referenced.

The facts clearly say otherwise.

U.S. sanctions have been a major feature of U.S. policy toward Iran since Iran's 1979 revolution. The imposition of international sanctions and worldwide bilateral sanctions on Iran began in 2006 and increased dramatically in 2010.

In June of 2010, the Congress passed the Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act, also known as CISADA, which weakened Iran's access to the international financial system and bolstered existing sanctions specifically against Iran's human rights abuse.

That same month, with the support not just of our European allies but also Russia and China, the Obama administration and then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton led the passage of U.N. Security Council Resolution 1929, which created the most comprehensive and stinging international sanctions the Iranian regime has ever faced.

Two years later, in 2012, the National Defense Authorization Act designated the Central Bank of Iran for additional sanctions, which the Obama administration successfully used to undermine Iran's ability to sell oil on world markets.

The Obama administration also convinced key allies, such as Japan, Australia, South Korea, and Canada, to agree to additional bilateral measures that increased pressure on Iran's financial banking, insurance, transportation, and energy sectors.

The effects of these coordinated sanctions were clear, swift, and direct. The value of the Iranian currency decreased dramatically. Obstacles to Iranian trade forced businesses to close and increased inflation within Iran. Iran's oil exports and government revenues declined sharply. In 2011, for example, Iran exported about 2.4 million barrels of oil per day. By March of 2014, Iran's exports were down to just 1 million barrels a day—in a nation for which petroleum makes up 80 percent of all commodity exports.

In July of 2012, former President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad called the sanctions regime ''the most severe and strictest sanctions ever imposed on a country.''

The coordinated sanctions regime was so effective that Iran's current President even described Iran's economic situation as if the country had ''returned to the 19th century'' under the sanctions regime. I think it is clear on this first point that sanctions imposed an unsustainable cost on Iran and forced it to the table to engage in negotiations with the West regarding its nuclear program.

That brings me to his second erroneous argument that Iran has pursued nuclear technology with only peaceful purposes in mind. Iran's actions directly contradict this claim.

In 2002, members of the international community revealed that Iran had, in fact, been attempting to build a secret uranium enrichment facility at Natanz in Central Iran and a heavy water plutonium reactor at its Arak facility in the northwestern part of the country. Only because Iran failed to keep these facilities secret did the IAEA—or the International Atomic Energy Agency—finally begin having the opportunity to monitor these sites in 2002.

In 2009, the United States, France, and Britain revealed the existence of another uranium enrichment plant buried deep under a mountain near the city of Qom.

The evidence continues. In 2011, the IAEA released a report on the ''possible military dimensions'' of Iran's nuclear effort, known as PMD. The report detailed areas in which the agency had evidence of Iran's past—and potentially ongoing—work on nuclear weaponization and the development of nuclear warheads for missile delivery systems.

The IAEA's final report on the possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program, issued in December of 2015, found ''a range of activities relevant to the development of a nuclear explosive device were conducted in Iran prior to the end of 2003 as a coordinated effort.'' The report also found that Iran conducted certain activities relevant to nuclear weaponization for at least several years after 2003 and that some of these activities didn't end until 2009.

It is not just on-the-ground reports and secret nuclear facilities that suggest that Iran's nuclear efforts have not always been entirely peaceful. Let me remind my colleagues that just last month Iran tested a ballistic missile that supposedly had a message on its side proclaiming in Hebrew: ''Israel must be wiped off the Earth.''

An Iranian regime that continues to advocate for the destruction of Israel, America's vital ally Israel, does not sound like a nation that has been and hopes to continue to develop nuclear technology for anything remotely peaceful.

An Iranian regime that ships illicit weapons to support the murderous regime of Bashar al-Assad regime in Syria or the Houthi rebels in Yemen or Hezbollah in Lebanon is not seeking to develop weapons for peaceful purposes.

An Iranian regime that illegally tests dangerous ballistic missile technology—some of which is capable of carrying a nuclear weapon, all of which violates U.N. Security Council resolutions—does not have peaceful intentions.

Because of this behavior, we have every reason to distrust Iran's claims that its nuclear efforts were always peaceful. Iran continually misled the international community about the nature of its nuclear program, and it continually disguised its efforts to conduct research and other activities to help it better understand how to develop a nuclear weapon. It continues to threaten Israel, to test ballistic missiles, and to support terrorism throughout the Middle East.

That is why I simply cannot accept Seif's argument that Iran's nuclear program has always been entirely peaceful.

The third claim made by Seif last week was that the United States and our European allies have not honored our obligations under the nuclear deal known as the JCPOA. Iran's evidence for this claim is that the sanctions relief granted to Iran for complying with the terms of the agreement hasn't suddenly unleashed a flurry of Iranian economic activity. As Adam Szubin, our own Department of the Treasury's Acting Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, recently put it, throughout the negotiations between the United States, our allies, partners, and Iran, the U.S. and our allies ''did not guarantee economic outcomes, or a flood of immediate business into Iran.''

Acting Under Secretary Szubin is right. Iran is responsible for making Iran an attractive, safe place to do business. For many individuals and businesses, Iran appears neither attractive nor safe. For example, in October,

Iran arrested Siamak Namazi, a businessman who is a dual American-Iranian citizen. Namazi worked for a petroleum company in the UAE and previously ran a consulting business in Iran. He still has not been charged. In fact, the only recent development in Mr. Namazi's case is his father Baquer—an 80-year-old man who suffers from heart problems—was arrested in February and sent to Iran's notorious Evin Prison. Why would Iranian leaders expect foreign investment to flow into their country when it arbitrarily arrests and detains those seeking business opportunities for their own country.

It is not only Iran's flawed legal system or its ongoing human rights violations, more than half of Iran's economy consists of shadowy organizations controlled in part by the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, the IRGC, the hard-line military force committed to the preservation of the Iranian regime. The pseudo-private entities that are tied to the IRGC include banks, businesses, religious foundations, pension funds, and welfare projects that also serve as front companies for the IRGC.

During his question-and-answer session at the Council on Foreign Relations, Mr. Seif was asked whether foreign businesses considering investing in Iran or doing business with Iran could be confident that the money invested in Iran would not fund the IRGC. He was unable to declare definitively that it would not.

The onus, the burden, is on Iran—not the international community or the United States—to reform Iran's domestic economy and to make sure its businesses are not linked to the IRGC, to make it a country—transparent and open—and to engage in actions that suggest to the world it is a trustworthy partner. The burden is on Iran to comply with the JCPOA. The burden is on Iran to stop testing ballistic missiles, abusing human rights, and supporting terrorists. If Iran is unhappy with the level of economic relief it has received since this agreement came into effect, it only has its own actions to blame.

As Acting Under Secretary Szubin put it, ''the JCPOA [the nuclear deal] is an international arrangement, not a cashier's check.''

I commend Dr. Seif for his willingness to travel to the United States and to make his case in front of our Council on Foreign Relations. I think this is a constructive step, but as I have shown, I think the case he made is a weak one. The evidence is clear. A coordinated sanctions regime did, in fact, force Iran to negotiate. Iran's nuclear program was not entirely peaceful in its intent or execution. The United States and EU aren't holding the Iranian economy back—the Iranian Government is. The Iranian Government's actions are.

In my travels throughout the Middle East and in conversations with regional leaders and Ambassadors here, it is apparent these nations all share one overriding concern, Iranian aggression. This challenge unites countries as diverse as Israel, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates.

As my colleagues may have seen in an op-ed in the Washington Post just last week, Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Zarif sought to justify recent steps Iran has taken to dramatically build up its defenses.

Countries do, indeed, have a right to self-defense, but there is a difference between self-defense efforts undertaken by responsible members of the international community and some of Iran's recent aggressive and destabilizing actions.

Responsible nations don't support terrorist groups throughout the Middle East and stoke sectarianism to undermine the security of their neighbors. Responsible nations don't directly threaten the destruction of Israel. Responsible nations seek common ground and the pursuit of mutual interests with their neighbors. Responsible nations abide by U.N. Security Council resolutions.

Iran's actions make it clear it is not yet a responsible member of the international community. If Iran then has complaints about the relief it has received under this agreement, it should move its behavior and begin to uphold its commitments under the deal while changing the dangerous aspect of its ongoing behavior. Yet, instead, Iran continues to try and dominate its region, a valuable reminder we must continue to enforce the terms of the JCPOA strictly and push back on Iran's bad behavior that is outside the parameters of the agreement.

While I commend the Obama administration for its recent action in interdicting illicit arms shipments from Iran to the Houthis, continuing to designate IRGC-linked entities for more sanctions, and taking other critical steps to push back on Iran's bad behavior and destabilizing activities in the region, I also remain concerned about the administration's willingness to entertain Iranian complaints about sanctions relief.

I urge the United States and our allies to remain cautious in our dealings with Iran. We must remember that the most important contract with Iran is the one we have already agreed to—that is, this nuclear deal—and we must continue to remind Iran that its own behavior is the real cause of its continuing international isolation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ST. JUDE'S RANCH FOR CHILDREN, NEVADA CAMPUS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 50th anniversary of the St. Jude's Ranch for Children, Nevada Campus.

St. Jude's Ranch for Children was founded by Father Jack Adam to support abused and neglected children and give them an opportunity to learn and grow. Father Adam initially faced challenges in acquiring funding for the project. However, with the help of Nevadan community leaders, including Claudine and Shelby Williams, Forrest Duke, and the Sisters of Charity, the project raised $30,000, and the facility was built. Eddie, a resident of Elko, NV, became the first child to attend St. Jude's Ranch for Children. Since then, the organization has been a sanctuary for numerous abused and neglected children and is a recognized landmark in southern Nevada.

St. Jude's Ranch for children offers supportive housing and nutritional services for children and families. The Therapeutic Residential Foster Care program provides children an opportunity to live together, receive the nutritious foods they need to be successful, attend school, and participate in extracurricular activities. Children are nurtured in the program until they are ready to transition out of therapeutic are. Later, children are placed with loving foster families, and siblings are kept together.

April is National Child Abuse Prevention month. It is important that every April we work together to raise awareness for programs that support the physical and emotional well-being of children and recognize organizations, such as St. Jude's Ranch for Children, that transform the lives of children and families in our community.

Our youth are an important part of our history and future. We must ensure that children are protected and have a nurturing home that allows them to succeed. When a child suffers from abuse or neglect, the whole community and country suffers with them. The services provided by St. Jude's Ranch for Children ensure safety, health, and opportunity for many of our Nation's children. Their work is appreciated and admired, and I wish them continued success for years to come.

REMEMBERING RICHARD F. SCHOLZ, JR.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week the city of Quincy, in my home State of Illinois, lost a tough, principled, and fair public servant—but more importantly, a fine man. Judge Richard F. Scholz, Jr., passed away at the age of 87.

Judge Scholz was the quintessential public servant. He was a voice for the underprivileged and a passionate advocate for the most vulnerable in the community. He spent more than 24

years as a judge, fighting for at risk youths and a more equitable juvenile justice system. Although Judge Scholz could be tough, he had a softer side that put a gentle and compassionate face on the criminal justice system. He was celebrated in the courts for his well-reasoned and thoughtful decisions. Throughout his tenure, he was honored by several civic organizations and community groups, but it was dealing one-on-one with people that gave him the greatest joy and satisfaction.

Chuck Scholz, former Quincy mayor and Judge Scholz's nephew, recalled meeting a longtime Quincy resident who told him a story: ''Your uncle sent me to jail, and it was the best thing that ever happened to me.'' He went on to explain how Judge Scholz visited him one day at the correctional facility in St. Charles. The reason for his visit? To make sure he got his diploma while he was incarcerated. And when he was released, Judge Scholz got him a job. That is the kind of man Judge Scholz was. He understood that the job didn't end in his courtroom.

Judge Scholz believed in serving the community by serving the individual. He knew the recipe for building strong, healthy communities was getting the right people involved in the right way. And the community was better for it.

Born in 1928, Judge Scholz grew up in Quincy and attended St. Francis grade school, Quincy Notre Dame High School, St. Ambrose College, and the University of Illinois. After college, he moved down south and received his law degree from Mercer University in Macon, GA. While studying law, he met and married Ellen W. Scholz and shared 58 wonderful years before her death in 2009.

Following law school, the young couple returned to Quincy to raise their family and practice law with his father and brother. In 1958, he was elected judge of the 8th Judicial Circuit and served as chief judge from 1975 to 1979. In 1982, Judge Scholz retired from the bench and returned to private practice.

During his time on the bench, Judge Scholz presided over high profile cases, fought for higher pay for the county's chief probation officer and the Youth Home superintendent, and he worked tirelessly with community leaders to build the Adams County Youth Home, now the Adams County Juvenile Detention Center—one of only nine facilities of its kind in Illinois.

Hanging above the doorway at the Scholz family farm, there was a sign that read: ''You will only be a stranger here but once.'' Always willing to offer a helping hand, Judge Scholz made time for everyone. He helped young attorneys understand the right way to conduct themselves in and out of the courtroom. As a mentor to countless attorneys, judges, and children, Judge Scholz's mark on the community will endure for years.

I will close with one more story. Years ago, a mother from a Quincy family had been murdered. Her children were orphaned, and State welfare officials planned on placing them into different foster homes. Judge Scholz wouldn't hear of it. He said: ''No, you are not breaking up this family.'' The family stayed together, and there is a photo of them standing around Judge Scholz, with the words: our hero, carved into the picture—a hero indeed.

The stories of Judge Scholz's kindness and affection to the children and families in Quincy go on and on—what a legacy and what a great friend to the people of Quincy. Judge Scholz will certainly be missed.

NOMINATION OF MERRICK GARLAND

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday I had the honor of speaking at an event hosted by the Edward M. Kennedy Institute for the U.S. Senate on this body's role in considering Supreme Court nominees. The institute is a wonderful organization ''dedicated to educating the public about the important role of the Senate in our government.'' My friend Ted Kennedy loved the Senate and worked hard every day here to improve the lives of the people of Massachusetts and the people of America. I thank Vicki Kennedy for all of her efforts to build the institute. She has also continued the Kennedy legacy by working to advance medical research and health care for all Americans. I was honored by her invitation to speak at the event.

The institute's event was held on the important and timely issue of the Senate's constitutional role in providing advice and consent on nominees to the Supreme Court. As Senator Kennedy once said, ''Few responsibilities we have as Senators are more important than our responsibility to advise and consent to the nominations by the President to the Supreme Court.'' Ted understood the momentous nature of Supreme Court nominations, as well as the Senate's undeniable and irreplaceable constitutional role in providing advice and consent on the President's nominees.

And the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which Senator Kennedy and I served together for years, plays a singularly important role in considering nominees to serve in our Federal judiciary. But that critical role has been abdicated by the Senate Republicans' unprecedented decision to deny any process to Chief Judge Merrick Garland, who has been nominated to the Supreme Court.

In the last 100 years since public confirmation hearings began in the Judiciary Committee for Supreme Court nominees, the Senate has never denied a nominee a hearing and a vote. No nominee has been treated the way Senate Republicans are treating Chief Judge Garland. Even when a majority of the Judiciary Committee did not support a nominee, the committee still reported out the nomination for a vote on the Senate floor. This allowed all Senators to exercise their duty to consider the nominee.

In fact, when I became chairman of the Judiciary Committee in 2001 during the Bush administration, I and Senator HATCH—who was then the ranking member—memorialized how the committee would continue in this tradition to consider President George W. Bush's Supreme Court nominees. In a letter to all Senators, Senator HATCH and I wrote, ''The Judiciary Committee's traditional practice has been to report Supreme Court nominees to the Senate once the Committee has completed its considerations. This has been true even in cases where Supreme Court nominees were opposed by a majority of the Judiciary Committee.'' Senator HATCH and I agreed to that. And then-Majority Leader Trent Lott agreed, too, saying this back in 2001: ''the Senate has a long record allowing the Supreme Court nominees of the President to be given a vote on the floor of the Senate.'' We all agreed to this because that is what we in the Senate have done for a century, in an open and transparent manner, allowing the American people to see us doing our work.

This is exactly what the Judiciary Committee should be doing this very day. It has now been 42 days since Chief Judge Merrick Garland was nominated to the Supreme Court. If we follow the average confirmation schedule for Supreme Court nominees over the last 40 years, the Judiciary Committee should be convening a hearing today on Chief Judge Garland's nomination. The late Justice Scalia, whom Chief Judge Garland would replace on the Court, received a hearing 42 days after his nomination. And Democrats were in charge when the Senate last voted on a Supreme Court nominee in an election year when Justice Anthony Kennedy was confirmed in 1988. Justice Kennedy received a hearing in the Judiciary Committee just 14 days after President Reagan nominated him. Had he been nominated at the same time as Chief Judge Garland, his hearings would already have been completed.

Last month, the Kennedy Institute released a national poll that showed just 36 percent of Americans know that the Senate confirms Supreme Court nominees. Our response as Senators to this unfortunate fact should not be to deny Chief Judge Merrick Garland a public hearing and a vote, breaking 100 years of Senate tradition and failing to do our jobs as Senators. Instead, our response should be to engage with the American people and to show them through our actions that the Senate can hold up its part of the constitutional framework.

And although many Americans may not be able to tell you that the Senate confirms Supreme Court nominees, a solid majority of the American public does know—by a 2-to-1 margin—that Chief Judge Garland deserves to have a hearing. That strong majority of the public is telling us that the Senate should show up for work and carry out

its constitutional duty by holding a hearing for Chief Judge Garland.

We are hearing that call from so many around the country, including historians, faith groups, civil rights organizations, and legal leaders. In an op-ed yesterday, the president of the Vermont Bar Association, Jennifer Emens-Butler, and others, including a former president of the American Bar Association, made clear that Republicans' obstruction of Chief Judge Garland's nomination undermines the rule of law. They wrote: ''As leaders in the legal profession, we are committed to protecting the rule of law. Thus, we cannot remain silent as the Senate refuses to consider Garland. This level of obstructionism is unprecedented in American history and undermines the rule of law, the very foundation on which this great nation was built.'' I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this op-ed be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Some Republican Senators have claimed that their unprecedented obstruction against Chief Judge Garland is based on ''principle, not the person.'' There is no principle in refusing to confirm Supreme Court nominees in election years, as the Senate has done over a dozen times, most recently for President Reagan's last nominee to the Court. Furthermore, we have seen Republican Senators and outside interest groups attack Chief Judge Garland's judicial record, but then refuse to allow him the chance to respond at a public hearing. This is not principled, it is not fair, and it is not right.

To deny Chief Judge Garland a public hearing and a vote would be truly historic—but that is not the kind of history the Senate should be proud of. Over the more than 40 years I have served in the Senate, I recall times when the consideration of Supreme Court nominees was controversial.

But in every one of those instances, the nominee received a public hearing and a vote. We did not avoid doing our jobs simply because it was hard.

We must remember why we are here in the United States Senate. We are all here to serve the American people by carrying out our sworn oaths to uphold the Constitution. Protection of our enduring constitutional system requires that we hold our constitutional duties as Senators above the partisan politics of the now. I hope that Republicans will soon reverse course and put aside their obstruction to move forward on Chief Judge Garland's nomination.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Hill, Apr. 26, 2016]

SENATE'S REFUSAL TO MOVE ON GARLAND CONTINUES TO UNDERMINE RULE OF LAW

(By Monte Frank, James R. Silkenat, and Jennifer Emens-Butler)

A month ago, Sen. Richard Blumenthal (D–Conn.) and Monte Frank (one of the co-authors of this piece) warned that the Senate's refusal to consider President Obama's nomination of Chief Judge Merrick Garland to the U.S. Supreme Court would undermine the rule of law. Despite this warning, the Senate Judiciary Committee has continued its blocking tactics and has rebuffed calls for hearings and a vote. As leaders in the legal profession, we are committed to protecting the rule of law. Thus, we cannot remain silent as the Senate refuses to consider Garland. This level of obstructionism is unprecedented in American history and undermines the rule of law, the very foundation on which this great nation was built.

The rule of law is the restriction of the arbitrary exercise of power by subordinating such exercise to well-defined and established laws. As discussed in the earlier piece with Blumenthal, in the United States, the rule of law is grounded in our Constitution, which unambiguously lays out the process for filling vacancies to the Supreme Court. Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution states the roles the president and the Senate must play in the appointment process: ''The President . . . shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint . . . Judges of the Supreme Court.'' The Constitution is also clear that the president's term is four years, not three or three-and-one-fourth years.

Now that Obama has fulfilled his constitutional responsibility and made a nomination promptly to fill the current Supreme Court vacancy, the Constitution requires the Senate to likewise fulfill its responsibility to consider and act promptly on the nominee. The Senate needs to move forward by holding meetings, conducting hearings and ultimately taking a vote.

While Garland is preeminently qualified, having served as chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit since 1997, whether the Senate ultimately confirms him is an entirely different question than whether the Senate should even consider him. The current arbitrary exercise of power to deny Garland a hearing and a vote is the kind of abuse the rule of law is designed to protect us from. If the well-defined and established provisions of the Constitution are permitted to be willfully ignored, then the rule of law will be undermined.

In a letter to the leadership of the Senate, 15 past-presidents of the American Bar Association emphasized their utmost respect for the rule of law and the ''need for the judicial system to function independently of partisan influences. The founding fathers understood this as well, and structured the constitutional system of government to insulate the judiciary from changing political tides. The stated refusal to fill the ninth seat of the Supreme Court injects a degree of politics into the judicial branch that materially hampers the effective operation of our nation's highest court and the lower courts over which it presides.''

The Senate should follow the example set by President Reagan and then-Senate Judiciary Committee Chair Joe Biden (D–Del.) in considering Justice Anthony Kennedy, who was confirmed in an election year. Reagan urged the nation to ''join together in a bipartisan effort to fulfill our constitutional obligation of restoring the United States Supreme Court to full strength.'' He asked the Senate for ''prompt hearings conducted in the spirit of cooperation and bipartisanship.'' Biden responded: ''I'm glad the President has made his choice. We will get the process under way and move as rapidly as is prudent. We want to conduct the committee's review with both thoroughness and dispatch.'' Sen. Chuck Grassley (R–Iowa) was also on the Senate Judiciary Committee at that time. Now that he is the chair, he should follow the example set by Reagan and Biden.

The Senate's refusal to process the nomination has already impacted the lives of everyday people throughout the United States. If lower court decisions are confirmed simply because of a tie in the Supreme Court, as has already occurred and will continue to occur until the vacancy is filled, then the court will not have created precedent and the lower courts will not be able to rely on those decisions. Open questions of law on significant issues will continue to be left unanswered. To fill this void, the Senate must move forward on a bipartisan basis with meetings and hearings, consideration of and a timely vote on the nominee.

President Reagan's words in 1988 on the confirmation of Justice Kennedy are just as applicable today: ''The Federal Judiciary is too important to be made a political football. I would hope, and the American people should expect . . . for the Senate to get to work and act.'' We urge the Senate to put partisan politics aside for the good of the American people and to avoid undermining the rule of law.

PARIS CLIMATE CHANGE AGREEMENT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak in strong support of the United Nations' Paris climate change agreement and the President's decision for the United States to be among the first nations to sign the agreement.

Last Friday, April 22, the United States and more than 170 nations came together in New York to sign the international climate agreement negotiated last year that would slow global warming and help poorer nations most affected by it. I find it very symbolic that April 22, the first day that nations could officially sign the agreement, was also Earth Day. Earth Day is a reminder of our obligation to preserve and protect our environment for our children and future generations to come.

Last year, I joined nine of my Senate colleagues in Paris to attend the 21st United Nations Climate Change Conference, also known as COP 21, where the climate agreement was negotiated. What we witnessed at COP 21 was monumental: 195 countries, representing more than 95 percent of global carbon emissions, came together to adopt the first universal climate agreement that calls for international cooperation on addressing the causes of global warming and helping poorer nations most affected by it.

I am proud to say that the United States was a big part of that effort. President Obama's leadership was key in encouraging China, the world's largest emitter, to submit an aggressive climate action plan, and helping countries to find consensus necessary to make such a landmark agreement.

The Paris agreement establishes a long-term, durable global framework for countries to work together to reduce carbon emissions and keep the global temperature rise well below 2 degrees Celsius in order to avoid some of the worst consequences of climate change. For the first time, countries have committed to putting forward ambitious, nationally determined climate targets and reporting on their

progress towards those targets using a standardized process of review. The Paris agreement encourages transparency, accountability, and collaboration among nations not only to meet their climate targets, but to encourage innovation while doing so.

No country is insulated from the increasingly present and escalating effects of climate change. In the United States, we are seeing it throughout the country, and we are certainly feeling its effects in New Hampshire. Rising temperatures are shortening our fall foliage season, which is so important to our State's tourism economy. Milder winters have led to increases of insect-borne diseases that endanger our wildlife. In New Hampshire, we have already seen a 40 percent decline in our moose population. The changing climate is also putting more stress on sugar maples, and this is already affecting syrup production.

Investments to improve the resiliency of our communities at all levels is critically important to our ability to mitigate the impacts of climate change. And that is what we are doing in New Hampshire. At the grassroots and statewide, Granite Staters recognize the urgency of addressing climate change and are leading the way by reducing pollution and transitioning to a more efficient, clean energy economy.

For example, last month in Durham, the New Hampshire Climate Action Coalition joined with the University of New Hampshire to host a pancake breakfast and discuss the negative impact of climate change on the maple syrup industry. The event featured a panel of local maple syrup producers, scientists, and others who understand the impacts that climate change is having on forests and maple trees. Over 80 people came together to enjoy maple syrup, hear the speakers, and take action to protect our environment.

New Hampshire is also a part of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, RGGI—the Nation's first regional cap-and-trade program designed to reduce harmful carbon emissions from the power sector. Through our participation in RGGI, New Hampshire has reduced greenhouse gas emissions in the power sector by nearly 50 percent since 2008 and is on track to meet the administration's Clean Power Plan's carbon-reduction goals 10 years ahead of schedule.

The events happening in New Hampshire show that there truly is broad momentum in the fight against climate change. But in order to achieve our goals, State and local actions must be accompanied by national and international involvement. This is why the international climate change agreement is so essential.

Under the Paris agreement, the United States has made a commitment to reduce carbon emissions by at least 26 percent below 2005 levels by 2025. While this goal is indeed ambitious, it is something that we can achieve. By implementing administrative policies like the administration's Clean Power Plan, which will reduce pollution from our Nation's dirtiest power plants, and by doing what this Chamber did last week, which was to take up and pass a comprehensive energy bill that will encourage energy efficiency and improve our Nation's energy policies, we can meet our commitments.

The United States must also be responsive to climate change's impact on our friends in the world's least developed and most vulnerable countries. As one of the world's largest emitters of carbon emissions, we have a responsibility to the world on climate change.

Climate change represents an enormous challenge, but the solutions are within reach if we put into place policies that allow for swift action. The world must work together to ensure that the goals of the Paris agreement are realized. We have a responsibility to help protect our children and grandchildren from the most severe consequences of global warming by reducing emissions now.

101ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, last Sunday I had the opportunity to attend the 101st anniversary commemoration of the Armenian genocide, hosted at the Armenian Martyrs Memorial in Providence, RI. I was pleased to be able to join with so many in the Armenian community in my home State for this solemn event.

Over a century ago, the Young Turk leaders of the Ottoman Empire summoned and executed over 200 Armenian community leaders and intellectuals, beginning an 8-year campaign of oppression and massacre.

By 1923, an estimated 1½ million Armenians were killed, and over a half a million survivors were exiled. These atrocities affected the lives of every Armenian living in Asia Minor and, indeed, throughout the world. The survivors of the Armenian Genocide, however, persevered due to their unbreakable spirit and steadfast resolve and went on to greatly contribute to the lands in which they found new homes and communities, including the United States. This genocide should no longer be denied, which is why I have joined with several of my colleagues on resolutions over the years to encourage the United States to officially recognize the Armenian genocide.

But as we remember our history, we must also look to the present and to our future.

Violence against Armenians in Nogorno-Karabakh has escalated in recent months. These attacks on the Armenian people are completely unacceptable and call into question the sincerity with which Azerbaijan has approached recent peace negotiations. We must remain vigilant and do all that we can to encourage Azerbaijan to return to the negotiating table and make a good faith effort to ensure a lasting peace agreement in the region.

As ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I remain committed to supporting efforts to provide assistance to Armenia to strengthen security, promote economic growth, and support democratic reforms and development.

We also must find a way to come together to recognize our past and to show our unwavering support to those facing persecution today.

TRIBUTE TO DR. RUTH ELLEN WASEM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Dr. Ruth Ellen Wasem, a specialist in immigration policy, will be retiring from CRS at the end of this month. Dr. Wasem is a graduate of the University of Michigan, where she received a Ph.D. and M.A. in history. She completed her undergraduate degree at Muskingum College—a private university located in New Concord, OH—where she graduated magna cum laude. Dr. Wasem was raised in Cadiz, OH.

Dr. Wasem came to CRS in 1987 as an analyst in social legislation, where she worked on teenage pregnancy, youth policy, homelessness, and immigration policy. She eventually moved full time into immigration policy, where she became a recognized and leading expert in the field.

Throughout her time at CRS, Dr. Wasem provided substantial legislative support to Members and congressional staff on various aspects of immigration and social welfare policy. Dr. Wasem's work was used by Congress in hearings, legislative development, markups, and preconference negotiations.

Dr. Wasem wrote numerous analytic and concise reports for Congress—well over 300 during her tenure at CRS. Dr. Wasem also testified before congressional committees numerous times throughout her tenure at CRS, providing testimony on issues ranging from asylum to unauthorized migration to immigration and social policy data.

As CRS's immigration team leader, Dr. Wasem served as a mentor to all of the other team members, and she always displayed great generosity and selflessness in devoting time and energy to their professional development.

The Congressional Research Service has given Dr. Wasem a number of outstanding commendations and special achievement awards for legislative analysis in the areas of immigration policy, Haitian relief, health care reform, homeland security, temporary foreign workers, and welfare reform.

Dr. Wasem recently spent a year as a Kluge Staff Fellow at the Library of Congress where she researched legislative efforts to end national origins and race-based immigrant admissions to the United States, all of which culminated in the Immigration Act of 1965. During her time as a Kluge Fellow, Dr. Wasem was awarded the Abba P. Schwartz Research Fellowship, which is administered by the John F.

Kennedy Library Foundation, to further her research in this area.

During her 29 years at CRS—and her 2 years of previous Federal service—Dr. Wasem won the respect and admiration of her colleagues. Her steadfast dedication to serve Congress and her commitment to the highest standards of analytic, unbiased, and timely response to congressional requests for information and analysis have made a positive and lasting contribution to the congressional policy discourse.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DR. BETTYE CALDWELL

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Dr. Bettye Caldwell, who pioneered early childhood education in the United States.

Dr. Caldwell's groundbreaking research at Syracuse University in the 1960s paved the way for the national Head Start Program and was the inspiration for countless researchers and programs to educate young children in the United States and around the world.

She received her bachelor's degree from Baylor University in 1945 and went on to earn a master's from the University of Iowa and her doctorate from Washington University in St. Louis.

As a developmental psychologist, her work with pediatrician Dr. Julius B. Richmond convinced her of the need infants and toddlers have for emotional and cognitive support. They focused on the development gap for children in disadvantaged homes and sought to combine childcare with education, while keeping families strong. With this mission, she founded and directed the Children's Center in Syracuse, NY. It was the first enrichment program for young children in the United States.

Dr. Caldwell and her husband, Dr. Fred Caldwell, moved to Little Rock, AR, in 1969, where she became the principal of the Kramer School. Under her leadership, ''the Kramer Project'' gained national attention as the site of the Center for Early Development and Education. Bettye's family notes that she considered the Kramer School her most significant work.

She joined the faculty of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock in the mid-1970s and continued at the university for almost 20 years. UALR chancellor Joel E. Anderson noted recently, ''Dr. Caldwell changed the way parents and policymakers understood early childhood development.'' She eventually retired from UAMS College of Medicine as a professor of pediatrics in child development.

Many scholars know her best as one of the developers of the HOME research tool that helps observe the impact of a supportive home environment on a child's development. It is used today by researchers around the world.

A popular speaker and prolific writer, Dr. Caldwell spoke in all 50 States and many foreign countries. She published more than 300 articles and edited several books. She served as president of the National Association for the Education of Young Children and gave her time and knowledge to organizations in Arkansas and throughout the Nation.

She received many honors and awards for her work, including being named Woman of the Year by Ladies Home Journal in 1978. Later in life, she was honored with the prestigious Dolley Madison Award for Outstanding Lifelong Contribution in 2001.

Dr. Caldwell passed away on Sunday, April 17, 2016, at the age of 91. In addition to her incredible professional contributions, her family noted, ''There was just little that Bettye could not do.'' She was married for 58 years to her college sweetheart, raised twins—her son Paul Caldwell and daughter Elizabeth Lawson—and adored her two granddaughters, Becca Ray and Rachel Caldwell. She was a talented seamstress, gourmet cook, and gardener. She loved to sing and enjoyed having guests in her home.

I am honored to work with Dr. Caldwell's granddaughter, Becca, and to know what an extraordinary legacy she left as an educator, researcher, mother, and grandmother. She was a true leader and pioneer whose work will continue to impact millions of children each day.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:51 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it request the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1523. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 223. An act to authorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1684. An act to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to impose penalties and provide for the recovery of removal costs and damages in connection with certain discharges of oil from foreign offshore units, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2615. An act to establish the Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission.

H.R. 2908. An act to adopt the bison as the national mammal of the United States.

H.R. 3583. An act to reform and improve the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Office of Emergency Communications, and the Office of Health Affairs of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4096. An act to amend the Volcker Rule to permit certain investment advisers to share a similar name with a private equity fund, subject to certain restrictions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4359. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that Federal employees may not be placed on administrative leave for more than 14 days during any year for misconduct or poor performance, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4360. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that a Federal employee who leaves Government service while under personnel investigation shall have a notation of any adverse findings under such investigation placed in such employee's official personnel file, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4698. An act to enhance aviation by requiring airport security assessments and a security coordination enhancement plan, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4820. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to use the testimonials of former violent extremists or their associates in order to counter terrorist recruitment, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1493) to protect and preserve international cultural property at risk due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1684. An act to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to impose penalties and provide for the recovery of removal costs and damages in connection with certain discharges of oil from foreign offshore units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 2615. An act to establish the Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3583. An act to reform and improve the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Office of Emergency Communications, and the Office of Health Affairs of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4096. An act to amend the Volcker Rule to permit certain investment advisers to share a similar name with a private equity fund, subject to certain restrictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4359. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that Federal employees may not be placed on administrative leave for more than 14 days during any year for misconduct or poor performance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4360. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that a Federal employee who leaves Government service while under personnel investigation shall have a notation of any adverse findings under such investigation placed in such employee's official personnel file, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4698. An act to enhance aviation by requiring airport security assessments and a security coordination enhancement plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4820. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to use the

testimonials of former violent extremists or their associates in order to counter terrorist recruitment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 223. An act to authorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2908. An act to adopt the bison as the national mammal of the United States.

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–5271. A communication from the Director of the Center for Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Agency Final Regulations Implementing Executive Order 13559: Fundamental Principles and Partnerships With Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Organizations'' (RIN0503–AA55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5272. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Five-year Comprehensive Range Plan for Melrose Military Range''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5273. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Yemen that was originally declared in Executive Order 13611 on May 16, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5274. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5275. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Agency Final Regulations Implementing Executive Order 13559: Fundamental Principles and Partnerships With Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Organizations'' (RIN2501–AD65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5276. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5277. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Safety Evaluation of BWRVIP–100, Revision 1, 'BWRVIP Vessel and Internals Project: Updated Assessment of the Fracture Toughness of Irradiated Stainless Steel for BWR Core Shrouds''' (BWRVIP–100, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5278. A communication from the Regulatory Policy Officer, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Agency Final Regulations Implementing Executive Order 13559: Fundamental Principles and Policymaking Criteria for Partnerships With Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Organizations'' (RIN0412–AA75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5279. A communication from the Director, Center for Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Agency Final Regulations Implementing Executive Order 13559: Fundamental Principles and Policymaking Criteria for Partnerships With Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Organizations'' (RIN0991–AB96) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5280. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Office of the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Agency Final Regulations Implementing Executive Order 13559: Fundamental Principles and Policymaking Criteria for Partnerships With Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Organizations'' (RIN1290–AA29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5281. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Agency Final Regulations Implementing Executive Order 13559: Fundamental Principles and Policymaking Criteria for Partnerships With Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Organizations'' (RIN1895–AA01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5282. A communication from the Senior Advisor to the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Office of the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Agency Final Regulations Implementing Executive Order 13559: Fundamental Principles and Policymaking Criteria for Partnerships With Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Organizations'' (RIN1601–AA40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5283. A communication from the Acting Director, Pay and Leave, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Family and Medical Leave Act; Definition of a Spouse'' (RIN3206–AM90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5284. A communication from the Associate Administrator for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's fiscal year 2015 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5285. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Agency Final Regulations Implementing Executive Order 13559: Fundamental Principles and Policymaking Criteria for Partnerships With Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Organizations'' (RIN1105–AB45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5286. A communication from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Agency Final Regulations Implementing Executive Order 13559: Fundamental Principles and Policymaking Criteria for Partnerships With Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Organizations'' (RIN2900–AP05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2016; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5287. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting proposed legislation relative to major medical facility construction projects and major medical facility leases for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Veterans' 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–160. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress to enact legislation that will enhance hunting, fishing, recreational shooting, and other outdoor recreational opportunities for sportsmen and women nationwide; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 228

Whereas, Conservation in the United States is funded primarily by sportsmen and women. This American System of Conservation Funding is a user pays—public benefits approach that includes excise taxes on hunting, fishing, and boating equipment. This strategy is widely recognized as the most successful model of fish and wildlife management funding in the world; and

Whereas, Through the pursuit of their outdoor passions, sportsmen and women support hundreds of thousands of jobs and contribute billions to our economy annually through salaries, wages, and product purchases; and

Whereas, Currently pending legislation in the U.S. Senate would create or renew several important programs that are vital to the continued conservation of our natural resources, the health of America's local economies, and the enhancement and protection of our time-honored outdoor pastimes. Senate Bill 659, the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2015, pulls together fourteen separate programs that impact sportsmen. The bill will advance the cause of making public lands more accessible for multiple recreational uses including hunting and fishing; and

Whereas, The bill will renew several important programs, including reauthorization of the federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. The reauthorization of these

programs as well as the creation of new programs will enhance opportunities for outdoor recreation enthusiasts, improve access to public lands, and help boost the outdoor recreation economy. Conserving our fish and wildlife resources and their habitats, and ensuring that future generations have access to public lands and continued recreational opportunities protects our hunting, shooting, and conservation heritage for generations to come: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we urge the United States Congress to enact legislation that will enhance hunting, fishing, recreational shooting, and other outdoor recreational opportunities for sportsmen and women nationwide; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

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. 438. A bill to provide for the repair, replacement, and maintenance of certain Indian irrigation projects (Rept. No. 114–245).

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 480. A bill to amend and reauthorize the controlled substance monitoring program under section 399O of the Public Health Service Act.

S. 1455. A bill to provide access to medication-assisted therapy, and for other purposes.

S. 2256. A bill to establish programs for health care provider training in Federal health care and medical facilities, to establish Federal co-prescribing guidelines, to establish a grant program with respect to naloxone, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Andrew J. Read, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission for a term expiring May 13, 2016.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Jennifer K. Grzelak and ending with Andrew R. Sheffield, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 14, 2015.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Meredith L. Austin and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Paul F. Thomas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 24, 2016.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Jonathan P. Tschudy and ending with Matthew B. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 17, 2016.

*Coast Guard nomination of Vice Adm. Charles D. Michel, to be Admiral.

*Coast Guard nomination of Vice Adm. Charles W. Ray, to be Vice Admiral.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2856. A bill to streamline certain feasibility studies and avoid duplication of effort; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2857. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain membership status for India in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2858. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate for lower prices for Medicare prescription drugs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 2859. A bill to establish a competitive grant program to incentivize States to implement comprehensive reforms and innovative strategies to significantly improve postsecondary outcomes for low-income and first generation college students, including increasing postsecondary enrollment and graduation rates, to reduce the need of postsecondary students for remedial education, to increase alignment of high school and postsecondary education, and to promote innovation in postsecondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2860. A bill to establish the Climate Change Advisory Commission to develop recommendations, frameworks, and guidelines for projects to respond to the impacts of climate change, to issue Federal bonds, the proceeds of which shall be used to fund projects that aid in adaptation to climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 2861. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to review and monitor prescribing practices at military treatment facilities of pharmaceutical agents for the treatment of post-traumatic stress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2862. A bill to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2863. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove limitations on Medicaid benefits for persons in custody pending disposition of charges; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BENNET, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2864. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prevent catastrophic out-of-pocket spending on prescription drugs for seniors and individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 2865. A bill to promote stability and security in the Asia-Pacific maritime domains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2866. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the sharing of health information concerning and individual's substance abuse treatment by certain entities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2867. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish an Office of the Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation and a Small Business Capital Formation Advisory Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 2868. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deferral of inclusion in gross income for capital gains reinvested in economically distressed zones; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 442. A resolution condemning the terrorist attacks in Brussels and honoring the memory of the United States citizens murdered in those attacks, and offering thoughts and prayers for all the victims, condolences to their families, resolve to support the Belgian people, and the pledge to defend democracy and stand in solidarity with the country of Belgium and all our allies in the face of continuing terrorist attacks on freedom and liberty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 443. A resolution designating April, 2016, as ''National Sarcoidosis Awareness Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. Res. 444. A resolution honoring the life and achievements of Prince; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 445. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Coast Guard aviation and the contribution of Coast Guard aviators to naval aviation and the safety and security of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 446. A resolution designating April 2016 as ''National 9–1-1 Education Month''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 27

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from California

(Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 27, a bill to make wildlife trafficking a predicate offense under racketeering and money laundering statutes and the Travel Act, to provide for the use for conservation purposes of amounts from civil penalties, fines, forfeitures, and restitution under such statutes based on such violations, and for other purposes.

S. 71

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 71, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 579, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes.

S. 616

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 616, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide recruitment and retention incentives for volunteer emergency service workers.

S. 804

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 812

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 812, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 1062

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1062, a bill to improve the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1567

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1567, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for a review of the characterization or terms of discharge from the Armed Forces of individuals with mental health disorders alleged to affect terms of discharge.

S. 1996

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1996, a bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the premium assistance tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy.

S. 2034

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2034, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim.

S. 2279

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2279, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program to increase efficiency in the recruitment and hiring by the Department of Veterans Affairs of health care workers that are undergoing separation from the Armed Forces, to create uniform credentialing standards for certain health care professionals of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 2392

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2392, a bill to enhance beneficiary and provider protections and improve transparency in the Medicare Advantage market, and for other purposes.

S. 2437

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2437, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the burial of the cremated remains of persons who served as Women's Air Forces Service Pilots in Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes.

S. 2441

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2441, a bill to provide that certain Cuban entrants are ineligible to receive refugee assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 2454

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2454, a bill to limit the period of authorization of new budget authority provided in appropriation Acts, to require analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of existing programs for which continued new budget authority is proposed to be authorized by committees of Congress, and for other purposes.

S. 2551

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2551, a bill to help prevent acts of genocide and mass atrocities, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States civilian capacities to prevent and mitigate such crises.

S. 2595

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2595, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 2628

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2628, a bill to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

S. 2644

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2644, a bill to reauthorize the Federal Communications Commission for fiscal years 2017 and 2018, and for other purposes.

S. 2702

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2702, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals with disabilities to save additional amounts in their ABLE accounts above the current annual maximum contribution if they work and earn income.

S. 2703

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2703, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow

rollovers between 529 programs and ABLE accounts.

S. 2704

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2704, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 2707

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 2707, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to nullify the proposed rule regarding defining and delimiting the exemptions for executive, administrative, professional, outside sales, and computer employees, to require the Secretary of Labor to conduct a full and complete economic analysis with improved economic data on small businesses, nonprofit employers, Medicare or Medicaid dependent health care providers, and small governmental jurisdictions, and all other employers, and minimize the impact on such employers, before promulgating any substantially similar rule, and to provide a rule of construction regarding the salary threshold exemption under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes.

S. 2736

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2736, a bill to improve access to durable medical equipment for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2760

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2760, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to address certain issues related to the extension of consumer credit, and for other purposes.

S. 2790

At the request of Mr. HELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2790, a bill to provide requirements for the appropriate Federal banking agencies when requesting or ordering a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, to provide for additional requirements related to subpoenas issued under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, and for other purposes.

S. 2796

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2796, a bill to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to Indians.

S. 2843

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2843, a bill to provide emergency supplemental appropriations to address the Zika crisis.

S. 2845

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2845, a bill to extend the termination of sanctions with respect to Venezuela under the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014.

S. RES. 432

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 432, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

AMENDMENT NO. 3857

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3857 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2028, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3877

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3877 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2028, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2856. A bill to streamline certain feasibility studies and avoid duplication of effort; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2856

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 ''Corps' Obligation to Assist in Safeguarding Texas Act'' or the ''COAST Act''.

SEC. 2. COASTAL TEXAS PROTECTION AND RESTORATION STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study—

(1) the Secretary of the Army shall take into consideration studies, data, or information developed by the Gulf Coast Community Protection and Recovery District to expedite completion of the Study; and

(2) any studies, data, or information used in the development of the final recommendations of the Chief of Engineers shall be credited against the non-Federal share of study costs.

(b) EXPEDITED COMPLETION.—The Secretary shall expedite completion of the reports for the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study and, if the Secretary determines that a project described in the completed report is justified, proceed directly to project preconstruction, engineering, and design.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2857. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain membership status for India in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2857

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

SECTION 1. PARTICIPATION OF INDIA IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC ECONOMIC COOPERATION REGIONAL ECONOMIC FORUM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Republic of India is the world's ninth largest economy in nominal terms and the third largest economy based on purchasing-power parity.

(2) The United States-India partnership is vital to United States strategic interests in the Asia-Pacific region and across the globe, and is an integral aspect to the Administration's Rebalance to Asia.

(3) United States-India bilateral trade and investment continue to expand, supporting thousands of United States jobs.

(4) The Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) regional economic forum is the premier Asia-Pacific economic forum with a goal to support sustainable economic growth and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region.

(5) APEC works to champion free, open trade and investment, to promote and accelerate regional economic integration, to encourage economic and technical cooperation, to enhance human security, and to facilitate a favorable and sustainable business environment.

(6) APEC held a moratorium on new membership from 1997 to 2010, which has since been lifted.

(7) India has pursued membership in APEC for over 20 years, and became an APEC observer in November 2011 at the invitation of the United States, when the forum met in Hawaii.

(8) India enjoys a location within the Asia-Pacific region which provides an avenue for continued trade and investment partnerships with APEC member states.

(9) India has been or is pursuing bilateral or multilateral trade agreements with the majority of APEC member states.

(10) India's ''Look East, Act East'' strategy to expand economic engagement with East and Southeast Asia demonstrates its effort to pursue external oriented, market-driven economic policies.

(b) ACTIONS.—The Secretary of State shall—

(1) develop a strategy to obtain membership status for India in APEC, including participation in related meetings, working groups, activities, and mechanisms; and

(2) actively urge APEC member states to support such membership status for India.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report, in unclassified form, describing the United States strategy to obtain membership status for India in APEC. Such report shall be updated and submitted annually until such time as India obtains membership in APEC. Each such report shall include the following:

(1) A description of the efforts the Secretary has made to encourage APEC member states to promote India's bid to obtain membership status.

(2) The further steps the Secretary will take to assist India in obtaining membership status for APEC.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2862. A bill to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Probation Officer Protection Act, which I introduced today with Senator FEINSTEIN. I would like to begin by thanking Senator FEINSTEIN for cosponsoring this bill and also thank Representatives REICHERT and PASCRELL for introducing companion legislation in the House.

Under current law, a Federal probation officer may arrest a probationer or individual on supervised release if the officer has probable cause to believe that the offender has violated a condition of his or her probation or release. The officer may make the arrest with or without a warrant.

In practice, formal arrests by probation officers are rare. Rather, probation officers use this authority to lawfully engage in less restrictive uses of force, such as ordering an offender to stand aside during a search; instructing an offender not to interfere with the officer's movements; or, in rare cases, temporarily restraining an offender who poses a physical danger.

Current law does not, however, address a probation officer's arrest authority in situations where a third party attempts to physically obstruct the officer or cause the officer physical harm. Although obstructing a probation officer in the performance of his or her official duties is illegal, when a probation officer encounters an uncooperative or violent third party, the officer may be forced to retreat because he or she lacks authority to restrain the third party. This lack of authority and resulting need to retreat exposes probation officers to greater risk of harm and allows the third party—along with any evidence or individual the third party is attempting to shield—to elude capture. As a result, evidence that an offender has violated a condition of his or her probation or supervised release, or evidence of other criminal activity, may be lost.

In some circumstances, a probation officer may be able to enlist the assistance of local police in responding to a hostile third party. But this is not, in and of itself, an adequate solution. First, unless the probation officer knows in advance that he or she is likely to encounter a hostile third party and can find an available police officer to accompany him or her, the probation officer must wait for police backup to arrive. This is often not a viable option. Second, even if a local police officer is available to accompany the probation officer, because the probation officer lacks arrest authority, he or she cannot lawfully assist the police officer if the police officer is accosted. Third, requiring federal probation officers to rely on local law enforcement in responding to uncooperative or violent third parties burdens local police departments and diverts police resources from other uses.

My bill addresses these problems by authorizing Federal probation officers to arrest a third party if there is probable cause to believe the third party has forcibly assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with the officer, or a fellow probation officer, while the officer was engaged in the performance of official duties. This language parallels 18 U.S.C. §111, which makes it a crime to forcibly assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with an officer or employee of the United States while the officer or employee is engaged in the performance of official duties.

The bill additionally provides that this arrest authority shall be exercised in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

It is important to note, that this legislation does not give probation officers general arrest authority. Rather, it merely authorizes arrest in the narrow circumstance where a third party forcibly interferes with a probation officer in the course of the officer's performance of his or her official duties. This limited arrest authority will protect officers, offenders, and third parties alike by preventing obstruction from escalating to actual violence, consistent with the rehabilitative mission of the Federal probation system. State probation officers in many jurisdictions have similar third-party arrest authority.

This legislation has the strong support of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, and numerous other law enforcement groups. It will make a meaningful difference in the lives of our Federal probation officers and local police officers and in the homes and communities they serve.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 442—CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ATTACKS IN BRUSSELS AND HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE UNITED STATES CITIZENS MURDERED IN THOSE ATTACKS, AND OFFERING THOUGHTS AND PRAYERS FOR ALL THE VICTIMS, CONDOLENCES TO THEIR FAMILIES, RESOLVE TO SUPPORT THE BELGIAN PEOPLE, AND THE PLEDGE TO DEFEND DEMOCRACY AND STAND IN SOLIDARITY WITH THE COUNTRY OF BELGIUM AND ALL OUR ALLIES IN THE FACE OF CONTINUING TERRORIST ATTACKS ON FREEDOM AND LIBERTY

Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 442

Whereas, on March 22, 2016, three suicide bombers and their accomplices conducted three coordinated terrorist attacks across the city of Brussels, Belgium, killing at least 32 civilians and wounding over 340 innocent men, women, and children;

Whereas these terrorist attacks were conducted in order to maximize casualties, the 7:58 a.m. explosions targeted the Brussels-Zaventem Airport morning rush and the 9:10 a.m. metro attack targeted those commuting to and from the Maelbeek metro station, which is near the United States Embassy and the European Union headquarters buildings;

Whereas evidence suggests that these attacks explicitly targeted United States interests by placing explosive devices in front of the American Airlines, Delta, and United Airlines check-in counters;

Whereas the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS) has claimed responsibility for these attacks, which marks the second time in just over four months that ISIS has used suicide bombers to attack innocent civilians in a Western European capital;

Whereas the world still grieves for those innocent lives lost and injured in Paris, the 129 murdered civilians and the 350 injured men, women, and children;

Whereas Charles Michel, the Prime Minister of Belgium, has responded to these horrors by calling for solidarity: ''[W]hat we feared has happened. Our country and citizens have been hit by a terrorist attack, in a violent and cowardly way . . . To those who have chosen to be the barbaric enemies of liberty, of democracy, of fundamental values, I want to say with the greatest strength that we will remain assembled and united.'';

Whereas President Barack Obama has called these attacks ''yet another reminder that the world must unite; we must be together, regardless of nationality or race or faith, in fighting against the scourge of terrorism'';

Whereas Justin and Stephanie Shults, an American married couple, were murdered at the airport, where they had just taken Stephanie's mother for her flight back to the United States after visiting the Shults' home in Belgium;

Whereas Justin and Stephanie Shults met at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee, close to both where Justin grew up in Gatlinburg, Tennessee and Stephanie grew up in Lexington, Kentucky;

Whereas Justin and Stephanie lived in Brussels and worked for CLARCOR and Mars,

respectively, both United States corporations;

Whereas Alexander and Sascha Pinczowski, Dutch siblings who called New York home, were murdered at the airport while speaking on the phone with their mother;

Whereas Mayor Bill de Blasio called Alexander and Sascha ''two of our own'';

Whereas Gail Minglana Martinez, wife of United States' Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Kato Martinez, was injured in the airport attack with her husband of 21 years and their four children;

Whereas that blast ultimately claimed the life of Gail Minglana Martinez, a native of Corpus Christi, Texas;

Whereas the Governments of Belgium, France, and Germany have expanded counterterrorism operations, resulting in the arrest of over twelve suspected terrorists across their countries between March 24 and 25, 2016; and

Whereas these attacks represent a continued assault on freedom and democracy and an unmitigated evil that plagues the Middle East and the wider world, against which the United States and our allies must stand united in fighting: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the terrorist attacks on March 22, 2016, in Brussels, Belgium that killed 32 people and injured hundreds;

(2) honors the memories of Justin and Stephanie Shults, Alexander and Sascha Pinczowski, and Gail Martinez, who were murdered by the Islamic State in these heinous terrorist attacks;

(3) expresses its heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathies for the victims of these attacks and their families;

(4) renews the solidarity of the Government and people of the United States with the people and the leadership of Belgium, as well as those throughout the world who work to eliminate terrorism;

(5) pledges United States support to Belgium, Europe, and all United States allies in the effort to defeat ISIS and associated groups; and

(6) reaffirms its commitment to the transatlantic relationship and the shared values of freedom, democracy, and human rights.

SENATE RESOLUTION 443—DESIGNATING APRIL, 2016, AS ''NATIONAL SARCOIDOSIS AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 443

Whereas sarcoidosis is an inflammatory disease that can affect almost any organ of the body, but most commonly affects the lungs;

Whereas sarcoidosis causes the immune system to overreact, causing damage to tissue in the form of granulomas, which are microscopic clumps of inflammatory cells, and interference with the functioning of an organ when too many granulomas form in that organ;

Whereas sarcoidosis is a multisystem disorder, which means that symptoms vary depending on which organ is affected, and ⅓ of individuals diagnosed with sarcoidosis will experience damage to multiple organs;

Whereas the cause of sarcoidosis is unknown;

Whereas sarcoidosis is classified as a rare disease, but there are an estimated 200,000 individuals in the United States who live with sarcoidosis;

Whereas sarcoidosis affects all demographics, regardless of age, race, or gender, but is most common among adults between the ages of 20 and 40 and more likely to be severe and chronic in African-Americans;

Whereas sarcoidosis was the first diagnosis for an overwhelming majority of rescue workers responding to the site of the attacks on September 11, 2001;

Whereas sarcoidosis patients are often left undertreated or misdiagnosed due to the diverse presentation of sarcoidosis, the lack of knowledge of sarcoidosis among some physicians, and the diagnosis of sarcoidosis through exclusions;

Whereas the average time it takes to diagnose sarcoidosis is 7 years, and many sarcoidosis patients struggle to find knowledgeable physicians and emotional support resources relating to sarcoidosis;

Whereas treatment options for sarcoidosis are limited due in part to the lack of informative research and funding specific to sarcoidosis;

Whereas the Sarcoidosis of Long Island and the Foundation for Sarcoidosis Research—

(1) actively advocate for more research to better understand how environmental or occupational exposures may increase the risk of sarcoidosis; and

(2) strive to serve individuals afflicted by sarcoidosis by focusing efforts relating to sarcoidosis on public policy, research, funding, patient services, public awareness, education, and finding a cure; and

Whereas April 2016 is appropriate to designate as ''National Sarcoidosis Awareness Month'', with worldwide events—

(1) to increase public awareness of the need to support individuals with sarcoidosis;

(2) to raise awareness of the environmental and occupational issues associated with sarcoidosis; and

(3) to educate medical professionals who care for individuals with sarcoidosis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of ''National Sarcoidosis Awareness Month''; and

(2) designates April 2016 as ''National Sarcoidosis Awareness Month''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 444—HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF PRINCE

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 444

Whereas Prince Rogers Nelson (referred to in this preamble as ''Prince'') was born on June 7, 1958, in Minneapolis, Minnesota;

Whereas Prince developed an interest in music at an early age and wrote his first song at the age of 7 years;

Whereas Prince pioneered the Minneapolis sound, which is a mixture of funk, rock, and pop that emerged in the late 1970s and 1980s and influenced music for decades;

Whereas Prince and his band, the Revolution, shot many scenes of the classic film ''Purple Rain'' at First Avenue, making the downtown Minneapolis music venue a landmark;

Whereas Prince was a superstar composer, an amazing performer, and a music innovator with a fierce belief in the independence of his art;

Whereas Prince—

(1) sold more than 100,000,000 records worldwide;

(2) released 39 studio albums;

(3) had 5 number 1 Billboard hits; and

(4) had 40 singles in the top 100 songs;

Whereas Prince won 7 Grammy Awards, an Academy Award, and a Golden Globe Award;

Whereas Prince was inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame in 2004, the first year in which Prince was eligible for induction;

Whereas in 2010, Prince accepted a Black Entertainment Television Lifetime Achievement Award;

Whereas Prince wrote songs about Minnesota sports teams, including ''Purple and Gold'' during the Minnesota Viking's run to the 2010 National Football Conference championship game, and held a concert for the Minnesota Lynx after the Minnesota Lynx won their third Women's National Basketball Association championship;

Whereas even after all of his success, Prince still called the State of Minnesota home and never lost the sense that he was a beloved son, a neighbor, and the superstar next door;

Whereas Prince reminded the people of the United States that ''there's a world waiting for us after this life, a world of never ending happiness, where you can always see the sun, day or night''; and

Whereas on April 21, 2016, Prince passed away at his Paisley Park Estate in Chanhassen, Minnesota, leaving behind millions of fans and a legacy of music that touched hearts, opened minds, and made the people of the United States want to dance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the life of Prince Rogers Nelson and his achievements as a musician, composer, innovator, and cultural icon.

SENATE RESOLUTION 445—RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF COAST GUARD AVIATION AND THE CONTRIBUTION OF COAST GUARD AVIATORS TO NAVAL AVIATION AND THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 445

Whereas, on December 17, 1903, members of the United States Lifesaving Service stationed at Kill Devil Hills, North Carolina, assisted the Wright brothers during their first successful flight;

Whereas April 1, 1916, marks the official establishment of Coast Guard aviation as the date on which the first Coast Guard aviator, Third Lieutenant Elmer F. Stone, reported to United States Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida, for flight training;

Whereas, on August 29, 1916, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to establish 10 Coast Guard air stations;

Whereas Coast Guard First Lieutenant Elmer F. Stone—

(1) took off from the Naval Air Station at Rockaway, New York, on May 8, 1919, and landed in Lisbon, Portugal, on May 27, 1919, completing the first successful trans-Atlantic flight; and

(2) was later assigned to duty with the United States Navy as a test pilot, during which First Lieutenant Stone aided in the development of shipboard catapult systems and arresting gear for use on United States Navy aircraft carriers;

Whereas in early 1925—

(1) the first permanent Coast Guard air station was established at Ten Pound Island, Massachusetts; and

(2) Lieutenant Commander Carl von Paulsen, with approval of the Commandant of the

Coast Guard, initiated the transfer to the Coast Guard of a surplus Navy aircraft for 1 year and during that year, Lieutenant Commander von Paulsen coordinated daily patrols to combat alcohol smuggling in the waters off New England;

Whereas the Coast Guard Air Station Floyd Bennett Field in Brooklyn, New York, was designated as a helicopter training base on January 14, 1942, at which

(1) the Coast Guard led the rotary wing training program of the military; and

(2) by 1944, Coast Guard instructor pilots had trained 125 military helicopter pilots from the United States and Great Britain and 200 helicopter mechanics;

Whereas, on January 3, 1944, despite high winds and blowing snow that closed all of the airfields in the New York area, Commander Frank Erickson, the first Coast Guard helicopter pilot, flew a Sikorsky helicopter from New York City to Sandy Hook, New Jersey, to deliver 2 cases of blood plasma for 150 injured United States Navy sailors, completing the flight in just 14 minutes and conducting the first lifesaving helicopter flight;

Whereas, on March 15, 1946, the Coast Guard first used aircraft to scout for ice and determine the limits of the ice fields along critical North Atlantic shipping lanes in support of the International Ice Patrol and since that date, Coast Guard surveillance aircraft have conducted the primary reconnaissance work for the International Ice Patrol, monitoring for ships transiting the North Atlantic the movement of icebergs throughout thousands of square miles of ocean;

Whereas, on December 17, 1951, President Harry Truman presented to the Coast Guard, the Department of Defense, and the helicopter industry the Collier Trophy in a joint award for outstanding development and use of rotary-winged aircraft for air rescue operations;

Whereas Bobby Wilkes—

(1) on March 25, 1957, was designated as Coast Guard aviator number 735; and

(2) was the first African-American—

(A) Coast Guard aviator;

(B) promoted to the rank of captain in the Coast Guard; and

(C) to command a Coast Guard air station;

Whereas, on January 9, 1963, the Coast Guard received the first of 99 HH-52A helicopters, which was instrumental in the rescue of more than 15,000 people during its 26 years of service, more lives than have been rescued by any other helicopter;

Whereas, on March 31, 1967, the Coast Guard established an aviator exchange program with the United States Air Force that authorized Coast Guard pilots to serve with combat search and rescue forces during the Vietnam War and as part of the program, 11 Coast Guard pilots served heroically with Air Force pilots on harrowing missions behind enemy lines during the rescue of downed United States airmen;

Whereas, on March 4, 1977, Janna Lambine was designated as Coast Guard aviator number 1812, becoming the first woman Coast Guard aviator;

Whereas, on October 9, 1982, a Coast Guard aircraft participated in the first rescue mission using a satellite search and rescue system;

Whereas, on October 30, 1984, Congress authorized the Coast Guard to establish a Rescue Swimmer program to train personnel to rescue incapacitated people from the water and since that date, Coast Guard Rescue Swimmers have demonstrated exceptional bravery and dedication during the rescue of innumerable people from the ocean under extreme conditions;

Whereas Commander Bruce E. Melnick—

(1) on June 5, 1987, became the first Coast Guard aviator to participate in the space program; and

(2) in October 1990, serving as a mission specialist aboard STS-41, became the first Coast Guard aviator to complete a space mission;

Whereas, on February 13, 1991, during Operation Desert Storm, 2 HU-25A Falcon jets from Air Station Cape Cod, equipped with specialized oil detection technology—

(1) were deployed to Saudi Arabia to serve with the interagency oil spill assessment team;

(2) provided a critical service by mapping over 40,000 square miles to locate every drop of oil on the water after 1 of the worst oil spills in history;

Whereas, on June 24, 2005, Lieutenant Junior Grade Jeanine McIntosh-Menze was designated as Coast Guard aviator number 3775, becoming the first African-American woman Coast Guard aviator;

Whereas in the weeks following Hurricane Katrina, 1 of the worst natural disasters in United States history, the heroic efforts of Coast Guard flight crews contributed to—

(1) the rescue of more than 33,000 people; and

(2) the delivery of nearly 2,000,000 pounds of relief supplies;

Whereas, on October 29, 2012, during Hurricane Sandy, the heroic efforts of Coast Guard flight crews contributed to the rescue of 14 sailors aboard the *HMS Bounty*, during which the Coast Guard flight crews located the shipwrecked sailors and performed, at great personal risk, a helicopter-borne night rescue in 18-foot seas and gale-force winds; and

Whereas, since 1916, 4,493 Coast Guard aviators have been trained at Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida—

(1) in preparation for assignment to operational Coast Guard air stations; and

(2) in support of the national defense, law enforcement, and maritime safety, security, and stewardship missions of the Coast Guard around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes 100 years of Coast Guard aviation; and

(2) honors past and present Coast Guard aviators who have served in support of the safety and security of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 446—DESIGNATING APRIL 2016 AS ''NATIONAL 9-1-1 EDUCATION MONTH''

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 446

Whereas 9-1-1 is recognized throughout the United States as the number to call in an emergency to receive immediate help from police, fire, emergency medical services, or other appropriate emergency response entities;

Whereas, in 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recommended that a ''single number should be established'' nationwide for reporting emergency situations, and various Federal Government agencies and governmental officials supported and encouraged the recommendation;

Whereas, in 1968, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (commonly known as ''AT&T'') announced that it would establish the digits 9-1-1 as the emergency code throughout the United States;

Whereas Congress designated 9-1-1 as the national emergency call number in the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–81; 113 Stat. 1286);

Whereas section 102 of the ENHANCE 911 Act of 2004 (47 U.S.C. 942 note) declared an enhanced 9-1-1 system to be ''a high national priority'' and part of ''our Nation's homeland security and public safety'';

Whereas it is important that policy makers at all levels of government understand the importance of 9-1-1, how the 9-1-1 system works, and the steps that are needed to modernize the 9-1-1 system;

Whereas the 9-1-1 system is the connection between the eyes and ears of the public and the emergency response system in the United States and is often the first place emergencies of all magnitudes are reported, making 9-1-1 a significant homeland security asset;

Whereas more than 6,000 9-1-1 public safety answering points serve more than 3,000 counties and parishes throughout the United States;

Whereas telecommunicators at public safety answering points answer more than 200,000,000 9-1-1 calls each year in the United States;

Whereas a growing number of 9-1-1 calls are made using wireless and Internet Protocol-based communications services;

Whereas a growing segment of the population of the United States, including individuals who are deaf, hard of hearing, or deaf-blind, or who have speech disabilities, is increasingly communicating with nontraditional text, video, and instant messaging communications services and expects those services to be able to connect directly to 9-1-1;

Whereas the growth and variety of means of communication, including mobile and Internet Protocol-based systems, impose challenges for accessing 9-1-1 and implementing an enhanced 9-1-1 system and require increased education and awareness about the capabilities of different means of communication;

Whereas numerous other ''N-1-1'' and 800 number services exist for nonemergency situations, including 2-1-1, 3-1-1, 5-1-1, 7-1-1, 8-1-1, poison control centers, and mental health hotlines, and the public needs to be educated on when to use those services in addition to or instead of 9-1-1;

Whereas international visitors and immigrants make up an increasing percentage of the population of the United States each year, and visitors and immigrants may have limited knowledge of the emergency calling system in the United States;

Whereas people of all ages use 9-1-1 and it is critical to educate people on the proper use of 9-1-1;

Whereas senior citizens are highly likely to need to access 9-1-1 and many senior citizens are learning to use new technology;

Whereas thousands of 9-1-1 calls are made every year by children properly trained in the use of 9-1-1, which saves lives and underscores the critical importance of training children early in life about 9-1-1;

Whereas the 9-1-1 system is often misused, including by the placement of prank and nonemergency calls;

Whereas misuse of the 9-1-1 system results in costly and inefficient use of 9-1-1 and emergency response resources and needs to be reduced;

Whereas parents, teachers, and all other caregivers need to play an active role in 9-1-1 education for children, but can do so only after first being educated themselves;

Whereas there are many avenues for 9-1-1 public education, including safety fairs, school presentations, libraries, churches, businesses, public safety answering point tours or open houses, civic organizations, and senior citizen centers;

Whereas children, parents, teachers, and the National Parent Teacher Association make vital contributions to the education of children about the importance of 9-1-1 through targeted outreach efforts to public and private school systems;

Whereas the United States should strive to host at least 1 educational event regarding the proper use of 9-1-1 in every school in the country every year;

Whereas programs to promote proper use of 9-1-1 during National 9-1-1 Education Month could include—

(1) public awareness events, including conferences, media outreach, and training activities for parents, teachers, school administrators, other caregivers, and businesses;

(2) educational events in schools and other appropriate venues; and

(3) production and distribution of information about the 9-1-1 system designed to educate people of all ages on the importance and proper use of 9-1-1; and

Whereas the people of the United States deserve the best education regarding the use of 9-1-1: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2016 as ''National 9-1-1 Education Month''; and

(2) urges governmental officials, parents, teachers, school administrators, caregivers, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate ceremonies, training events, and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3878. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3879. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3804 proposed by Mr. ALEXANDER to the amendment SA 3801 proposed by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) to the bill H.R. 2028, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3880. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3804 proposed by Mr. ALEXANDER to the amendment SA 3801 proposed by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) to the bill H.R. 2028, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3881. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2028, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3882. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. PERDUE) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 383, recognizing the importance of the United States-Israel economic relationship and encouraging new areas of cooperation.

SA 3883. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. PERDUE) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 383, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3878. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC__. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to purchase heavy water produced in Iran.

SA 3879. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3804 proposed by Mr. ALEXANDER to the amendment SA 3801 proposed by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) to the bill H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 2, insert ''and related facilities'' after ''technologies''.

SA 3880. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3804 proposed by Mr. ALEXANDER to the amendment SA 3801 proposed by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) to the bill H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following: ''*Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at $823,114,000 in fiscal year 2017 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, $5,000,000 shall be available for activities related to the development of regulatory infrastructure for advanced nuclear reactor technologies and related facilities, and $5,000,000 of that amount shall not be available for fee revenues, notwithstanding section 6101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 2214): *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2017 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2017 appropriation estimated at not more than $115,886,000.''.

SA 3881. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

SEC__. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to purchase heavy water produced in Iran.

SA 3882. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. PERDUE) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 383, recognizing the importance of the United States-Israel economic relationship and encouraging new areas of cooperation; as follows:

On page 6, line 12, insert ''and investment, and remove barriers to, and to provide incentives for, private sector market entry'' before ''; and''.

SA 3883. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. PERDUE) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 383, recognizing the importance of the United States-Israel economic relationship and encouraging new areas of cooperation; as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the deep bond between the United States and Israel is exemplified by its many facets, including the robust economic and commercial relationship;

Whereas, on April 22, 2015, the United States celebrated the 30th anniversary of its free trade agreement with Israel, which was the first free trade agreement entered into by the United States;

Whereas the United States-Israel Free Trade Agreement established the Joint Committee to facilitate the agreement and collaborate on efforts to increase bilateral cooperation and investment;

Whereas, since the signing of this agreement, two-way trade has multiplied tenfold to over $40,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas Israel is the third largest importer of United States goods in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region after Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, despite representing only 2 percent of the region's population;

Whereas nearly half of all investment in the United States from the MENA region comes from Israel;

Whereas Israel has more companies listed on the NASDAQ Stock Exchange than any other country except for the United States and China;

Whereas, in 1956, the United States-Israel Education Foundation was established to administer the Fulbright Program in Israel, and has facilitated the exchange of nearly 3,300 students between the United States and Israel since its inception;

Whereas the United States-Israel Innovation Index (USI3), which was developed by USISTF to track and benchmark innovation relationships, ranks the United States-Israel innovation relationship as top-tier;

Whereas, since 2011, the United States Department of Energy and the Israeli Ministry of National Infrastructures, Energy and Water Resources have led an annual United States-Israel Energy Meeting with participants across government agencies to facilitate bilateral cooperation in that sector;

Whereas, in 2012, Congress passed and President Barack Obama signed into law the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–150), which set United States policy to expand bilateral cooperation across the spectrum of civilian sectors, including high technology, agriculture, medicine, health, pharmaceuticals, and energy;

Whereas, in 2013, President Obama said in reference to Israel's contribution to the global economy, ''That innovation is just as important to the relationship between the United States and Israel as our security cooperation.'';

Whereas, in 2014, Secretary of the Treasury Jacob Lew said, ''As one of the most technologically-advanced and innovative economies in the world, Israel is an important economic partner to the United States.'';

Whereas the 2014 Global Venture Capital Confidence Survey ranked the United States and Israel as the two countries with the highest levels of investor confidence in the world;

Whereas, in 2014, Congress passed and President Obama signed into law the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–296), which deepened cooperation on energy, water, agriculture,

trade, and defense, and expressed the sense of Congress that Israel is a major strategic partner of the United States; and

Whereas economic cooperation between the United States and Israel has also thrived at the State and local levels through both formal agreements and bilateral organizations in over 30 States that have encouraged new forms of cooperation in fields such as water conservation, cybersecurity, and alternative energy and farming technologies: Now, therefore, be it

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2016, at 11:30 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2016, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''U.S.-China Relations: Strategic Challenges and Opportunities.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. COATS. 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 April 27, 2016, at 11 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Government Reform: Ending Duplication and Holding Washington Accountable.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2016, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2016, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The GAO Report on Telecommunications: Additional Coordination and Performance Measurement Needed for High-Speed Internet Access Programs on Tribal Lands.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2016, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Counterfeits and Their Impact on Consumer Health and Safety.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2016, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2016, at 10 a.m., in room SR–428A of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Drowning in Regulations: The Waters of the U.S. Rule and the Case for Reforming the RFA.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2016, at 3:30 p.m., in room SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Valeant Pharmaceuticals' Business Model: the Repercussions for Patients and the Health Care System.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kelsey Avery, Leigh Stuckhardt, Matthew Fuentes, and Luke Alo, fellows for the Senate Finance Committee, and Julia Bradley-Cook, Ryan Matheny, and Katherine Tsantiris, fellows in my personal office, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that my intern, Jonathan Lin, be granted floor privileges for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, upon the recommendation of the Democratic leader, pursuant to Public Law 105–292, as amended by Public Law 106–55, Public Law 107–228, and Public Law 112–75, appoints the following individual to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom: Sandra Jolley of Nevada.

SUPPORTING EFFORTS BY THE GOVERNMENT OF COLOMBIA TO PURSUE PEACE AND THE END OF THE COUNTRY'S ENDURING INTERNAL ARMED CONFLICT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 397, S. Res. 368.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 368) supporting efforts by the Government of Colombia to pursue peace and the end of the country's enduring internal armed conflict and recognizing United States support for Colombia at the 15th anniversary of Plan Colombia.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 368) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 9, 2016, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIP AND ENCOURAGING NEW AREAS OF COOPERATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 400, S. Res. 383.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 383) recognizing the importance of the United States-Israel economic relationship and encouraging new areas of cooperation.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Perdue amendment to the resolution be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the Perdue amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3882) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To foster investment and private sector market entry)

On page 6, line 12, insert ''and investment, and remove barriers to, and to provide incentives for, private sector market entry'' before ''; and''.

The resolution (S. Res. 383), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3883) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the deep bond between the United States and Israel is exemplified by its many facets, including the robust economic and commercial relationship;

Whereas, on April 22, 2015, the United States celebrated the 30th anniversary of its free trade agreement with Israel, which was the first free trade agreement entered into by the United States;

Whereas the United States-Israel Free Trade Agreement established the Joint Committee to facilitate the agreement and collaborate on efforts to increase bilateral cooperation and investment;

Whereas, since the signing of this agreement, two-way trade has multiplied tenfold to over $40,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas Israel is the third largest importer of United States goods in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region after Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, despite representing only 2 percent of the region's population;

Whereas nearly half of all investment in the United States from the MENA region comes from Israel;

Whereas Israel has more companies listed on the NASDAQ Stock Exchange than any other country except for the United States and China;

Whereas, in 1956, the United States-Israel Education Foundation was established to administer the Fulbright Program in Israel, and has facilitated the exchange of nearly 3,300 students between the United States and Israel since its inception;

Whereas the United States-Israel Innovation Index (USI3), which was developed by USISTF to track and benchmark innovation relationships, ranks the United States-Israel innovation relationship as top-tier;

Whereas, since 2011, the United States Department of Energy and the Israeli Ministry of National Infrastructures, Energy and Water Resources have led an annual United States-Israel Energy Meeting with participants across government agencies to facilitate bilateral cooperation in that sector;

Whereas, in 2012, Congress passed and President Barack Obama signed into law the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–150), which set United States policy to expand bilateral cooperation across the spectrum of civilian sectors, including high technology, agriculture, medicine, health, pharmaceuticals, and energy;

Whereas, in 2013, President Obama said in reference to Israel's contribution to the global economy, ''That innovation is just as important to the relationship between the United States and Israel as our security cooperation.'';

Whereas, in 2014, Secretary of the Treasury Jacob Lew said, ''As one of the most technologically-advanced and innovative economies in the world, Israel is an important economic partner to the United States.'';

Whereas the 2014 Global Venture Capital Confidence Survey ranked the United States and Israel as the two countries with the highest levels of investor confidence in the world;

Whereas, in 2014, Congress passed and President Obama signed into law the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–296), which deepened cooperation on energy, water, agriculture, trade, and defense, and expressed the sense of Congress that Israel is a major strategic partner of the United States; and

Whereas economic cooperation between the United States and Israel has also thrived at the State and local levels through both formal agreements and bilateral organizations in over 30 States that have encouraged new forms of cooperation in fields such as water conservation, cybersecurity, and alternative energy and farming technologies: Now, therefore, be it

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 383

Whereas the deep bond between the United States and Israel is exemplified by its many facets, including the robust economic and commercial relationship;

Whereas, on April 22, 2015, the United States celebrated the 30th anniversary of its free trade agreement with Israel, which was the first free trade agreement entered into by the United States;

Whereas the United States-Israel Free Trade Agreement established the Joint Committee to facilitate the agreement and collaborate on efforts to increase bilateral cooperation and investment;

Whereas since the signing of this agreement, two-way trade has multiplied tenfold to over $40,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas Israel is the third largest importer of United States goods in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region after Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, despite representing only 2 percent of the region's population;

Whereas nearly half of all investment in the United States from the MENA region comes from Israel;

Whereas Israel has more companies listed on the NASDAQ Stock Exchange than any other country except for the United States and China;

Whereas, in 1956, the United States-Israel Education Foundation was established to administer the Fulbright Program in Israel, and has facilitated the exchange of nearly 3,300 students between the United States and Israel since its inception;

Whereas the United States-Israel Innovation Index (USI3), which was developed by USISTF to track and benchmark innovation relationships, ranks the United States-Israel innovation relationship as top-tier;

Whereas, since 2011, the United States Department of Energy and the Israeli Ministry of National Infrastructures, Energy and Water Resources have led an annual United States-Israel Energy Meeting with participants across government agencies to facilitate bilateral cooperation in that sector;

Whereas, in 2012, Congress passed and President Barack Obama signed into law the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–150), which set United States policy to expand bilateral cooperation across the spectrum of civilian sectors, including high technology, agriculture, medicine, health, pharmaceuticals, and energy;

Whereas, in 2013, President Obama said in reference to Israel's contribution to the global economy, ''That innovation is just as important to the relationship between the United States and Israel as our security cooperation.'';

Whereas, in 2014, Secretary of the Treasury Jacob Lew said, ''As one of the most technologically-advanced and innovative economies in the world, Israel is an important economic partner to the United States.'';

Whereas the 2014 Global Venture Capital Confidence Survey ranked the United States and Israel as the two countries with the highest levels of investor confidence in the world;

Whereas, in 2014, Congress passed and President Obama signed into law the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–296), which deepened cooperation on energy, water, agriculture, trade, and defense, and expressed the sense of Congress that Israel is a major strategic partner of the United States; and

Whereas economic cooperation between the United States and Israel has also thrived at the State and local levels through both formal agreements and bilateral organizations in over 30 States that have encouraged new forms of cooperation in fields such as water conservation, cybersecurity, and alternative energy and farming technologies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that the United States-Israel economic partnership has achieved great tangible and intangible benefits to both countries and is a foundational component of the strong alliance;

(2) recognizes that science and technology innovation present promising new frontiers for United States-Israel economic cooperation, particularly in light of widespread drought, cybersecurity attacks, and other major challenges impacting the United States;

(3) encourages the President to regularize and expand existing forums of economic dialogue with Israel and foster both public and private sector participation and investment, and remove barriers to, and to provide incentives for, private sector market entry; and

(4) expresses support for the President to explore new agreements with Israel, including in the fields of energy, water, agriculture, medicine, neurotechnology, and cybersecurity.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 444, S. Res. 445, and S. Res. 446.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolutions by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 444) honoring the life and achievements of Prince.

A resolution (S. Res. 445) recognizing the 100th anniversary of Coast Guard aviation and the contribution of Coast Guard aviators to naval aviation and the safety and security of the United States.

A resolution (S. Res. 446) designating April 2016 as ''National 9–1-1 Education Month.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 2016

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, April 28; 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 for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 2028; finally, that the cloture motion with respect to the motion to proceed to H.R. 2577 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:39 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, April 28, 2016, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMBATING TERRORIST RECRUITMENT ACT OF 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 2016

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the agreed upon mission of the Countering Violent Extremism Taskforce ''to review terror travel programs, and issue a report that may include recommendations based on this review.''

I agreed to serve on the task force because I agree that we must do everything we can to prevent acts of terrorism on our homeland, and terror travel programs is one of many terrorism-related threats we must address.

The bipartisan Taskforce Report I signed included general recommendations related to terror travel programs—it did not include specific legislative proposals nor did it suggest that we should prioritize the threat of foreign terrorist organizations over the threat posed by domestic terror organizations.

As a Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Representative of a diverse Congressional district in New Jersey, I recognize that we must do everything in our power to prevent our communities from being terrorized, regardless of the motivation.

We need to prevent the radicalization of people inspired by anti-government ideology who might ultimately try to occupy Federal facilities.

We need to prevent the radicalization of people inspired by racism who might ultimately sit through an evening prayer service at a predominantly black church and then shoot the other attendees.

And we need to prevent the radicalization of people inspired by a perverse interpretation of religion from carrying out attacks on American soil.

No one version of radicalization is more dangerous than another.

And we cannot treat them differently.

That is why I cannot support H.R. 4820.

STATE HEALTH PREPAREDNESS GRANT CUTS

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following list of States, and their loss of Health Preparedness grants.

Grantee	Cuts (dollars)	Cuts (%)
Alabama	−613,733	−6.90
Alaska	−194,836	−4.63
American Samoa	−6,600	−1.82
Arizona	−915,853	−7.74
Arkansas	−377,461	−5.70
California	−3,979,850	−9.35
Chicago	−530,926	−5.42
Colorado	−706,343	−7.21
Connecticut	−490,363	−6.35
Delaware	−143,256	−3.27
District of Columbia	−142,165	−2.23
Florida	−2,653,185	−9.00
Georgia	−1,351,184	−8.44
Guam	−19,345	−3.98
Hawaii	−196,065	−4.01
Idaho	−211,568	−4.20
Illinois	−1,422,463	−8.51
Indiana	−872,687	−7.66
Iowa	−393,286	−5.80
Kansas	−388,911	−5.77
Kentucky	−568,480	−6.72
Los Angeles	−1,575,170	−7.98
Louisiana	−613,015	−6.89
Maine	−177,231	−3.77
Marshall Islands	−8,413	−2.21
Maryland	−856,366	−7.60
Massachusetts	−937,359	−7.14
Michigan	−1,310,210	−7.86
Micronesia	−12,798	−3.03
Minnesota	−744,017	−6.61
Mississippi	−384,621	−5.74
Missouri	−818,745	−7.52
Montana	−139,375	−3.21
N. Mariana Islands	−6,172	−1.72
Nebraska	−245,839	−4.58
Nevada	−390,223	−5.77
New Hampshire	−187,880	−3.90
New Jersey	−1,303,734	−8.36
New Mexico	−275,903	−4.09
New York	−1,564,792	−7.90
New York City	−1,158,820	−6.27
North Carolina	−1,240,926	−8.32
North Dakota	−194,836	−4.63
Ohio	−1,548,159	−8.65
Oklahoma	−499,358	−6.40
Oregon	−522,990	−6.51
Palau	−2,546	−0.78
Pennsylvania	−1,716,179	−8.79
Puerto Rico	−433,740	−6.06
Rhode Island	−155,523	−3.45
South Carolina	−605,876	−6.16
South Dakota	−118,947	−2.87
Tennessee	−857,750	−7.62
Texas	−3,598,615	−9.55
Utah	−380,115	−5.71
Vermont	−194,836	−4.63
Virgin Islands (US)	−12,633	−3.00
Virginia	−1,149,940	−7.64
Washington	−948,052	−7.81
West Virginia	−242,010	−4.54
Wisconsin	−742,890	−6.41
Wyoming	−194,836	−4.63
TOTAL	**44,250,000**	**7.23**

CONGRATULATING SINCLAIR OIL FOR 100 YEARS OF SUCCESS

HON. JASON CHAFFETZ

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Sinclair Oil for celebrating 100 years of success in the oil and gas industry. Headquartered in Utah, Sinclair Oil has served as a shining example of American excellence for a century. Harry Ford Sinclair was 25 when he lost his father's drugstore in 1901 and began selling lumber for oil derricks. An incredibly savvy individual, Sinclair was soon buying and selling small oil leases, eventually attracting investors. Sinclair's immediate success was remarkable, he became a millionaire by the age of 30 and founded the Sinclair Oil and Refining Corporation in 1916.

The success of Sinclair Oil has stood the test of time and bolstered the United States economy. Sinclair saved hundreds of jobs during the Great Depression era by buying up dying competitors. During World War II, Sinclair's oil supported the Allied effort, and Sinclair's Dinoland exhibit was a highlight of the 1960s World's Fair. In 1976, self-made legend Earl Holding acquired Sinclair Oil. Under Holding's leadership, Sinclair Oil continued its growth as a beacon of American excellence. Holding's work at Sinclair is revered for his commitment to the company's culture and his incredible dedication to hard work. I look forward to the future of Sinclair Oil, as it continues to fuel the economy and provide jobs to hardworking Americans.

I am proud to congratulate Sinclair Oil on achieving 100 years of success today. Sinclair's accomplishments have not only been of great benefit to Utah, but to the United States. I thank CEO Ross Matthews, Earl Holding, and the Sinclair Oil family for their contributions.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MRS. GLADYS TARVER COLEMAN

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of a true trailblazer in the Fairfield, Alabama community and an Alabama heroine—Mrs. Gladys Tarver Coleman. A lifelong resident of Fairfield, Mrs. Gladys Coleman was born there on May 15, 1917. She received her Bachelor of Arts degree from Miles College and her Master's degree from Alabama A&M University. Mrs. Coleman also received educational training from Tuskegee University and the University of Southern California. She was married to the late Jerry D. Coleman, the first black President of the Fairfield City Council.

Mrs. Gladys Coleman is best known for her tireless efforts around voter registration and voter mobilization. She was one of the founding members of the Fairfield Democratic Women, an organization created over 60 years ago to help educate voters, mobilize the Fairfield community, and elect candidates supportive of the community's needs. Mrs. Coleman was passionate about impacting the political dialogue in her community and it showed through her efforts to help elect council members, judges, state representatives and even members of Congress—all of whom Mrs. Coleman knew on a personal level.

Mrs. Gladys Coleman's political affiliations were numerous. She served as president of the Fairfield Democratic Women, and a member of the Jefferson County (AL) and State Democratic Executive Committees. In April 2015, she was one of seven honorees inducted into the Alabama Democratic Party Hall of Fame. Mrs. Coleman was a member of the Alabama Democratic Delegation to the 1984 National Democratic Convention in San Francisco, CA, the 1992 convention in New York City, and the 1996 convention in Chicago, IL. She was also present in Washington, DC for the January 2009 inauguration of our Nation's first black president, Barack Obama.

Besides politics, Mrs. Coleman's other passion was education. She believed in educating children about life, as well as book knowledge. She was a retired teacher from the Jefferson County (AL) and Birmingham City School Systems. Mrs. Coleman was the first black member appointed to the Fairfield Board of Education during the crucial years of desegregation in the city's school system. In 1975, she was appointed by the Alabama State Superintendent of Education to serve on the Accreditation Committee for Elementary Schools. Mrs. Coleman was a member of the Alabama and National Education Associations, and the American Federation of Teachers.

Mrs. Gladys Coleman was a lifelong member of her beloved Miles Chapel CME Church and served in many capacities over the years, including as choir member, Christian Board of Education, Ladies Guild, Missionary Society, and Steward Board.

Mrs. Coleman believed her "life's work" was educating her community about the importance of voting. She also enjoyed music—big bands, jazz and The Temptations, as well as shopping, and spending time taking care of her family. She was preceded in death by her late husband of 44 years, Jerry D. Coleman, and her brothers, Lawrence (Alberta), William, and John Tarver. She leaves to cherish her memory numerous nieces, nephews and a host of other relatives and friends.

On a personal note, I was blessed to call Mrs. Gladys Coleman a political mentor, distant relative and an important ally. When I decided to run for Congress in 2009, everyone told me there was only one person whose support in Fairfield would determine my success. When I went to her house to ask for her vote, she drilled me for hours on every issue affecting the Fairfield and Birmingham communities. She was dedicated to her beloved Fairfield Democratic Women and I will always be grateful for her support and the support of this influential group, including her honoring me with her presence at my swearing-in ceremony on Capitol Hill in January 2011. Mrs. Gladys Coleman was the real matriarch of the Fairfield community and the rock of her family. She instilled a sense of pride in all who knew her and had a sincere passion to better her community through public service and political activism. She was a committed servant leader and demanded the same excellence from others.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring an icon of Fairfield and an Alabama treasure—Mrs. Gladys Tarver Coleman. Her legacy will continue to live on in the countless lives that she touched. May the Blessing of God be with her family and provide solace in their loss.

IN APPRECIATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL FESTIVAL OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my appreciation to the International Festival of Language and Culture, which is having its 14th Annual celebration in Washington, DC on April 28, 2016.

This celebration brings 100 students from 20 countries who will perform at the festival and demonstrate their traditions, their culture and their talent with poetry, songs and dance. The celebration is intended as an expression of friendship, optimism and hope. The IFLC has as its mission the impressive goal to use music and art in order to promote cultural understanding, cultural tolerance, and to seek peace.

I congratulate the participants, and the IFCL, for coordinating and hosting this event.

HONORING SENIOR CHIEF PETTY OFFICER JAMES BROWN

HON. DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Senior Chief Petty Officer James Brown's tireless commitment to serving our nation.

Senior Chief Brown first enlisted in the United States Navy on February 2, 1961. During his tenure in the U.S. Navy, Senior Chief Brown has served in numerous locations, including Guantanamo Bay, Cuba and Naval Air Station Roosevelt, Puerto Rico in 1962, and Sigonella, Sicily in 1963. He was discharged from active duty on January 25, 1965. After being initiated as a Chief Petty Officer on September 16, 1989, he advanced to Senior Chief Petty Officer on January 15, 1995. In recognition of his exemplary service, he has received the Navy and Marine Corps Medal, the Navy Achievement Medal, the Good Conduct Medal, the Naval Reserve Meritorious Medal, the National Defense Medal, the Navy Expeditionary Medal, the Armed Forces Medal, the Humanitarian Service Medal, the Armed Forces Reserve Medal, the Navy Expert Rifle Medal, and the Navy Expert Pistol Medal. These accolades speak volumes to the distinguished dedication and valor with which Senior Chief Brown has served our nation.

After being discharged from active duty, Senior Chief Brown returned to New York, where he worked for the New York Telephone Company for a decade. He then moved on to positions with the American Satellite Corporation, Western Union, Satelco, Greenwich Air Services, the Teleport Communications Group, and AT&T. In 2000, after thirty-five years of working in the private sector, Senior Chief Brown began his well-deserved retirement. Currently, Senior Chief Brown serves as the president of Staten Island's Fleet Reserve Association Branch 226, an organization that conducts patriotic activities to honor veterans.

Mr. Speaker, Senior Chief Petty Officer James Brown has devoted his life to serving his country and his community, and it is only right to take this opportunity to recognize him and thank him for all that he has done. I am proud to honor this great American from New York's 11th District.

HONORING MR. WILLIAM "BILL" TURGEON FOR HIS EXEMPLARY SERVICE TO THE YOUTH OF RIVER BEND MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Bill Turgeon for his contributions to his community both inside and outside the classroom at River Bend Middle School. The positive influences he has had on young children running the youth after school program go well beyond the classroom in preparing them as they face the challenges of real life. Parents and others in his community are proud to call him their own and there is no question, he is very deserving of their praise.

Mr. Turgeon is a fine example to his fellow citizens of dedication, selflessness, and commitment to the common good around the world. I thank him for his devotion to go above and beyond the call to mentor the youth of Sterling, Virginia.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the annual Days of Remembrance, and specifically of the Burbank Human Relations Council's 2016 Days of Remembrance program.

The Holocaust was the planned, systemic attempt by Nazi Germany to annihilate the Jewish people and to eradicate every vestige of Jewish life. The genocide resulted in the death of an estimated 6 million Jewish people, Romani people and hundreds of thousands of others who were considered unworthy of life. In 1980, the United States Congress unanimously passed legislation to establish the United States Holocaust Memorial Council. Among their other responsibilities, the Council was entrusted with creating an annual national day of remembrance for the victims of the Holocaust; thus the Days of Remembrance was established.

Each year schools, governments, workplaces, religious and other organizations all across the country host observances and remembrance activities for their communities. For many years, the Burbank Human Relations Council has partnered with local temples and churches and presented the Days of Remembrance program, a Community Commemoration of the Holocaust to the Burbank community. In addition, the council has provided an array of Holocaust teaching materials to Burbank's middle and high schools, including films, speakers and books, educating students about tolerance, inclusiveness and compassion. This year alone, over 2,500 students have been given an invaluable lesson in this living history.

There are few periods of time in humankind's history that are more appalling and sinister than the Holocaust. We must always recognize the Days of Remembrance, paying tribute to those who perished and those who courageously tried to save Jewish lives, and ensure that a tragedy of this nature will never happen again.

I ask all Members to join me in acknowledging the Days of Remembrance commemoration, and in particular, the Burbank Human Relations Council's program.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday afternoon, April 27, 2016, I was required to be in my congressional district in Fairfield, Alabama in order to attend a memorial service for Mrs. Gladys Coleman. Mrs. Gladys Coleman was one of the founding members of the Fairfield Democratic Women. She served as president of the Fairfield Democratic Women, and a member of the Jefferson County (AL) and State Democratic Executive Committees. In April 2015, she was one of seven honorees inducted into the Alabama Democratic Party Hall of Fame. Mrs. Coleman was the first black member appointed to the Fairfield Board of Education during the crucial years of desegregation in the city's school system. In 1975, she was appointed by the Alabama State Superintendent of Education to serve on the Accreditation Committee for Elementary.

As a Member of the Alabama congressional delegation, attending the memorial service was directly related to my representational, legislative, and committee responsibilities. Because of this absence I was not present for Roll Call Votes 166 through 169. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

YES on H.R. 4923—American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2016

YES on H.R. 699—Email Privacy Act

NO on Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4498—Helping Angels Lead our Startups Act, and

NO on H. Res. 701—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4498—Helping Angels Lead our Startups Act.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF DR. JOSEPH E. KUTZ

HON. JOHN A. YARMUTH

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of world-renowned surgeon and Louisville resident, Dr. Joseph E. Kutz, as he retires after 52 years of practice.

For more than a half a century, Dr. Kutz has worked to help heal the lives and limbs of countless patients. Joining forces with a fellow accomplished surgeon, the late Dr. Harold E. Kleinert, in 1964, Dr. Kutz helped found what is now KentuckyOne Health's Kleinert Kutz Hand Care Center.

Through the leadership of Dr. Kutz and his colleagues, Louisville has become the preeminent center for hand transplantation in the world and a city at the forefront of new medical technologies and progress. His commitment to our city runs deep, as Dr. Kutz has served as Clinical Professor of Surgery at the University of Louisville's School of Medicine, past director of the Christine M. Kleinert Fellowship in Hand Surgery, past president of both the American Society for Reconstructive Microsurgery and the Greater Louisville Medical Society, and past treasurer for the International Society of Reconstructive Microsurgery.

But in addition to his own practice, he has also worked throughout his career to help prepare more of his fellow surgeons for hand and microsurgery. His work with the Christine M. Kleinert Institute has helped train scores of surgeons and made the Kleinert Institute—and the city of Louisville—the place where many of the biggest and most important breakthroughs in hand surgery have occurred.

Dr. Kutz has spent his life helping others, in and out of the operating room, and he will leave behind a field of medicine that is better off because of his hard work and vision. I thank Dr. Kutz for his devotion to this important medical field, for his passion in transforming the lives of his patients, and for his dedication to our community.

On behalf of the people of Kentucky's Third Congressional District and the City of Louisville, I extend my best wishes to Dr. Kutz as he begins his much-deserved retirement.

HONORING HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS FROM FLORIDA'S PALM BEACHES AND TREASURE COAST FOR THEIR COURAGEOUS DECISION TO ENLIST IN THE U.S. ARMED FORCES

HON. PATRICK MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor 39 high school seniors from the Treasure Coast and Palm Beaches of Florida for their admirable decision to enlist in the United States Armed Forces following their graduation this year. Of these 39 enlistees, one is an Air Force enlistee, nine are Army enlistees, nine are National Guard enlistees, ten are Marine Corps enlistees, eight are Navy enlistees, and two are Army Reserve enlistees. These young men and women have demonstrated the utmost patriotism by answering the call of duty. They should know that they have the full support of their communities, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the American people.

With a deep appreciation for each student's service, I ask my colleagues to join me in personally recognizing: Kamarley Campbell, Alexander Harre, Rebecca Wise, Ivy Gagner, Shannon Hunter, John Reid, James Turner, Christopher Labeach, Melissa Martinez, Chelsea Cobb, Nickolas Poskin, Dylan Reinhardt, Nicolas Sangricco, Jacob Crawford, Brett Marshall, Nicolas Key, Luke Spadafora, Lazaro Palenzuela, Zachary Odell, Kenneth McDonald, Nicolas Rivero, Sean Saake, Cameron Manochi, Carlton Epstein, Karina Derouen, Victor Marques, Colton Mullins, Sarah Fairchild, Anthony Brito, Jacob Barber, Corey Boyce, Justo Rolando Alvarez, Logan Griffith, Cristian Nicolls, Cristian Hodges, Alex Mahan, Myles Wilkerson, Chase Krusbe, and Elizabeth Bonhomme. These enlistees will be recognized on May 3, 2016 at the fourth annual Our Community Salutes Enlistee Recognition event in Delray Beach.

Mr. Speaker, we are grateful to each of these fine men and women, and to all who commit to defending our great nation by serving in the United States Armed Forces. It is my honor and privilege to recognize their courage, dedication, and commitment to service here today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SETH MOULTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was absent for roll call vote No. 165 on H.R. 4096 that took place on Tuesday, April 26, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ROBERT HADDON

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Dr. Robert Haddon who passed away in California on Thursday, April 21, 2016. Dr. Haddon was a renowned authority in nanotechnology research and a professor at the University of California, Riverside, and he will be deeply missed.

Raised in Longford, Tasmania, an island state of Australia, Dr. Haddon obtained his undergraduate degree in chemistry in 1966 at the Melbourne University, Australia. Dr. Haddon then moved to the United States where he would obtain his Ph.D. in Chemistry in 1971 at Pennsylvania State University. After obtaining his Ph.D., Dr. Haddon joined AT&T (Lucent) Bell Laboratories where he worked on materials research as a Distinguished Member of the Technical Staff in the Materials Chemistry Research Department. In 2000, Dr. Haddon joined UC Riverside to launch and

serve as the director of the university's new Center for Nanoscale Science and Engineering.

Dr. Haddon was best known for the prediction and discovery of superconductivity in alkali-metal-doped carbon-60, for his preparation and characterization of a stable crystal of phenalenyl radicals, and for his pioneering research in nanotechnology. His research has earned a number of distinctions in his field, including the James C. McGroddy Prize for New Materials, American Physical Society (2008), and being named Person of the Year by Superconductor Week in 1991. Dr. Haddon was also named a Fellow by the Royal Australian Chemical Institute (1998), American Physical Society (1996), and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (1993).

Dr. Haddon's dedication to his work and improving our understanding of an exciting field of research, are a testament to a legacy that will continue long after his passing. I was proud to call Dr. Haddon my friend and I will miss him. I extend my condolences to Dr. Haddon's family and friends; although Dr. Haddon may be gone, the many incredible contributions he made to nanotechnology will never be forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO ERIN WETZEL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Erin Wetzel for being named one of the IOWA STEM Teachers of the Year by the Iowa Governor's STEM Advisory Council. The award was created in 2014 to celebrate STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) teachers who are ''Innovative in their methods, Outstanding in their passion for education, Worldly in how their students see that STEM is all around them and Academic in engaging students both in and out of the classroom.''

Ms. Wetzel, of Southwest Valley School District in Corning, Iowa, teaches design and modeling, automation and robotics, as well as computer classes to seventh and eighth grade students as part of Project Lead the Way. Her love of teaching science and technology shows as she is always encouraging her students to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Wetzel is an Iowan who has made her community and the school district she serves very proud. She has worked hard and dedicated herself to making STEM education a priority. It is with great pride that I recognize her today. I ask that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating Ms. Wetzel for this award and wishing her nothing but continued success in all her future endeavors.

CONGRATULATING CARTER COREY NORTON ON RECEIVING THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA'S EAGLE SCOUT RANK

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Carter Corey Norton, of Ozark, Missouri, on his recent achievement of the Boy Scouts of America's (BSA) Eagle Scout rank.

The rank of Eagle Scout is the highest rank attainable in the Boy Scouts of America. It is the culmination of many years of hard work and dedication, requiring countless hours of service, training and learning. An extremely exclusive honor, less than two percent of the 112 million scouts since the BSA's founding in 1910 have achieved the Eagle Scout distinction.

Since the age of 6, BSA has been a formative factor in Carter's life. He has been working towards achieving the Eagle Scout rank for most of his life, seeking to actualize the ideals of community service and integrity upheld by the organization. His recently completed ''Eagle Project''—an Eagle Scout rank prerequisite—involved constructing several benches for his local church to be used by parishioners and scouting groups for years to come.

Becoming an Eagle Scout requires a significant amount of determination and self-discipline, traits which will no doubt serve Carter well in the future.

Mr. Speaker, by attaining the rank of Eagle Scout, Carter has set himself on the path to achieve future success, and I'm proud to count him among my constituents. His dedication in completing the required benchmarks and community service requirements to reach the Eagle Scout rank is indicative of his ability to accomplish whatever goals he sets his mind to. I wish Carter luck with all his future endeavors, and urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on this momentous achievement.

HONORING THE COUNTY COLLEGE OF MORRIS

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the County College of Morris (CCM), located in Randolph, New Jersey, for its remarkable record as an institution of higher learning.

Since its foundation in 1968, the County College of Morris has been a model of success, and has represented the standard of the academic excellence associated with the great state of New Jersey. CCM offers more than 50 associate degrees and more than 25 certificate programs, in addition to a wide selection of career and professional programs. The institution has one of the highest graduation and transfer rates among community colleges in New Jersey.

The County College of Morris has a diverse campus and enriching academic and social environments that have created a culture ripe for personal and academic growth. CCM has become a place for students to reach their true potentials, as well as a community resource for those seeking to further their careers through additional education.

In the classroom, students at the County College of Morris have repeatedly excelled in every department, from the math and sciences, to business, to the liberal arts. Graduates have pursued respected careers, going on to become doctors, engineers, nurses, teachers, and civil servants. CCM's dynamic academic programs have challenged students, and pushed them to produce high-level work.

Students at CCM are not limited to just academic success. With more than 45 active student organizations, nine intercollegiate varsity sports teams, and countless community service opportunities, students have demonstrated excellence outside of the classroom. The County College of Morris is home to two award-winning student publications: its newspaper, The Youngtown Edition and its graphic arts and literary magazine, The Promethean. In the performing arts, students have the opportunity to participate in high-quality musical theater and drama productions, or can join CCM's acclaimed Dance Theatre troupe.

Under the exceptional leadership and vision of its president for 30 years, Dr. Edward J. Yaw, CCM has continued to modernize and has become one of the finer academic institutions in New Jersey. The college ensures that its students have all of the necessary resources to develop the skills crucial for success in the world beyond the classroom.

Since its founding, CCM has been a driving force in the lives of thousands of successful students who have passed through its halls. Graduates over the years continue to serve as leaders and role models in their communities all over the country. Thanks to the work of its renowned faculty and staff, like Dr. Yaw, CCM will continue to offer a first class education to those who seek to pursue higher learning.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in honoring and recognizing the achievements of the County College of Morris and those who devote themselves to its continuing success as an institution of higher learning.

TRIBUTE TO MAXINE VOGEL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ms. Maxine Vogel on the celebration of her 100th birthday.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Maxine's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Maxine has lived through seventeen United States Presidents and twenty-four Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Maxine in the United States Congress and it

is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 100th birthday. I invite my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Maxine on reaching this incredible milestone, and wishing her continued health and happiness.

IN HONOR OF THE RECIPIENTS OF LOUDOUN COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE MERITORIOUS ACTION AWARD

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the achievements of some of the 10th Congressional District's bravest constituents. The Loudoun County Sheriffs Office held their 2015 Awards and Recognition Ceremony on Friday, February 19th to recognize the daily services and sacrifices provided by our local law enforcement. Selected from America's finest, and nominated by their peers, the following award serves as a testament to each officer's unwavering courage and dedication to protecting our community. The following individuals deserve the thanks of not only the communities which they serve, but also that of their elected officials.

The Meritorious Action Award recognizes individuals who have demonstrated exceptional action in response to both routine and emergency situations. The following members merit special recognition: Deputy Eric Turner, Deputy First Class Joshua Colburn, Deputy First Class Matthew Steinfurth, Deputy Jillian Brock, Deputy Michael Ramirez, Deputy Jeffry Rima, Sergeant Nathan Zilke, Deputy Evelin Valladares, Deputy Harry Elliott, Johnique Moseley, LPN, Yvonne Savala, RN, Sergeant Dylan Foscato, Deputy First Class Derrick Franz, Sergeant Brett Phillips, Sergeant Gregory Rogers, Deputy First Class Casey Johnson, Deputy First Class Joseph Gass, Master Deputy Richard Garis, and Loudoun County Public School teachers Mrs. Linda Merola, Mrs. Jennifer Piccolonmini, Mrs. Christina Karmara, Mrs. Mary Hummer, Senior Deputy Amy Harper and resident Mr. Rick Allison, Sergeant Jeffrey Haig, Master Deputy Francis Trinh, Deputy First Class Donovan Reid, Deputy First Class Edward O'Toole, Master Deputy Charles Rounds, Deputy First Class Aaron Taylor, Deputy First Class Dawn Taylor, Deputy First Class Chad Braun, Dispatcher Christopher McDonald, Deputy First Class Dustin Moon, Deputy James Maguire, Deputy Ruben Cardenas, Deputy Jeffry Rima, Deputy Jillan Brock, Deputy Joshua Edney, Detective Steven Schochet, Detective Tommy Rodriguez and Special Agent Eric Vega, Virginia State Police.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these members of the Loudoun County Sheriff's Department for protecting and serving our community day-in and day-out.

2016 14TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ART COMPETITION

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the artistic ability of a young woman from my Congressional District, Alyssa Marsh from Springdale High School. Ms. Marsh is the winner of the 2016 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania's High School Art Competition, ''An Artistic Discovery.'' Ms. Marsh's artwork, a drawing in colored pencil entitled ''American Reflaction,'' was selected from a number of outstanding entries to this year's competition.

In fact, 74 works from 16 different schools in Pennsylvania's 14th Congressional District were submitted to our panel of respected local artists. It's a real tribute to Ms. Marsh's skill and vision that her work was chosen as the winner of this year's competition.

Ms. Marsh's artwork will represent the 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania in the national exhibit of high school students' artwork that will be displayed in the United States Capitol over the coming year. I encourage my colleagues as well as any visitor to Capitol Hill to view Ms. Marsh's artwork, along with the winning entries from the high school art contests held in other Congressional Districts, which will be on display in the Capitol tunnel. It is amazing to walk through this corridor and see the interpretation of life through the eyes of these young artists from all across our country.

Miranda Miller from Woodland Hills High School was awarded second place for her untitled oil and acrylic painting. Incidentally, Ms. Miller received third place last year for her acrylic on board painting entitled ''Corner of Hanover and Church,'' and she won the top prize in 2014 for her charcoal composition ''City Built on Hope.'' Hannah Schwartz from Penn Hills High School received third place for her Boise acrylic composition entitled ''Pup Kaiyai.'' Sabrina Davies from West Mifflin High School was awarded fourth place for her white charcoal, watercolor, and acrylic artwork entitled ''The Lingering Past,'' and Nicole Bonomo from Wilson Christian Academy received the fifth place award for her acrylic composition ''Snowy Owl.''

In addition, Honorable Mention Awards were presented to works by Zachary Blanner from Baldwin High School; Ada Griffin and Sagar Kamath from the Pittsburgh Creative and Performing Arts School; Leah Berman-Kress from the Ellis School; Kerry Dietrich from Montour High School; Sara Weir from Riverview High School; Macy K. Ernst and Nick Lasica from South Allegheny High School; Lauren Boyd and Alyssa Tocco from Springdale High School; Haley Peretic from Wilson Christian Academy; and Kobe Sanders of Woodland Hills High School.

I would like to recognize all of the participants in this year's 14th Congressional District High School Art Competition, ''An Artistic Discovery:'' from Baldwin High School, Zachary Blanner, Casey R. Conboy, Natalie Weida, and Jasmine Wicks; from CAPA, Ada Griffin, Sagar Kamath, Victoria Kipiller, Todd LaQuatra, Mia M. Stanton, and Abigail Sullivan; from East Allegheny High School, Sarah Cornell, Kylee Fazek, Daneille Foscoe, Katlyn McArdle, Kacy Neiderlander, Mark Robinson, and Santino Runco; from the Ellis School, Leah Berman-Kress, Lela Krackow, Mishon Levine, and Alexandra Papernick; from Montour High School, Kerry Dietrich, Emily Kortisky, and Olivia Trevenen; from Penn Hills High School, Marieme Diop, Seanna Dutrieuille, YaKira Porter, Hannah Schwartz, and Katarina Marie Shields; from Propel School, Constance Alexander, Diamonne Fuller, Breeonia Prioleau, and Jordan Todd; from Riverview High School, Viktoria Kutunina, Emma Patterson, and Sara Weir; from Serra Catholic High School, Tyler J. Gedman, Jen Pricener; from the Shuman Center, Kimberly Andrews, Walter Hodge, and Zaire Mauro; from South Allegheny High School, Jared Brysh, Macy K. Ernst, Nick Lasica, Madison Pastore, and Nicolette Ruhl; from Springdale High School, Lauren Boyd, Taylor Frantz, Alyssa Marsh, Andrew Strawinski, Alyssa Tocco, and Alyssa Vansach; from Sto-Rox High School, Amber Bayton, Julia Black, Shan Lin, Allana Molter, Katelyn Parker, and Beauty Williams; from West Mifflin High School, Nicole Beres, Michaeline Bost, Sabrina Davies, and Jordin Waugaman; from Wilson Christian Academy, Andrew Arovits, Nicole Bonomo, Jessica Hinchman, and Haley Peretic; from Woodland Hills High School, Juliette Gough, Miranda Miller, Kobe Sanders, Rayven Smith, Roni J. Taylor, and Dejon Young.

I would like to thank these impressive young artists for allowing us to share and celebrate their talents, imagination, and creativity. The efforts of these students in expressing themselves in a powerful and positive manner are no less than spectacular I hope that all of these individuals continue to utilize their artistic talents, and I wish them all the best of luck in their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING CENTRAL VIRGINIA STUDENTS FOR THEIR PRAISEWORTHY DECISION TO ENLIST IN THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to honor 90 students from the Central Virginia area for their praiseworthy decision to enlist in the United States Armed Forces.

Of the 90, 36 have chosen to join the U.S. Army to include the U.S. Army Reserves and U.S. Army National Guard: Benjamin P. Arrington (NG), Alexander Barton, Ethan R. Bernier, Colton Breedan, Sean Brenneisen, Hannah T. Brock, Tanner C. Brooker (NG), Eric M. Calvert, Jason D. Cooke, Anthony Cruz, Terra D. Daniels, Scott M. Dice, Christian Donavant, Ryan Eckert, Steven Gandy, Michael R. Hampson, Ruston L. Hill, II (NG), Robin G. Jat, Minjung Kim, Youjung Kim, Brittany Maddox, Francisco Leiva Magana, Alejandro J. Mastrapa, Mardin Mohammadzadeh, Aaron E. Molloy, Mason L. Plum, Michael L. Robinson (NG), Jonathan C. Shifflet, Aaron M. Spurlock, Caleb A. Staff, Matthew J. Sullivan, Maria Torres Trujillo, Chihao Wang, Kaiying Wang, Lorenzo Wells and Cheyenne Williams.

Thirty-two have selected the U.S. Marine Corps: Derek Alewine, Jacob Alderman, Brian Alvarado, Lilian Booysen, Jonathan Bowman, Sim Brand, Wendy Bustillo, Joshua Campbell, Dylan Chenault, Jacob Clark, Chase Cline, Jacob Green, Noah Hallen, Chester Harvey III, Matthew Hill, Charles Hite, Collin Ingles, Tylore Jones, Dakota Kelley, Christopher Leake, Rickey Langhorne, Patrick Mayo, Isaiah Meadows, Kyle Rochefort, Jacob Shaver, Edward Sher, Benjamin Showalter, Andrew Smith, Dylan Snyder, Gaines ''Randall'' Thomas, Jerod Williams, and John Weatherman.

Eighteen have elected to join the U.S. Navy: Jesse R. Bast, Devin M. Carter, Storey A. Collier, Nicholas S. Finnan, Nathaniel Fisher, Colin D. Grimsley, Christian N. Hoffman, Steven Howard, Christopher S. Keller, Raymond G. Markle, Alexander N. Ostrowski, Devin O'Neal Richardson, Tayvaun D. Richardson, Taylor M. Stark, Katelyn R. Shafer, Lucas J. Valleau, Devin L. Walker, and Andrew H. Williams.

Four have elected to join the U.S. Air Force: Hunter Brittle, Jordan Stracener, Martha Wells, and Jackson Winum.

These 90 young men and women will be recognized on April 30, 2016, as part of the ''Our Community Salutes'' Recognition Ceremony, and Albemarle High School Guidance Counselor, Jacquelyn Perry, will be awarded The General Colin L. Powell Service Award. This prestigious citation is given to a high school educator who best supports young adults desiring to serve in the U.S. Armed Forces after graduation from high school.

Every citizen of the United States of America owes his or her freedom to the men and women that have served, are serving or will serve this nation in the uniform of one of our military services. The future of our Nation remains strong because of young men and women like these 90 individuals who have stepped forward to serve in the defense of our country and to uphold the ideals and principles upon which it was founded.

These young Virginians from the home of Founding Father, Thomas Jefferson, represent all that is good in our Nation. They depart with the full faith and support of the U.S. Senate and the American people. They will experience good days and they will experience challenges and we will support them in both environments.

We owe a great deal of gratitude to these young patriots who will take the Oath of Enlistment and serve in their respective service. It is because of their decision today that the United States remains secure and a beacon of liberty throughout the world.

CONGRATULATING AUSTIN BAILEY SWEARENGIN ON RECEIVING THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA'S EAGLE SCOUT RANK

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Austin Bailey Swearengin, of Springfield, Missouri, on his recent achievement of the Boy Scouts of America's (BSA) top rank of Eagle Scout.

The rank of Eagle Scout is the highest rank attainable in the Boy Scouts of America. It is the culmination of many years of hard work and dedication, requiring countless hours of service, training and learning. An extremely exclusive honor, less than two percent of the 112 million scouts since the BSA's founding in 1910 have achieved the Eagle Scout distinction.

Austin's promotion to Eagle Scout is even more significant given that his brothers, Ethan and Logan, also achieved the Eagle Scout rank. To have one Eagle Scout in a family is remarkable, but to have three is beyond exemplary. Austin and his brothers' achievements are a testament to their family's reverence for focus and commitment.

Mr. Speaker, by attaining the rank of Eagle Scout, Austin has set himself on the path to achieve future success, and I'm proud to count him among my constituents. His dedication in completing the required benchmarks and community service requirements to reach the Eagle Scout rank is indicative of his ability to accomplish whatever goals he sets his mind to. I wish Austin luck with all his future endeavors, and urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on this momentous achievement.

TRIBUTE TO LONDON VAIS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate London Vais for being named First Team All-American in women's basketball by the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA).

London is a member of the Des Moines Area Community College (DMACC) women's basketball team. She was named ICCAC Athlete of the Week on four different occasions during this past basketball season, leading DMACC to a 26–7 overall record in 2016.

Mr. Speaker, London has made Des Moines Area Community College and the great State of Iowa very proud. She has worked hard and dedicated herself to being a part of a successful team. It is with great pride that I recognize her today. I ask that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating London for receiving this award and in wishing her nothing but continued success in all her future endeavors.

CHIEF CHRIS CARTER RETIRES FROM BISHOP POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the law enforcement career of Bishop Police Chief Chris Carter, who retired from the Bishop Police Department on September 30, 2015. On June 4, 2016, there will be a long-awaited retirement party to celebrate Chief Carter's distinguished career.

Chief Carter's time in law enforcement began in 1983 while serving as a Military Police Officer in the United States Army. He served two years on active-duty and an additional nine years in the California National Guard. His military awards include the Army Service Ribbon, Good Conduct Medal, Rifle Sharpshooter, Hand Grenade Sharpshooter, and Pistol Expert.

After leaving active-duty service, Chief Carter was hired as a police officer with the City of Barstow, where he eventually obtained the rank of corporal. His service with the Barstow Police Department earned him a number of accolades, including the California Highway Patrol/AAA ''10851'' Award for stolen vehicle recoveries, the Meritorious Service Award, and the Medal of Valor.

In 2003, Chief Carter was hired by the Bishop Police Department and received promotions to the ranks of sergeant and lieutenant. In 2010, he was sworn in as the Chief of the Bishop Police Department, a position he held until his retirement.

I want to congratulate Chief Carter on his well-deserved retirement. It is an honor to represent people like Chief Carter who dedicate their lives to making our communities better and safer.

IN HONOR OF SERGEANT KENNETH DONDERO

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the achievements of some of the 10th Congressional District's bravest constituents. The Loudoun County Sheriff's Office held their 2015 Awards and Recognition Ceremony on Friday, February 19th to recognize the daily services and sacrifices provided by our local law enforcement. Selected from America's finest, and nominated by their peers, the following award serves as a testament to the officer's unwavering courage and dedication to protecting our community. The following individual deserves the thanks of not only the communities in which he serves, but also that of his elected officials.

The Sheriff's Excellence Award recognizes both senior civilian and sworn officer supervisors for superior job knowledge, devotion to duty, and dedication to the community which they serve. Sergeant Kenneth Dondero's actions over the years resulted in his nomination and selection for this award.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking this member of the Loudoun County Sheriff's Department for protecting and serving our community day-in and day-out.

CONGRATULATING LOGAN MARTIN SWEARENGIN ON RECEIVING THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA'S EAGLE SCOUT RANK

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Logan Martin Swearengin, of Springfield, Missouri, on his recent achievement of

the Boy Scouts of America's (BSA) top rank of Eagle Scout.

The rank of Eagle Scout is the highest rank attainable in the Boy Scouts of America. It is the culmination of many years of hard work and dedication, requiring countless hours of service, training and learning. An extremely exclusive honor, less than two percent of the 112 million scouts since the BSA's founding in 1910 have achieved the Eagle Scout distinction.

Logan's promotion to Eagle Scout is even more significant given that his brothers, Ethan and Austin, also achieved the Eagle Scout rank. To have one Eagle Scout in a family is remarkable, but to have three is beyond exemplary. Logan and his brothers' achievements are a testament to their family's reverence for focus and commitment.

Mr. Speaker, by attaining the rank of Eagle Scout, Logan has set himself on the path to achieve future success, and I'm proud to count him among my constituents. His dedication in completing the required benchmarks and community service requirements to reach the Eagle Scout rank is indicative of his ability to accomplish whatever goals he sets his mind to. I wish Logan luck with all his future endeavors, and urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on this momentous achievement.

COMMUNITIES ORGANIZED FOR PUBLIC SERVICE (C.O.P.S.)

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the Communities Organized for Public Service (C.O.P.S.) and the Metro Alliance as they celebrate over 40 years of organizing in San Antonio. COPS/Metro are a coalition of congregations, schools, and unions coming together with the goal of making San Antonio a better place for families.

COPS/Metro are part of the Texas Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) Network, which traces its roots back to San Antonio. The Industrial Areas Foundation is the oldest and largest organizing and leadership development network in the United States, and includes COPS/Metro in San Antonio, TMO in Houston, Valley Interfaith in the Rio Grande Valley, EPISO & Border Interfaith in El Paso, Austin Interfaith, ACT in Fort Worth, Dallas Area Interfaith, the West Texas Organizing Strategy, and The Border Organization in Del Rio and Eagle Pass.

This non-partisan network of community organizations trains leaders to organize a powerful constituency to improve their quality of life and teach ordinary people to do extraordinary work for the common good. The Texas IAF Network has created nationally recognized workforce development, job training, living wage and other economic development strategies. Thanks to the network's efforts over the decades, Texas communities have benefitted from successful educational initiatives and significant investments in colonias, parks, libraries, after school programs, sidewalks and innumerable other local and statewide efforts.

I commend COPS/Metro and the Network of Texas Industrial Areas Foundation Organizations on their commitment to helping families, developing leadership of Texas residents, and promoting civic engagement in the public life of our communities and state. On the occasion of this anniversary, I extend to its members best wishes for a memorable celebration of over 40 years of organizing.

RECOGNIZING DENT MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, recently, students from Dent Middle School in Columbia competed in the South Carolina History Day regional competition at the South Carolina State Museum.

Their presentation topics ranged from politics and government to historical discussions on some of our nation's greatest Presidents. I am honored to say that eight remarkable students from the Second District won awards during this competition and will compete in the national competition this June.

Tessa Giusto won in the Junior Historical Paper category for her work discussing Plato and Locke and how they influenced U.S. politics. Hannah Hedley won in the Junior Individual Documentary category for her entry on Oskar Schindler. Sofia Crowley and Gabby Snow won in the Junior Individual Performance category for their project on Japan. And finally, Katie Pittman, Lauren Price, McKenna Wright, and Mariya Medvedchikova won in the Junior Exhibit Group for their project on Adolf Hitler.

Congratulations to these students, their principal Dr. David Basile and teacher Ms. Jill Carroll.

In conclusion, God Bless Our Troops and may the President by his actions never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF CHIEF DELL URBAN

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, last week, on Monday, April 18, 2016, I rose to honor Dell Urban, the Chief of the North Chicago Fire Department, on her more than 25 years of service to the department. Ms. Urban is the first female fire chief in Lake County, and is one of only two female fire chiefs in the State of Illinois.

During my remarks, I incorrectly stated that Chief Urban was retiring. I would like to correct the record, congratulate Chief Urban for her dedicated service to the community of North Chicago for more than 25 years, and thank her for her service in the years to come. Here is the speech as it should have been delivered:

I rise today to honor Dell Urban, the Chief of the North Chicago Fire Department on her more than 25 years on the force. Ms. Urban is the first female fire chief in Lake County, and one of only two female fire chiefs in the State of Illinois.

As fire chief, Ms. Urban has been responsible for saving countless lives and has done her duty protecting the community of North Chicago. We should all aspire to be as brave as the firemen who lay down their lives each and every day to ensure our safety.

In addition to performing her duties, Ms. Urban has been a mentor and a friend to many firefighters throughout her time as chief, and the station today is far better off than before she was chief.

I want to thank Ms. Urban for her service and wish her the best as she continues to serve the community of North Chicago.

TRIBUTE TO HANNAH N. SEALOCK

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Hannah Sealock of Underwood, Iowa, for being awarded the Good Citizen Award by the Council Bluffs Chapter of the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution (NSDAR). Hannah is a senior at Underwood High School in Underwood, Iowa.

Hannah exhibited all of the talents and skills needed to qualify for this award. They include dependability, service to others, leadership, and patriotism. Judges took into consideration several areas in grading her application including high school achievement, home and community activities, future plans, extra-curricular activities, and good citizenship. A second requirement was to write an essay on Our American Heritage and Our Responsibility for Preserving It. The essay was to focus on our American rights and freedoms and the rights she would select to celebrate.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Hannah for earning this award. She is a shining example of the future of our youth. I urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Hannah for her interest in preserving our rights and freedoms. I wish her nothing but continued success in all her future endeavors.

HONORING THE AMERICAN HERITAGE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOWL TEAM

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a team of exemplary students I represent who are paving the way for the future of math and science achievement in this country.

Students from the American Heritage School in Plantation, Florida have the honor of representing their region in the Department of Energy's National Science Bowl taking place in our nation's capital this week. These South Florida scholars are among 550 students from around the country competing for prizes and awards in this year's competition.

The National Science Bowl offers middle and high school students the chance to test

their math and science skills, and enhance their knowledge through seminars and workshops.

I congratulate these incredible students—Jared Shulkin, Christopher Hermens, Jacob Carbone, Saaketh Vedantam, and Jared Lassner—on their success, and I thank their coaches and teachers for their dedication to molding young minds and shaping America's future thinkers and creators.

CONGRESSIONAL BADGE OF BRAVERY PRESENTED TO COBB COUNTY HERO

HON. BARRY LOUDERMILK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, it's not every day that we get to recognize a true hometown hero. Last month, I was given the great honor of presenting the Congressional Badge of Bravery to a very deserving hero.

Officer Tony Luong, of the DeKalb County Police Department, and a resident of the 11th Congressional District, puts on his uniform each day, knowing the dangers he may face. However, his commitment to serving his fellow man is greater than the risk.

In December, 2014, during a home invasion with two heavily armed suspects, Officer Luong arrived on the scene, ready to do whatever it took to keep his community safe. The two suspects ignored police orders and began shooting at the law officers. The policemen took cover and returned fire. As Officer Luong attempted to detain one of the suspects, he sustained a near fatal bullet wound to the leg, just prior to the officers apprehending the suspect and taking him into custody. While Officer Luong was undergoing life-saving measures in the hospital, the second suspect was captured after a four-hour manhunt with the assistance of surrounding police jurisdictions.

During this incident, Officer Luong showed uncommon courage in the face of imminent danger, protecting DeKalb County residents against a violent home invasion. Even though Officer Luong was shot in the line of duty, his commitment to protecting innocent lives is unwavering. Today, Officer Luong continues to serve on the DeKalb County Police force, and I'm proud to know such a brave officer, who even in the midst of danger, does not cower in fear, but courageously takes action to serve and protect his fellow citizens.

CONGRATULATING ETHAN LYNN SWEARENGIN ON RECEIVING THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA'S EAGLE SCOUT RANK

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ethan Lynn Swearengin, of Springfield, Missouri, on his recent achievement of the Boy Scouts of America's (BSA) top rank of Eagle Scout.

The rank of Eagle Scout is the highest rank attainable in the Boy Scouts of America. It is the culmination of many years of hard work and dedication, requiring countless hours of service, training and learning. An extremely exclusive honor, less than two percent of the 112 million scouts since the BSA's founding in 1910 have achieved the Eagle Scout distinction.

Ethan's promotion to Eagle Scout is even more significant given that his brothers, Austin and Logan, also achieved the Eagle Scout rank. To have one Eagle Scout in a family is remarkable, but to have three is beyond exemplary. Ethan and his brothers' achievements are a testament to their family's reverence for focus and commitment.

Mr. Speaker, by attaining the rank of Eagle Scout, Ethan has set himself on the path to achieve future success, and I'm proud to count him among my constituents. His dedication in completing the required benchmarks and community service requirements to reach the Eagle Scout rank is indicative of his ability to accomplish whatever goals he sets his mind to. I wish Ethan luck with all his future endeavors, and urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on this momentous achievement.

IN HONOR OF PAUL MORIN

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the achievements of some of the 10th Congressional District's bravest constituents. The Loudoun County Sheriffs Office held their 2015 Awards and Recognition Ceremony on Friday, February 19th to recognize the daily services and sacrifices provided by our local law enforcement. Selected from America's finest, and nominated by their peers, the following award serves as a testament to the officer's unwavering courage and dedication to protecting our community. The following individual deserves the thanks of not only the communities in which he serves, but also that of his elected officials.

The Distinguished Training Officer Award recognizes Deputy First Class Paul Morin who consistently demonstrated superior performance in training others within his respective division. His work ensures that the community will continue to be protected by some of the most highly trained officers in the nation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking this member of the Loudoun County Sheriff's Department for protecting and serving our community day-in and day-out.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes on Tuesday, April 26, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on roll call votes 164 and 165.

TRIBUTE TO HELEN AND JOHN REGAN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate John and Helen Regan of Braddyville, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 65th wedding anniversary. They were married on April 7, 1951.

John and Helen's lifelong commitment to each other and their children, John, Claudia, and Cathy truly embodies Iowa values. It is Iowans like the Regan's that make me proud to represent our great state.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 65th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE LOUDOUN VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL STEM CLUB

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge a group of my constituents who have proudly represented Loudoun Valley High School—located in Purcellville, Virginia—in Samsung's Solve For Tomorrow STEM Education competition. The team was led by José Rodriguez and Erin Wissler, and won the competition after being named one of the final five national finalists. Members of the team include Gwen Eging, Morgan Freiberg, Summer Harvey, Riley Herr, Carter Hunt, Jackson Kennedy, Sean Lohr, Blake Messegee, Malcolm Miller, Ethan Rodriguez, Riley Schnee, Graeson Smith.

Samsung's Solve For Tomorrow competition is designed to give schools across the country the opportunity to raise students' interest in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) subjects by awarding their schools with new technology products. It also encourages some of America's brightest high school students to create their own applications and further their interest in advancing modern technology. I know that the experience of developing new technologies, and engaging in friendly competition with their fellow students, serves as a valuable learning tool.

The winning technology developed by the Loudoun Valley High School team was a solar powered safety alert system that allows students and their families to contact the police if they are in danger on the Washington & Old Dominion Railroad Regional Park, which is a 45 mile paved trail that runs between Shirlington and Purcellville, Virginia. These students value our community's safety and wanted to create a more secure route for those who enjoy this park.

In today's world, it cannot be stressed enough how important science, technology, engineering, and math are for the future of our nation. It is young STEM leaders, like these constituents, who will continue to help the

United States compete in the global economy. I strongly encourage these students, and the rest of my constituents, to continue exploring and developing their talents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding the 2016 Solve For Tomorrow champions from Loudoun Valley High School for their incredible achievement, and wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

HONORING MS. PAM CHATMAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Ms. Pam Chatman.

For as long as Pam Chatman can remember, she's been coming in first. She was the first of 3 children born to parents in the heart of the poverty-stricken Mississippi Delta. She was the first of her siblings to graduate from college. She was the first African American Woman to steer a course through the chaos of a broadcast news career to achieve the position of News Director at WABG.

But little did Pam know in 2006, when she became News Director, she was achieving yet another first: Mississippi's first-ever female African-American News Director, an honor she wears proudly.

Recently the Tru TV network chronicled Pam's seemingly unlikely journey from poverty to power, which is its hit new reality series ''Breaking Greenville''. Pam's starring role in that show underscores her passion, not just for her profession, but for the people who work for her as anchors, reporters and producers. Kids right out of college, who are hungry to learn the ropes of an often cut-throat career, find comfort in Pam's approach to leadership and management.

Pam was raised up in Shaw, Mississippi in a small rural community outside of the city limits called ''Choctaw'' a dirt-poor town of about less than 2-thousand people that sits in the heart of Bolivar County. Her grandmother, Marie Fly, raised her, and while poverty pulled at every corner of their lives, Pam relishes her adolescent years, coming of age in the Deep South. From its rich farming heritage, to its lakes and rivers teeming with catfish, to its red-clay hillsides that give a hint of color to an otherwise difficult existence, the Mississippi Delta to this day holds Pam's heart.

Pam graduated from Shaw high school in 1988 and enrolled in Rust College, one of Mississippi's oldest and most prestigious colleges for African-Americans.

Pam pledged to Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority Incorporated, the first inter-collegiate Greek-letter sorority established for Black colleges. Pam graduated from Rust College in 1994 with a degree in Broadcasting Mass Communication, and returned to the Delta, degree in hand, with her heart set on making a difference close to home. She landed her first television job at Greenville's WXVT where she worked as a Production Assistant and then later moved to the Newsroom. She eventually went to work for WXVT's competitor, WABG, where she worked her way up from Assignment Manager to ultimately News Director, a position she's held for 10 years.

Her notoriety as Mississippi's first female African-American News Director also convinced the state legislators to dedicate a portion of Highway 61 in her honor and to proclaim January 18th as Pam Chatman Day.

In addition to leading a winning news team, Pam is a tireless community volunteer and advocate for teens and young women. She's also a motivational speaker, teaching women of all ages to accept and appreciate their uniqueness within the human race. She especially has a big heart for women who have come from small rural communities and are victims of abuse and drugs.

Yes, Pam Chatman is indeed a woman of firsts: the first to volunteer when there's a need; the first to offer comfort when someone is hurting; a first-class example of what a little faith and a lot of love can accomplish.

Pam also has a Mentoring, Consulting and Training Organization; the organization believes that every person you meet is a Diamond in the Rough. The organization provides workshops to educate and empower teens to get an education; strive for success; and to let no one define their dreams or destiny. The organization provides food and clothing to needy families. Once a month Pam herself does random acts of kindness where she pays for people's groceries or their utility bill. Yes, she is a servant determined to impact everyone she meets in life with a smile or an act of kindness. The organization has a doll called the PChat Doll that has a curriculum that comes along with it to teach young girls to love the skin they're in as well to deter bullying. The focus of the curriculum is Character Education, Literacy and Parental Involvement.

Pam does consultant work for the Mississippi Department of Education Federal 21-Century Program's after school projects. In addition, Pam is also an entrepreneur. Pam has a cosmetics and spa line to enhance women of color and beauty called ''Boss Lady PChatman'' which was developed to assist in healing the totality of a woman from her inner beauty to her outer beauty.

Pam loves to help women break the chain of hurt and pain. So, she wrote a monologue gospel play entitled ''Lord Show Me How to Heal My Scars''. The play allows women from all walks of life to share their story through testimonials and songs.

Pam is the daughter of Louise Henry and the late Joseph Henry and has three siblings: Joseph, Jr., III; Evelyn and special niece Karris Henry, which she is assisting her family in raising.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an amazing News Director, Actor, Motivational Speaker, Author, Entrepreneur, Philanthropist who has been instrumental in magnifying strides of America's black history.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DOWNRIVER CAREER TECHNICAL CONSORTIUM'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Downriver Career Technical Consortium on their 50th Anniversary. As a Member of Congress, it is an honor and privilege to recognize their commitment to providing first class career development and vocational training to students from across our community.

In 1965, the school districts of Flat Rock, Gibraltar, and Grosse Ile launched eight jointly funded and supported vocational education programs, beginning the efforts of working and coordinating together these types of services between school entities, to better leverage and utilize resources among them. In the next few years, more school districts joined the effort including; Huron Schools, Airport Schools, Woodhaven-Brownstown Schools, Riverview Schools, Trenton Schools, Allen Park Schools and Southgate Schools. In 1978, the then current coalition of schools was approved as the Downriver Area Vocational Cooperative and was renamed the Downriver Career Technical Consortium (DCTC) in 1991. This type of cooperation and coordination is a hallmark of the success our Downriver communities, where leaders from across municipal, non-profit, business and educational institutions, have had in understanding the importance of working together to support and build our regional economy.

Today, the DCTC provides vocational programming in over 24 different career pathways including building and construction trades, accounting and finance, aviation, automotive services, communications, hospitality, dental occupations, and computer aided design, just to name a few. Not only is it important for our economy, but this type of vocational training is instrumental to the futures of our students who pursue these pathways. In an ever changing global economic environment, programs such as the DCTC allow our students and future workforce to be trained for the jobs of the 21st century and realize the American dream.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to honor the DCTC on their 50th Anniversary and to wish them many more years of successful education and collaboration.

TRIBUTE TO KENT MUYSKENS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Kent Muyskens for being named Northwest Iowa STEM Teacher of the Year by the Iowa Governor's STEM Advisory Council.

Kent lives in Yale, Iowa and teaches chemistry at Carroll High School. He was selected because of nominations from colleagues that praised him for his hard work and innovation in the area of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics. He worked with the community, engaged students in the process and used innovative instructional methods. Kent was also praised for his work with Project Lead the Way, taking students to a NASA space shuttle competition and writing new curriculum.

Mr. Speaker, Kent is an Iowan who has made his community and school district very proud. He has worked hard and dedicated himself to making STEM education a priority. It is with great honor that I recognize him

today. I ask that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating Kent for this award and in wishing him continued success in all his future endeavors.

REGARDING THE ENSURING USEFUL RESEARCH EXPENDITURES IS KEY FOR ALZHEIMER'S (EUREKA) ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Ensuring Useful Research Expenditures is Key for Alzheimer's Act—also known as the ''EUREKA Act'', a bill I introduced earlier today with my fellow Tennessean JOHN DUNCAN, which would establish a prize competition to accelerate the discovery and development of treatments to alleviate, prevent, and/or cure Alzheimer's disease and related dementia.

This is a bipartisan House companion to a bipartisan bill introduced previously by Senators ROGER WICKER, KELLY AYOTTE, JOHN BARRASSO, SHELLEY CAPITO, SUSAN COLLINS, ANGUS KING, and BRIAN SCHATZ.

Alzheimer's disease is a tragic disease affecting millions of Americans, and it has reached crisis proportions.

There is no effective treatment, no means of prevention, and no method for slowing the progression of the disease.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, five million Americans were living with Alzheimer's in 2013, and those numbers have swelled since then.

Because of the large numbers of patients and the length of time living with the disease, the Alzheimer's Association has called it ''the most expensive disease in America.''

They estimate that the U.S. will spend $236 billion in 2016 on patients who have Alzheimer's and related dementias.

Earlier this month, I and over 70 of my colleagues in the House signed a letter to the House Committee on Appropriations to request a $500 million increase in National Institutes of Health (''NIH'') funding for Alzheimer's research in fiscal year 2017.

And while funding Alzheimer's research directly by the NIH is important to combating the disease, it is not the only way that Congress can act to stimulate discovery and development of new treatments.

The creation of prizes to be awarded for solving difficult problems is a new strategy for U.S. agencies to tap into the limitless ingenuity and creativity of the American people.

Prize competitions are run by more than 80 agencies across the federal government.

The EUREKA Act builds upon these efforts to seek innovative solutions from the public, and bring the best ideas and talent together to solve difficult problems.

If enacted, the EUREKA Act will provide $10 million for the NIH and other agencies to create prizes for new prevention measures, treatments, and cures for Alzheimer's disease.

I urge my colleagues to join our bipartisan effort and help pass the EUREKA Act.

IN HONOR OF MASTER DEPUTY SHANNON CODERRE

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the achievements of some of the 10th Congressional District's bravest constituents. The Loudoun County Sheriff's Office held their 2015 Awards and Recognition Ceremony on Friday, February 19th to recognize the daily services and sacrifices provided by our local law enforcement. Selected from America's finest, and nominated by their peers, the following award serves as a testament to the officer's unwavering courage and dedication to protecting our community. The following individual deserves the thanks of not only the communities in which she serves, but also that of her elected officials.

The Master Deputy Program Achievement Award recognizes Master Deputy Shannon Coderre within the Master Deputy Program for superior job knowledge, devotion to duty, dedication and loyalty to the community as well as to the Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking this member of the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office for protecting and serving our community day-in-day-out.

MEDIA IGNORE DISAGREEMENT ABOUT GLOBAL WARMING

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the national liberal media promote the fiction that scientists all agree the earth continues to get warmer and that climate change causes severe weather events. However, there is little scientific consensus to support these claims.

For example, one often-cited statistic comes from one author who examined abstracts of articles to conclude that 75 percent of scientists believe in global warming.

But the author omitted abstracts from global warming skeptics. And the author never specifies how many of the abstracts actually endorse her conclusion that a ''consensus'' of scientists believes in climate change.

Slanting data on climate change is contrary to the respected scientific method.

Americans deserve all the facts that surround climate change, not just those that fit the view the national liberal media want to promote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Number 165 on H.R. 4096, I am not recorded because I was absent for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted Aye.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR JODI MARTI

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Major Jodi Marti for being awarded the Air Force Commendation Medal.

Maj. Marti spent fifteen months planning a domestic operations exercise called VIGILANT GUARD, conducted by the Iowa Army National Guard in conjunction with Iowa Homeland Security and Emergency Management. The operation partnered with over 45 federal, state, regional and county agencies, involving simulated scenarios of flooding, tornados and widespread power outages. Maj. Marti is now serving in Kosovo, mentoring and training members of the Kosovo Security Forces.

Mr. Speaker, Maj. Marti is an Iowan who has made her state and nation proud. She has worked hard and dedicated herself to serving her country. It is with great honor that I recognize her today. I ask that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating Maj. Marti for this award and wishing her nothing but continued success in all her future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATON

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on roll call Numbers 164 and 165, on H.R. 4820 and H.R. 4096, I was unable to make it to the vote series.

Had I been present, I would have voted yes on both.

CELEBRATION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WESLEY UNITED METHODIST CHURCH IN BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA

HON. GARRET GRAVES

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the Wesley United Methodist Church of Baton Rouge.

In 1866, the community decided it was time to build a church.

And like good Louisianans, they set out to build one.

Members of the church harvested wood from the forests north of Baton Rouge, floated the logs down the Mississippi River to their chosen site and used them to build the congregation's first church a house of worship built by hands of her parishioners.

Throughout the dark days of segregation in our nation's history, the Wesley Methodist Church was a beacon of light and played an important role serving the African American in the heart of Louisiana's capital.

Sadly, the original structure was destroyed by a storm in 1883, and shortly after being rebuilt, the church was again destroyed by a fire in 1892.

But as a testimony to the church's importance in the community and to the perseverance of the spirit of Louisiana, Wesley United Methodist was rebuilt in its current location.

Today, the Wesley United Methodist Church continues a proud tradition of service, fellowship, and ministry—as a church at the heart of the city, with the city at heart.

IN HONOR OF THE RECIPIENTS OF LOUDOUN COUNTY'S SHERIFF'S OFFICE MERITORIOUS SERVICE AWARD

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the achievements of some of the 10th Congressional District's bravest constituents. The Loudoun County Sheriff's Office held their 2015 Awards and Recognition Ceremony on Friday, February 19th to recognize the daily services and sacrifices provided by our local law enforcement. Selected from America's finest, and nominated by their peers, the following award serves as a testament to each officer's unwavering courage and dedication to protecting our community. The following individuals deserve the thanks and appreciation of not only the communities which they serve, but also that of their elected officials.

The Meritorious Service Award recognizes exceptional performance by a member within the scope of normal responsibilities. The following individuals deserve special recognition: Detective Nicholas Altom, Investigator Julian Berger III, Deputy Joseph Hacay and Deputy First Class Daniel Martynowicz. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these exceptional members of the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office for protecting and serving our community day-in and day-out.

RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF HECLA MINING COMPANY

HON. RAÚL R. LABRADOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 125th anniversary of Hecla Mining Company. Formed in 1891 for the purpose of acquiring and trading mining claims in north Idaho's Silver Valley mining district, Hecla is the last of this district's pioneer mining companies and is now the largest primary silver producer in the United States.

Over the past 125 years, Hecla has weathered numerous storms including the Panic of 1893, the Great Depression, and two world wars. Minerals produced by Hecla, such as zinc and lead, have played key roles in our national defense while silver is a key ingredient for solar voltaic cells and modern electronic and medical devices. These resources provide the raw materials needed for economic growth across a myriad of sectors.

Today, Hecla is a vital part of Idaho's economy and communities. Hecla employs 1,300 individuals and has provided over $1.5 million to support education, youth activities, community health and infrastructure through its charitable foundation in recent years. Additionally, Hecla employees serve on local school boards, as EMTs, elected officials, and firemen.

I recently visited Hecla's Lucky Friday mine in Mullan, Idaho, and saw firsthand the state-of-the-art mining practices that are used to extract silver from deep in the earth. Hecla is currently taking the Lucky Friday mine to 10,000 feet below the surface to open up more than 20 years of additional resources. Hecla has maintained an uncompromising commitment to better mining and worker safety and plays an important role in meeting the nation's mineral demands. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating this great milestone for Hecla Mining Company.

TRIBUTE TO HANNAH D. LARSON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Hannah Larson of Minden, Iowa, for being awarded the Good Citizen Award by the Council Bluffs Chapter of the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution (NSDAR). Hannah is a senior at TriCenter High School in Neola, Iowa.

Hannah exhibited all of the talents and skills needed to qualify for this award. They include dependability, service to others, leadership, and patriotism. Judges took into consideration several areas in grading her application including high school achievement, home and community activities, future plans, extra-curricular activities, and good citizenship. A second requirement was to write an essay on Our American Heritage and Our Responsibility for Preserving It. The essay was to focus on American rights and freedoms and the rights she would select to celebrate. Hannah was chosen to advance and represent the Council Bluffs Chapter of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) in the southwest Iowa district competition.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Hannah for earning this award. She is a shining example of the future of our youth. I ask that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating Hannah for her interest in preserving our rights and freedoms. I wish her continued success in all her future endeavors.

CONGRATULATING COLTON KEY ON RECEIVING THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA'S EAGLE SCOUT RANK

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Colton Key, of Willard, Missouri, on his recent achievement of the Boy Scouts of America's (BSA) top rank of Eagle Scout.

The rank of Eagle Scout is the highest rank attainable in the Boy Scouts of America. It is the culmination of many years of hard work and dedication, requiring countless hours of service, training and learning. An extremely exclusive honor, less than two percent of the 112 million scouts since the BSA's founding in 1910 have achieved the Eagle Scout distinction.

Becoming an Eagle Scout requires a significant amount of determination and self-discipline, traits which will no doubt serve to make Colton a better employee, family member, and American throughout his life. To achieve the rank, he demonstrated active teamwork in his troop, underwent numerous wilderness training tests, dedicated time to his community, and has adhered to the BSA oath's reverence for character, citizenship, and personal wellness.

Mr. Speaker, by attaining the rank of Eagle Scout, Colton has set himself on the path to achieve future success, and I'm proud to count him among my constituents. His dedication in completing the required benchmarks and community service requirements to reach the Eagle Scout rank is indicative of his ability to accomplish whatever goals he sets his mind to. I wish Colton luck with all his future endeavors, and urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on this momentous achievement.

GIRLS OF STEEL

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Girls of Steel robotics team on winning the Engineering Inspiration award at the 2016 Queen City Regional FIRST Robotics Competition in Cincinnati, Ohio. This is the most prestigious award at FIRST, and it honors the team that does the most to increase appreciation for engineering in its community and embodies the purpose and goals of FIRST.

The Girls of Steel also won the Entrepreneurship Award at the 2016 Greater Pittsburgh FIRST Robotics Competition in California, PA. This award recognizes the team that developed the best business plan to identify, manage, and accomplish its objectives.

I think that winning these awards speaks volumes to the dedication with which these young women are pursuing ''STEM'' careers, along with the hundreds of hours they have spent conducting outreach in their community.

FIRST, which stands for ''For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology,'' is an organization dedicated to engaging our students in STEM fields. Hundreds of thousands of students gain practical, team-based engineering experience through FIRST every year. The FIRST Robotics Competition allows these students to apply creativity and critical thinking in the demanding and competitive field of robotics, all while instilling a strong sense of pride in participants.

As a founder and co-chair of the Congressional Robotics Caucus, I believe competitions like these are incredible tools for helping the next generation to explore potential careers in STEM. I've witnessed firsthand the incredible

economic growth and development that these fields can bring in my home district, and I strongly believe that they are crucial to our nation's future prosperity. For encouraging young people in these pursuits, I want to commend organizations like FIRST for their important work.

In addition to their success at these competitions, the Girls of Steel have also been featured in American Girl Life: Get Your Science On!, Xploration Earth 2050 ''The Future of Robotics Makers and Innovators'', and they will be featured this year in an original documentary series called ''What We Teach Girls,'' which takes a close look at what girls are being taught around the globe. Recently, they even met with former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton at Carnegie Mellon University and had the opportunity to speak with her about the design of their robot and why they joined Girls of Steel.

Sixty-one young women from 8th through 12th grades associated with schools located in and around the Pittsburgh area are members of this year's Girls of Steel. In recognition of their hard work, intelligence, and teamwork, I would like to mention each of these inspiring young ladies by name. They are Alexandria Adams, Vishi Agrawal, Arushi Bandi, Margaret Begg, Emilia Bianchini, Kimball Bruning, Julia Bukowski, Emma Burnett, Melissa Burnett, Hanna Chen, Mulin Chen, Claire Cummings, Hope DiGioia, Samantha Eppinger, Clarisa Espinoza-Delgado, Rozie Fero, Corinne Hartman, Kristina Hilko, Sydney Hnat, Madelyn Human, Anna Jablonowski, Katelyn Johnson, Isabelle Kowenhoven, Jisue Lee, Sophia Lee, Shiyu Liu, Huiyun Liu, Sofia Liovet-Nava, Gayathri Manchella, Jordan Martinez, Svea McCann, Sree Mekala, Cheyenne Meyers, Claire Morton, Gigi Nieson, Anne Kailin Northam, Jimin Oh, Maddie Oppelt, Helen Paulini, Lehka Pendyala, Eden Petri, Riley Pottinger, Priya Ray, Isabella Salvi, Lauren Scheller-Wolf, Cate Seay, Sarah Seay, Anzu Sekikawa, Alexa Selwood, Swathi Senthil, Kriti Shah, Makayla Shreve, Kavya Soman, JéanMarie Trichel, Mikayla Trost, Langley Turcsanyi, Molly Urbina, Anja Vogt, Becca Volk, Ziya Xu, and Natalie Young.

Additionally, I want to convey my sincere appreciation to the faculty and staff of Carnegie Mellon University's Field Robotics Center, who have mentored the Girls of Steel since 2010. Because of their efforts, more young women can experience real-world technological challenges and learn from some of the nation's best at solving these problems. These experiences will certainly benefit these young women in the future.

I look forward to hearing about their progress as they advance to the FIRST Championship in St. Louis—the final and largest competition of its kind, a.k.a. the Super Bowl of robotics. This will be their sixth consecutive trip in six years, and they will be competing against top teams from all over the world. I congratulate the Girls of Steel and wish them all continued success in their academic and professional endeavors.

IN MEMORY OF JUDGE SOL BLATT, JR.

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of South Carolina are mourning the loss of one of its most respected judges with the death of Judge Sol Blatt, Jr., on April 20, 2016. He was nominated by President Richard M. Nixon. The Blatt family, of Russian-Jewish heritage, is beloved in Barnwell County for their dedicated service. His passing was recognized in an editorial in the Charleston Post and Courier on April 23, 2016:

Sol Blatt, Jr., earned his stellar reputation not for making big headlines but for his long tenure as a fair, courteous and intelligent federal judge—a standard that all judges should aspire to attain.

Judge Blatt practiced law in his native Barnwell for 25 years before 1971 when he was appointed a U.S. District Court judge in Charleston. He became a chief judge in 1986.

And in 2006, he became the longest-serving federal judge in South Carolina history.

In honor of that distinction the U.S. district judges in South Carolina signed a resolution naming the first-floor courtroom in Charleston's federal courthouse the Solomon Blatt Jr. Courtroom.

Would that every judge in that courtroom, where he usually presided, could conduct himself as impressively.

Judge Blatt's father was the prominent speaker of the S.C. House for 33 years. Like his father, Sol Blatt, Jr., attained prominence for public service, which he handled with grace and competence.

Mr. Blatt, 94, died Wednesday night at his home in Charleston.

He will be remembered for his remarkable judicial temperament.

Indeed, it was as if the American Bar Association had him in mind when it outlined the tenets of judicial temperament: ''compassion, decisiveness, open-mindedness, sensitivity, courtesy, patience, freedom from bias and commitment to equal justice.''

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $19,210,345,265,252.22. We've added $8,583,468,216,339.14 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $8 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

TRIBUTE TO LEONA AND GEORGE HOLLINS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Leona and George Hollins of Council Bluffs, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. They were married on March 21, 1956 at St. John's Lutheran Church in Council Bluffs, Iowa.

George and Leona's lifelong commitment to each other and their children, George, Cheryl, Greg, and Jamie, and their grandchildren and great-grandchildren truly embodies Iowa values. It is families like the Hollins' that make me proud to represent our great state.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them nothing but the best.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHEMICAL DISTRIBUTORS' RESPONSIBLE DISTRIBUTION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th anniversary of the National Association of Chemical Distributors' Responsible Distribution program. I want to congratulate NACD and its members for their commitment to continuous performance improvement in every phase of chemical storage, handling, transportation, and disposal.

Chemicals are the building blocks of our modern world. They make most aspects of our lives easier, safer, and better. Chemical distributors formulate, blend, re-package, warehouse, transport, and market the chemical products produced by large-quantity manufacturers. In my district, 15 chemical distribution facilities, including Douglas Products and Packaging Company, have a total economic impact of more than $18 million and provide more than 112 high quality jobs. Throughout the country, the chemical distribution industry accounts for close to $15 billion in economic impact.

In December 1991, the member companies of NACD embarked on their most important mission—the inception of Responsible Distribution. Responsible Distribution is a mandatory, third party verified environmental, health, safety, and security program. Responsible Distribution provides a proven framework for the health, safety, environment, and security aspects of handling storing, and delivering chemical products and is mandatory for all NACD members, who represent 90 percent of all chemical distribution industry sales.

NACD and its nearly 450 member companies are vital to the chemical supply chain, providing products to more than 750,000 end users in industries as diverse and essential as construction, healthcare, electronics, pulp and paper, water treatment, and many others.

With Responsible Distribution, NACD members deliver 80 tons of product every minute, maintain a safety record that is nearly twice as good as all manufacturing combined, and pursue continuous improvement in every phase of the chemical distribution process while demonstrating sensitivity and responsiveness to public concerns.

I am proud of NACD member companies for the commitment to Responsible Distribution and for their contributions to the economy in Missouri and throughout the U.S.

IN HONOR OF THE RECIPIENTS OF LOUDOUN COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE COMMENDATION AWARD

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the achievements of some of the 10th Congressional District's bravest constituents. The Loudoun County Sheriff's Office held their 2015 Awards and Recognition Ceremony on Friday, February 19th to recognize the daily services and sacrifices provided by our local law enforcement. Selected from America's finest, and nominated by their peers, the following award serves as a testament to each officer's unwavering courage and dedication to protecting our community. The following individuals deserve the thanks of not only the communities which they serve, but also that of their elected officials.

The Commendation Award is presented by the Sheriff to individuals for acts that contribute to the accomplishment of the Sheriff's objectives or for an act that warrants special recognition in the public interest. I would like to recognize the following recipients: Deputy First Class Robert Heller, Sergeant Jay Conner, Deputy Ruben Cardenas, Deputy Jesus Diaz, Deputy Jillian Brock, Virginia State Troopers Rolando Curiel and Enzo A. Diaz, Deputy First Class Dawn Taylor, Detective Michael Hall, Sergeant Jeffrey Lockhart, Sergeant Michael Beatty, Detective Larry ''Rob'' Reed, Detective Jeffrey ''Tyler'' Brown, Deputy First Class Victor Lopreto, Mrs. Jacqueline Gallman, Detective Dana Cresswell, Detective Elissa Wilk, Detective Patrick Beaver, Detective Jeffrey Cichocki, Detective Justin Oksanen, Detective Corinne Czekaj, Sergeant Sara Tresselt (Posthumous), Sergeant Kevin Tucker, Detective Paul Loconti, Detective Christopher Staub, Detective Jenna Sullivan, Detective Timothy Lambert, Detective Christopher Salter, Detective Thomas Mengel, Detective Duane Rosa, Deputy First Class William Sullivan, Lieutenant Jamie Sanford (Leesburg Police Department), Sergeant Douglas Duhl, Deputy First Class Matthew Vess, Deputy First Class Kristopher Dawson, Deputy Joshua Carter, Detective Ron Colantonio, Deputy Sean McCormack, Deputy Eric Turner, and Assistant Commonwealth Attorney's Amy McMullen and Eric Pohlner and members of the Northern Virginia Gang Task Force.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these members of the Loudoun County Sheriff's Department for protecting and serving our community day-in-day-out.

TUDOR HOUSE SELECTED AS PLACE OF HISTORICAL INTEREST

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of an important dedication ceremony taking place this weekend in my district. On Sunday, May 1, 2016, the Billy Holcomb Chapter of E Clampus Vitus will dedicate the Tudor House as a place of California historical interest. The Tudor House is one of only two locations in all of California that will receive this designation from E Clampus Vitus this year. Over 750 members of E Clampus Vitus, or ''clampers'' as they prefer to be called, will attend the festivities in Lake Arrowhead, California.

The Tudor House has a long and storied past in the mountains of San Bernardino County. Constructed in 1926 as the Club Arrowhead Villas, the property served as a luxury resort for wealthy travelers. It boasted many amenities, including a dining club house, market, and sports facility.

Following the Great Depression of 1929, Club Arrowhead Villas became known for its moonshine, gambling, and dance hall girls. There are even rumors that famous mobster Benjamin ''Bugsy'' Siegal was involved in managing the resort.

By the early 1950s, the resort returned to more respectable forms of business and became an integral part of the Lake Arrowhead community. Today, the resort has been renamed the Tudor House and serves as a venue for mountain residents and visitors to enjoy various forms of art and entertainment.

I would like to thank the Billy Holcomb Chapter of E Clampus Vitus for selecting the Tudor House as a place of historical interest. I look forward to participating in this weekend's festivities.

IN MEMORY OF WARD CORRELL

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of my dear friend, Ward Correll. We have lost a giant in Somerset, Kentucky—a gentle giant, a generous giant, a business giant, a God-fearing giant.

Ward came up from the poorest of origins, but he had that drive and ambition to succeed. He overcame tremendous obstacles. He reminds us of what Churchill once said, ''The pessimist sees difficulty in every opportunity. The optimist sees opportunity in every difficulty.'' He had a profound positive attitude, always looking to the upside of life.

When I first ran for this office, to represent the good people of Kentucky's Fifth Congressional District, I went to see Ward about my chances. I'll never forget what he advised: ''Get out in the middle of the stream where the current is the swiftest. That's the only way to get where you want to go.''

This man was a business genius, the most generous man I've ever known, the truest friend of all of us, a visionary for his community, a dynamic personality, and he was the most skilled Rook player in all of Somerset.

My most vivid recollection of Ward was when he undertook his very first business venture—the development of Tradewinds Shopping Center. It required the huge movement of dirt from the slim hilly plot of land to create enough space for the endeavor. Driving by, I saw just one piece of machinery—a bulldozer, being driven by the only person on the project—that driver was Ward Correll; shirtless and sweating profusely. But that drive and determination yielded a historic first for Somerset—a modern shopping center, bringing new life to a new Somerset and the beginning of the business empire he built. He later established a thriving oil and gas distributorship, invested in a life insurance company and founded a bank, creating much-needed jobs and boosting the economy in the Lake Cumberland area.

Despite all his drive and his many skills, Ward had the most unexpected and almost child-like sense of humor—simple and warming little mannerisms—and he loved the simple, but meaningful pleasures: family, friends, his devout religion and especially his church—and its pastor, Dr. French Harmon.

His most enduring legacy will be the success he engendered in others. His generosity was unending, especially for children. Helping those in desperate straits, or at a critical time in their lives. His monumental gifts to education are legendary—whether the Somerset Christian School or the University of the Cumberlands, or any of hundreds of other institutions, churches or playgrounds for children. We'll never know just how much he gave to others, because he didn't brag.

He gave new meaning to the Biblical admonition that it is more blessed to give than to receive. He believed what Mark Twain said, ''to get the full value of joy, you must have people to divide it with.'' Leonard Nimoy, the actor, said, ''the miracle is this—the more we share, the more we have.''

We may not see his likes again on this Earth, but I'm sure of one thing—we will see him again—in Heaven, thanks be to God—his and ours.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost a loyal friend and true patriot, but his footprint in our region will be visible for generations to come. My wife Cynthia and I offer our deepest sympathy and prayers to the Correll family.

AUTO-OWNERS INSURANCE 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 100th anniversary of Auto-Owners Insurance Company—headquartered and founded in mid-Michigan.

In 1916, a young Vern V. Moulton, along with four other associates, started the Insurance Company in Mt. Pleasant, Michigan.

The startup agency operated out of one room in a bank building and had no capital.

A year later, the small company—with only $174 in assets and one book of policyholders' names—made the big jump to the city where it is headquartered today—Lansing, Michigan.

During the tough years of the Great Depression, Auto-Owners demonstrated its corporate toughness and financial stability by paying all claims promptly, daily, and in cash.

In 1940, the company moved into the general causality insurance field, while also expanding operations into Indiana and Ohio. This growth was only the start, and over the next several decades the company would begin operations across the country.

Today, Auto-Owners operates in 26 states throughout the United States and has opened offices from Arizona to Virginia.

The company that originated with only five associates in a one room office now employs more than 4,500 associates and operates out of an expansive complex. The combined premium of all companies exceeds $6 billion and total assets exceed $20 billion, with more than 5 million policies in force for over 3 million policy holders.

Throughout the company's history, Auto-Owners has upheld a high reputation for excellence. The Fortune 500 Company has the highest possible ratings from A.M. Best Company, A++ (Superior), and the Auto-Owners Life Insurance Company is rated A+ (Superior).

I offer my best wishes to Auto-Owners Insurance as they continue to maintain their reputation of being the ''No Problem'' people.

HONORING MILITARY ENLISTEES

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor 37 high school seniors in Florida's 22nd District who have decided to enlist in the United States Armed Forces.

Of the 37 from my district, seven have joined the Army; their names are the following: Gabriel Reis, Tyler Risko, Dave Marshall, Joan-Manuel Diaz Frias, Austin Budney, Matthew Disarle, and Jeremy Gonzalez.

Thirteen have joined the Marines; their names are the following: William Harding, Jordy Dejesus Garcia, Gina Cornejo, Matthieu Martelly, Moises Gonzalez Visoso, Antonio Smith, Kesley Juste, Adrian Rendon, James Ricer, Alexander Alvarez, Rolph Duplan, Kenneth Deangeles and Kaneisha Pinkney.

Two have joined the National Guard; their names are the following: Connor Mcclure and Merisanda Carstea.

Nine have joined the Navy; their names are the following: Hannah Piecewicz, Robert Maldonado, Connor Schmitt, Rosalyn Ovalle, Jack Schwencke, Michael Jones, Jennifer Janvier, Nicolas Cruz Velez, and Elsa Bello.

Five have joined the Air Force; their names are the following: Nicholas Antonucci, Matthew Core, Pedro Franco, Kacper Palej, and Joshua Marquez.

One has joined the Coast Guard; his name is Marcus Tauber.

It is in thanks to the dedication of patriots like these that we are able to meet here today, in the United States House of Representatives, and openly debate the best solutions to the diverse issues that confront our country. On behalf of myself and all of my constituents in Florida's 22nd District, thank you for your service and best of luck as you pursue this challenging endeavor.

INTRODUCING THE HADIYA PENDLETON AND NYASIA PRYEAR-YARD GUN TRAFFICKING & CRIME PREVENTION ACT OF 2016

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I proudly introduce The Hadiya Pendleton and Nyasia Pryear-Yard Gun Trafficking & Crime Prevention Act of 2016, the House companion legislation to Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND's bill in the Senate.

This legislation would establish gun trafficking as a federal crime. Specifically, it increases the penalties for those directly involved in the illegal movement of guns across state lines, those who organize the gun trafficking rings and those who conspire to traffic guns.

Additionally, this legislation enforces gun trafficking as a federal crime punishable of up to twenty years in prison and up to $250,000 in fines under Title 18. This legislation tackles firearm trafficking at each stage by also increasing the penalties for all personnel involved in the illegal movement of guns, including those who participate in trafficking rings and those who conspire to traffic guns.

Only 1 out of 10 guns used in a crime is wielded by the original purchaser and 1 in 3 guns used in criminal acts cross state lines. Ninety percent of guns found at crime scenes in New York City were originally purchased out of state and illegally brought to the city. Unfortunately, current crime laws are arbitrary: the act of selling guns without the necessary federal license carries the same punishment as trafficking chickens and cows across state lines. This critical legislation would not only make gun trafficking a federal crime, but it will also provide tools to law enforcement to get illegal guns off the streets, away from criminal networks and street gangs, and prosecute those who traffic firearms.

The bill was named after Hadiya Pendleton and Nyasia Pryear-Yard—two high school students who were killed in recent years. In both cases, the individuals were killed by people that were in illegal possession of a firearm. Hadiya Pendleton was killed in Chicago, when shots were fired into a crowd of people. The shots were intended for members of the shooter's rival gang. Nyasia Pryear was killed in Brooklyn, while with friends. Witnesses said the shooting was gang related.

The Hadiya Pendleton and Nyasia Pryear-Yard Gun Trafficking & Crime Prevention Act of 2016 is common sense legislation that should be supported by all Members of the House. I ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

HONORING 33 PALM BEACH COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of 33 high school seniors from Palm Beach County who plan to enlist in the military after graduation this spring. Their maturity and courage are a testament to their dedication to our country.

I am proud to represent a Congressional District that is home to veterans of every major conflict since World War II. I feel tremendous gratitude to these men and women in the armed services, veterans, and their families. My father, the late Bernard Deutch, volunteered to fight in World War II as a teenager where he earned a Purple Heart at the Battle of the Bulge. It was his example of service to our nation that motivated me to serve in Congress.

Congratulations to Roberto Montoya Bravo, Franchesco Garcia, Stephen Gordon, Alex-Lamar Stone, Niko Notare, Cristian Mccusker, David Coleman, Manolo Vallejo, Jonathan Burrage, Garianne Baucicaut, Jessica Hole, Susana Hoyos Cuervo, Isaiah Ortiz, Carlos Avila, Rafael Mitre, Uriel Najera Merino, Harrison Magyarosi, Enrique Cadiz, Kaiden Parker Bolley, Daniel Machado, Jordan Norwood, Neslendy Delice, Joshua White, Michael Rosa, Marek Gawel, Joshua Richardson, Nicholas Cutter, Lamar Butler Jr, Robert Del Carpio, Logan Peluso, Christopher Coronel, Sabrina Kutenits, and Camilo Rosado. I am pleased to honor them and I thank them for their future service.

RECOGNIZING RICHARD ''DICK'' AND ANNETTE GARIN WARREN ON THEIR PASSING

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Dick and Annette Warren of Hayward on the occasion of their passing away on March 23 and February 20, 2016, at the ages of 89 and 86, respectively.

After serving in the Army during World War II and graduating from Cal, Dick joined his father's company, Warren Transportation, later becoming the company's president until his retirement.

Dick was dedicated to the Hayward community where he lived, learning the value of giving back from his parents. He was a member and president of the Hayward Rotary Club, receiving a Paul Harris Fellowship for his contributions. Dick was also a member of organizations like the Hayward Area Historical Society, the California Trucking Association, and Rowell Ranch Board of Directors, among many others.

Annette, an alumna of the year from Holy Names High School in Oakland and a graduate of the San Francisco College for Women Lone Mountain, served as a teacher at Sherman Elementary in San Francisco. Annette was a member of the All Saints Parish in Hayward, hosting a Bible study class, the Order of Malta, where she served on projects to help the sick and the poor, and the St. Rose Hospital Foundation.

Dick and Annette were married in 1956, initially living in Castro Valley. They later moved to Hayward and raised their five sons, Guy, Richard, Jr., Rex, Garin, and Rob. They loved their family and friends, delighting in parties and celebrations.

The Warrens' commitment to the Hayward community was truly extraordinary. I want to

acknowledge them for their remarkable work and pass along my condolences to their family and friends.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 2016, I was unable to be present for votes. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 164, passage of H.R. 4820, the Combating Terrorist Recruitment Act of 2016, and ''yes'' on roll call no. 165, passage of H.R. 4096, the Investor Clarity and Bank Parity Act.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF TIFFANY JOSLYN

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today, as Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I join with my colleagues, Chairman BOB GOODLATTE of Virginia, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Chairman F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR. of Wisconsin and Subcommittee Ranking Member SHEILA JACKSON LEE of Texas, in celebrating and recognizing the life and accomplishments of Tiffany May Joslyn, who sadly passed away on March 5, 2016.

A 2004 graduate of Clark University and a 2007 graduate of George Washington University Law School, Tiffany was a dedicated public servant, highly-respected counsel to the Committee, and beloved colleague.

Tiffany worked diligently and with distinction for nearly seven years as an attorney for the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (NACDL). As a co-author of numerous studies and reports, she played a critical role in the NACDL's efforts to fight for effective representation of the accused.

After her work with the NACDL, Tiffany joined the House Judiciary Committee Democratic staff as Deputy Chief Counsel of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations in 2015. In her time serving the Committee, Tiffany helped Crime Subcommittee Ranking Member JACKSON LEE and other Committee Members make historic advances in the cause of reforming our broken criminal justice system.

She was dedicated to addressing youth justice issues, recognizing the need to value all of our young people and allow them to grow into adulthood without the burdens of the mistakes of their youth. Among her most prominent accomplishments while working for the Judiciary Committee are important bills such as H.R. 3713, The Sentencing Reform Act; H.R. 1854, The Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act; H.R. 3406, the Second Chance Reauthorization Act; and H.R. 759, the Corrections and Recidivism Reduction Act of 2016. She was also vital in assisting Ranking Member JACKSON LEE draft several youth justice bills: H.R. 3158, the Reforming Alternatives to Incarceration and Sentencing to Establish A Better Path for Youth Act of 2015 (RAISE Act), H.R. 3156, The Fair Chance for Youth Act of 2015, and H.R. 3155, The Effective and Humane Treatment of Youth Act of 2015.

Though her life was cut short by tragedy, Tiffany had a profound and positive impact on her community and our country. Today and always, we remember and appreciate her devotion to public service, her drive to make our nation more equal and fair, her wise and dedicated counsel, and the friendships she developed with us and her colleagues.

We are grateful for the time we were able to spend with Tiffany, and for her invaluable work on the Committee. It is in her honor and spirit that we continue the fight to reform our criminal justice system.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Number 164 on H.R. 4820, I am not recorded because I was absent for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted Aye.

ISRAEL THREATS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the State of Israel has always been threatened by nations and terror groups that hate Israel simply because it is a Jewish state. In recent years, the threats to Israel have become even more dangerous. Just this week, 16 people were wounded in a bus bombing in Jerusalem.

The volatile civil war in Syria has allowed the region to become a full-blown terrorist haven which directly threatens Israeli security. Al-Qaeda's Syrian affiliate, the al Nusrah Front, has literally straddled the Syrian-Israeli border. ISIS, which is even more brutal than al-Qaeda, controls large parts of Syria and Iraq, and it won't be long before they turn their sights on Israel. Lebanese Hezbollah, which is also heavily imbedded in the Syrian civil war, acts as Iran's terrorist proxy. Iran has moved advanced weapons systems into Lebanon, including anti-ship cruise missiles, air defense systems, and precision-guided surface-to-surface missiles. That means Hezbollah has an estimated 150,000 missiles sitting in their stockpile. Equally concerning is that Hezbollah is amassing valuable tactical experience while fighting in this Syrian civil war that could be used against Israel.

Compounding the terrorist threat in Israel is the recent spate of Palestinian lone-wolf attacks, which include stabbings, vehicle ramming, and shootings. The latest wave of attacks has killed 34 people and injured over 400. Among those killed were two American citizens: Ezra Schwartz of Massachusetts and Taylor Force from my home state of Texas. These attacks are directly fueled by the hateful incitement of the Palestinian Authority which must be stymied.

Meanwhile, down in Gaza, Israeli officials now believe that Hamas has completely replenished its rocket supply that Israel depleted in 2014. Just recently Israeli officials announced the discovery of a new tunnel built by Hamas into leading into Israel. The sole purpose of these tunnels is to secure arms supply lines and then strike at the heart of Israeli population centers.

Aside from terrorism, the global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement has led an onslaught of de-legitimization campaigns targeting Israel in recent years. Five American scholarly associations have already joined this cause citing what they refer to as Israel's ''violation of human rights.'' Interestingly, the organizations only boycott Israel and not other countries with much worse human rights records.

Israel must also deal with the fallout from the Iran nuclear deal made by this Administration. Iran's most recent ballistic missile test launched missiles marked with the words ''Israel must be wiped off the earth.'' Thanks to this deal, it is only a matter of time before the mullahs in Tehran develop a nuclear weapon and aim it towards Israel. It's no wonder why Israeli leaders call the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action a ''bad deal'' that threatens Israel's survival.

You would think that with all these threats facing our ally Israel, the United States would draw closer to its friend and help it protect itself. But that has not happened. Despite these threats, our relationship with Israel has become strained under this Administration. We must do more to repair our partnership and protect our friends and allies in Israel from the growing dangers that surround them. We must recognize that the threats that confront Israel also confront the United States. The same terrorist groups that want to destroy Israel also want to destroy the United States. The same Iran that calls Israel the 'little Satan' also calls the United States the 'Great Satan'. We must face these common threats together.

And that's just the way it is.

ESSAY BY KANIKA DRAKSHARAM

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight from across the political spectrum that sheds a light on the concerns of our younger constituents. Giving voice to their priorities will hopefully instill a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Kanika Draksharam attends Clements High School in Sugar Land, Texas. The essay topic is: Select an important event that has occurred in the past year and explain how that event has changed/shaped our country.

Amid a flood of controversy in June 2015, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned a longstanding controversial law. Five justices affirmed LGBT American's Constitutional right to wed, leading to many changes for not only those who supported the bill, but the entire country as well. Undoubtedly, in the past year, the legalization of same sex marriage has brought many differences to the United States, and has helped shaped us into a more accepting country.

The legalization of same sex marriage has brought various economic benefits in addition to the obvious social ones. Due to the law being passed by Congress, the economy has seen a sudden boost. Take New York for example; whose economy was boosted by over two and a half million dollars due to same sex marriage couples being able to get married in state. Since the law being passed, marriage license fees, local celebrations, and wedding related purchases, have contributed greatly to the economy. We can see that this law has helped our economy in a positive manner, which is a good change our country required. The income being brought in by this new change is aiding in curbing the economic deficit as well. Contributing to this, is also the fact that insurance companies are being used more, since people are able to utilize the advantages of being married that these companies provide. Additionally, the passing of this law raises tax revenues by bringing in between twenty and forty million dollars more than average per year, helping the economy greatly. Fiscal benefits are a large factor in what our economy has gained. The government would have to spend more on Social Security and Employee Health Benefits, but it would actually end up saving money when it the attention is turned to medical health programs, by almost a hundred million dollars. It's clear that passing this law has resulted in positive impacts on the economy.

Large corporations have advocated for this, making it something that is widely advertised as a positive change in society, going from being condemned in the past. Many of these companies such as Google, Apple, Verizon, Morgan Stanley and Microsoft have recruited people from this community to work for them, sending society an accepting message.

Marriage equality is a freedom that many groups across American have long strived for in the past. Now that the past year has brought this rightful prospect to our country, it has also brought positive changes for not only them, but all of American as well.

HONORING MR. DONALD GREEN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mr. Donald Green.

A Coahoma County native, Donald Green is a dedicated and seemingly tireless community leader and business owner who has committed his career to creating economic and educational opportunities for farmworkers and families in the Mississippi Delta.

As Executive Director of Mississippi Delta Council for Farm Worker Opportunities, Inc., Mr. Green leads a staff of 22 providing job training and placement services to thousands of individuals every year. His organization also hosts a monthly food distribution and offers a civilian relief distribution staging area following weather emergencies and disasters. Currently, his team is transforming an existing warehouse and property into a farmers market, commercial kitchen, produce aggregation and food hub to raise incomes for dozens of limited-resource and beginning farmers. Prior to becoming the organization's chief executive, he was its Chief Financial Officer for 21 years.

He served as one of three Associate Tax Commissioners for the State of Mississippi and is the second African American in the State of Mississippi to do so. An accountant, Mr. Green also owns and operates an independent accounting service business.

Throughout his career, Mr. Green has been an ambassador between working people and local businesses. His board service includes: Clarksdale/Coahoma County Chamber of Commerce; member of National Exchange Club; member of Clarksdale Industrial Foundation; member of Coahoma Community Development Organization; and member of Clarksdale/Coahoma County Airport Board. He has served as a State Treasurer of the Magnolia Council; Vice President of The Delta Council; member Delta State Alumni University Association; former President of National Alumni Association; Founder and former President for Mississippi Delta Strategic Compact; Treasurer for Mississippi Blues Foundation, former President of Friendship Community Federal Credit Union. He was recognized in 2004 as Delta Regional Minority Businessman of the Year, inducted into the Delta State University Alumni Hall of Fame in 2009, and received the Freedom Team Appreciation Certificate for Services to Members of the Armed Forces. He is a member of the Clarksdale Rotary Club.

Committed to making higher education more accessible, Mr. Green became president of Delta State National Alumni Association in 1995 and led a five million dollar capital campaign. That funding has more than doubled in the years since and has a significant endowment. He has served on the university's foundation board. In 2001, he was appointed to a six-year term on the Mississippi State Board of Community and Junior Colleges. Co-Founder and President of the Ronald Hoss Bennett Foundation, which awards college scholarships to football players from local high schools.

He is known to be a steady, hardworking leader in efforts to increase understanding and build relationships in social and economic diversity. Mr. Green helped negotiate the partnership between Delta State University and Coahoma Community College to purchase the Cutrer Mansion, which has evolved into a continuing education center for history, culture, and the arts. In 2014, he worked with the City of Clarksdale officials, business owners, and community activists to honor the life and work of civil rights leader Aaron Henry with a historical marker on the Mississippi Freedom Trail. He has served on the board of Clarksdale-Coahoma County Library and supports the Delta Blues Museum.

The son of sharecroppers, Mr. Sylvester and Aree Green, Mr. Green grew up operating farm equipment in Coahoma County, Mississippi. A graduate of Coahoma Agriculture High School, he earned college degrees from Coahoma Community College and Delta State University. Mr. Green is the first African American to serve as President of Delta State University National Alumni Association.

He and his wife, Nelia, have two sons: Donald, Jr., a biomedical engineer living in Ann Arbor, Michigan; and Adam, a high school student, who participated in Youth Leadership Clarksdale and who is currently a freshman at Delta State University majoring in commercial design.

Mr. Green is Chairman of the Deacon Board and Chairman of the Building Fund at New Hope Missionary Baptist Church in Jonestown, Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an amazing Entrepreneur and Economic Developer that has been instrumental in magnifying strides of America's black history.

HONORING JUDGE PETER DILTZ

HON. REID J. RIBBLE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Judge Peter Diltz for his service on the Door County Circuit Court for Wisconsin. Mr. Diltz has been an integral member of the Door County community and I am proud to recognize his dedicated service to the people of Wisconsin.

Judge Diltz was born in Winnetka, Illinois and spent many of his childhood summers in Door County. After receiving his undergraduate degree from Arizona State University, Judge Diltz attended the University of Wisconsin Law School.

Judge Diltz returned to Door County to practice law and serve as the Door County Family Court Commissioner from 1976 to 1994, at which time he was first elected Circuit Court Judge. It is truly an honor to represent an extraordinary citizen who has dedicated his career to serving the people of Door County in Northeastern Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 8th District of Wisconsin, I congratulate Judge Diltz on his retirement and sincerely thank him for his service to Wisconsin.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 26, 2016, I was unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: "Yes" on roll call vote No. 164, and "Yes" on roll call vote No. 165.

TRIBUTE TO HANNAH M. CAROLUS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Hannah Carolus of Treynor, Iowa, for being awarded the Good Citizen Award by the Council Bluffs Chapter of the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution (NSDAR). Hannah is

a senior at Treynor High School in Treynor, Iowa.

Hannah exhibited all of the talents and skills needed to qualify for this award. They include dependability, service to others, leadership, and patriotism. Judges took into consideration several areas in grading her application including high school achievement, home and community activities, future plans, extra-curricular activities, and good citizenship. A second requirement was to write an essay on Our American Heritage and Our Responsibility for Preserving It. The essay was to focus on our American rights and freedoms and the rights she would select to celebrate.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Hannah for earning this award. She is a shining example of the future of our youth. I urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Hannah for her interest in preserving our rights and freedoms. I wish her nothing but continued success in all her future endeavors.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF TIFFANY MAY JOSLYN, A PASSIONATE CRUSADER FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM AND TRANSCENDENT LIGHTBEAM OF JOY

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it's with mixed emotion that I rise in remembrance of Tiffany May Joslyn, one of the most beloved, talented, and effective members of the House Judiciary Committee staff, whose life tragically was cut short on March 5, 2016, in a car accident that sadly also claimed the life of her brother, Derrick. She was just 33 years old.

Although the years of Tiffany's life were short, the life of Tiffany's years was full. In a journey of a little more than three decades, Tiffany May Joslyn, traveled from the little schoolgirl who was born in Brockton, Massachusetts, on November 9, 1982, to Deputy Chief Counsel of House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, where she played a central role in crafting pioneering legislation to reform the nation's broken criminal justice system.

Tiffany was a Phi Beta Kappa and summa cum laude graduate of Clark University. She graduated with honors from The George Washington University Law School and was admitted to the Massachusetts and Rhode Island Bars after serving clerkships with the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

Before bringing her exceptional talent and servant's heart to Capitol Hill, Tiffany was Research Counsel for the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers in Washington, D.C., where she was the lead researcher and principal investigator for several major studies of the criminal justice system. Her work for the NACDL was so outstanding that she earned the reputation as one of the most thoughtful and forward-thinking policy experts of her generation in the area of criminal justice reform, which brought her to my attention when I became Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations.

Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful that I was able to secure for the Judiciary Committee, and this House, the services of Tiffany Joslyn. In the short time she was with us, she left an indelible impression on the Members of the Committee, her staff colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and most importantly on the criminal justice reform legislation produced by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Tiffany was a brilliant writer and was highly respected for her expertise, energy, dedication, loyalty, kindness, and perhaps, most of all, her persuasiveness as an advocate.

Mr. Speaker, Tiffany had a passion to help the most vulnerable and those who were caught up in the criminal justice system unfairly, but also those who deserved restoration and rehabilitation.

Together we were on a journey to continue to find a way to reform the criminal justice system.

She made great progress. Two of the bills we worked on have already passed out of the Judiciary Committee, and I am praying that they come to the floor not only in her name, but in the names of all the vulnerable people that would benefit from her great work.

I hope Tiffany's family can take comfort during the difficult days ahead in the knowledge that Tiffany and Derrick were the light of so many lives. May God bless them.

Mr. Speaker, to quote Maximus Decimus Meridus: "What we do in life echoes in eternity."

In her too short sojourn on this earth, Tiffany May Joslyn did so much good that I can say with confidence, and in the certain knowledge, that the glory of Tiffany's work will echo in eternity.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of Tiffany Joslyn.

MISSION JR. HIGH SCHOOL TEAM TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOWL

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a team of students from Mission Jr. High School for earning the opportunity to compete in the National Science Bowl.

The National Science Bowl was created by the Department of Energy in 1991 to encourage students to expand their knowledge within the subjects of mathematics and science, and pursue careers in such fields. Since its inception, approximately 265,000 students have participated; helping the National Science Bowl grow into one of the largest science competitions in the nation.

The competition is comprised of Middle and High School teams of four students, one alternate, and a teacher advisor. The teams will compete with each other in the topics of biology, chemistry, life science, earth science, physics, energy, and math. The competition is a fast-paced question and answer session and will be held on April 28th, 2016 through May 2nd, 2016 in Washington, D.C.

The team from Mission Jr. High School includes: Briana Diaz, Lucas Dovalina, Rodrigo Moran, Paul McCoy, and Damian Gonzalez, along with their coaches and sponsors Carolina Barrero, Jesus Razo, and David Land. They recently won the Regional Science Bowl Championship and were one of only forty-seven teams across the nation that qualified for the National Science Bowl. This will be the third time in a row that a team from Mission Consolidated Independent School District will compete. However, they are the first team to represent Mission Jr. High School.

I applaud these bright students and look forward to seeing what they will accomplish in the future. As students begin to consider which career path to choose, it is important to provide increased support and learning opportunities so students are able to graduate and compete in a globally competitive workforce. I believe competitions such as the National Science Bowl bring awareness to students about a possible STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) career. I am proud to have this team of students from Mission Jr. High School represent the 28th District of Texas.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, April 28, 2016 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 9

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017.
SR–232A

MAY 10

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017.
SR–232A

11 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Personnel
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017.
SD–G50

2 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017.
SD–G50

3:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017.
SD–G50

5:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017.
SR–232A

MAY 11

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017.
SR–222

MAY 12

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017.
SR–222

MAY 13

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017.
SR–222

MAY 24

10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine understanding the role of sanctions under the Iran Deal.
SD–538

MAY 25

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine understanding the role of sanctions under the Iran Deal, focusing on Administration perspectives.
SD–538

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2465–S2501

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2856–2868, and S. Res. 442–446. **Page S2492**

Measures Reported:

S. 438, to provide for the repair, replacement, and maintenance of certain Indian irrigation projects, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–245)

S. 480, to amend and reauthorize the controlled substance monitoring program under section 399O of the Public Health Service Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 1455, to provide access to medication-assisted therapy, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 2256, to establish programs for health care provider training in Federal health care and medical facilities, to establish Federal co-prescribing guidelines, to establish a grant program with respect to naloxone, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S2492**

Measures Passed:

15th Anniversary of Plan Colombia: Senate agreed to S. Res. 368, supporting efforts by the Government of Colombia to pursue peace and the end of the country's enduring internal armed conflict and recognizing United States support for Colombia at the 15th anniversary of Plan Colombia. **Page S2499**

United States-Israel Economic Relationship: Senate agreed to S. Res. 383, recognizing the importance of the United States-Israel economic relationship and encouraging new areas of cooperation, after agreeing to the following amendments proposed thereto: **Page S2499**

McConnell (for Perdue) Amendment No. 3882, to foster investment and private sector market entry. **Pages S2499–S2500**

McConnell (for Perdue) Amendment No. 3883, to amend the preamble. **Page S2500**

Honoring the Life of Prince: Senate agreed to S. Res. 444, honoring the life and achievements of Prince. **Page S2500**

100th Anniversary of Coast Guard Aviation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 445, recognizing the 100th anniversary of Coast Guard aviation and the contribution of Coast Guard aviators to naval aviation and the safety and security of the United States. **Page S2500**

National 9–1–1 Education Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 446, designating April 2016 as ''National 9–1–1 Education Month''. **Page S2500**

Measures Considered:

Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S2466–81**

Pending:

Alexander/Feinstein Amendment No. 3801, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S2466**

Alexander Amendment No. 3804 (to Amendment No. 3801), to modify provisions relating to Nuclear Regulatory Commission fees. **Page S2466**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 50 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 64), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on Alexander/Feinstein Amendment No. 3801 (listed above). **Page S2470**

Senator McConnell entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on Alexander/Feinstein Amendment No. 3801. **Page S2470**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 11 a.m., on Thursday, April 28, 2016. **Page S2501**

Appointments:

United States Commission on International Religious Freedom: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, upon the recommendation of the

Democratic Leader, pursuant to Public Law 105–292, as amended by Public Law 106–55, Public Law 107–228, and Public Law 112–75, appointed the following individual to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom: Sandra Jolley of Nevada, vice Katrina Lantos Swett of New Hampshire. **Page S2499**

Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the cloture motion with respect to the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 2577, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, be withdrawn. **Page S2501**

Messages from the House: **Page S2490**

Measures Referred: **Pages S2490–91**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S2491**

Executive Communications: **Page S2491**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S2491–92**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S2492**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2492–94**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2494–98**

Additional Statements: **Page S2490**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S2498–99**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S2499**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S2499**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—64) **Page S2470**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:39 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, April 28, 2016. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2501.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Defense, after receiving testimony from Ash Carter, Secretary, and General Joseph Dunford Jr., USMC, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, both of the Department of Defense.

THE BUDGET PROCESS

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine fixing the budget process, focusing on better budgets and better results, after receiving testimony from James C. Capretta, Ethics and Public Policy Center, and Stan Collender, Qorvis MSLGROUP, both of Washington, D.C.; and Barry Anderson, Bethesda, Maryland.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2644, to reauthorize the Federal Communications Commission for fiscal years 2017 and 2018, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 421, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for greater transparency and efficiency in the procedures followed by the Federal Communications Commission, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2607, to ensure appropriate spectrum planning and interagency coordination to support the Internet of Things, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2508, to reduce sports-related concussions in youth;

S. 2829, to amend and enhance certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2325, to require the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to establish a constituent-driven program to provide a digital information platform capable of efficiently integrating coastal data with decision-support tools, training, and best practices and to support collection of priority coastal geospatial data to inform and improve local, State, regional, and Federal capacities to manage the coastal region, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2817, to improve understanding and forecasting of space weather events, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

The nomination of Andrew J. Read, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission; and

Routine lists in the Coast Guard.

U.S.-CHINA RELATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States-China relations, focusing on strategic challenges and opportunities,

after receiving testimony from Antony J. Blinken, Deputy Secretary of State.

GOVERNMENT REFORM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine government reform, focusing on ending duplication and holding Washington accountable, after receiving testimony from former Senator Tom Coburn; and Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1928, to support the education of Indian children, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2205, to establish a grant program to assist tribal governments in establishing tribal healing to wellness courts;

S. 2304, to provide for tribal demonstration projects for the integration of early childhood development, education, including Native language and culture, and related services, for evaluation of those demonstration projects, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2421, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska, and to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska;

S. 2468, to require the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a 5-year demonstration program to provide grants to eligible Indian tribes for the construction of tribal schools, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2564, to modernize prior legislation relating to Dine College;

S. 2643, to improve the implementation of the settlement agreement reached between the Pueblo de Cochiti of New Mexico and the Corps of Engineers, with an amendment; and

S. 2717, to improve the safety and address the deferred maintenance needs of Indian dams to prevent flooding on Indian reservations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Government Accountability Office report on ''Telecommunications: Additional Coordination and Performance Measurement Needed for High-Speed Internet Access Programs on Tribal Lands.'', after receiving testimony from Brandon McBride, Rural Utilities Service Administrator, Department of Agriculture; Gigi B. Sohn, Counselor to the Chairman, Office of the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; Mark Goldstein, Director, Physical Infrastructure, Government Accountability Office; Julie Kitka, Alaska Federation of Natives, Anchorage; and Godfrey Enjady, National Tribal Telecommunications Association, Mescalero, New Mexico.

COUNTERFEITS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine counterfeits and their impact on consumer health and safety, after receiving testimony from Bruce Foucart, Director, National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center, Homeland Security Investigations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security; Conrad W. Wong, Attorney-Advisor, Office of Policy and International Affairs, Patent and Trademark Office; David Hirschmann, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D.C.; Shelley Duggan, The Procter and Gamble Company, Cincinnati, Ohio; and Gregory Maguire, Revision Military, Essex Junction, Vermont.

WOTUS RULE AND REFORMING THE RFA

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the waters of the United States rule and the case for reforming the Regulatory Flexibility Act, including S. 1536, to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, S. 2847, to require greater transparency for Federal regulatory decisions that impact small businesses, S. 1817, to improve the effectiveness of major rules in accomplishing their regulatory objectives by promoting retrospective review, and S. 708, to establish an independent advisory committee to review certain regulations, after receiving testimony from Darryl L. DePriest, Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Small Business Administration; Elizabeth Milito, National Federation of Independent Business Small Business Legal Center, and Rosario Palmieri, National Association of Manufacturers, both of Washington, D.C.; and Frank Knapp, Jr., South Carolina Small Business Chamber of Commerce, Columbia.

VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Valeant Pharmaceuticals' business model, focusing on the repercussions for patients and the health care system, after receiving testimony from Frederick Askari, University of Michigan Wilson Disease Center of Excellence, Ann Arbor; Richard I. Fogel, St. Vincent, Indianapolis, Indiana; William A. Ackman, Pershing Square Capital Management, L.P., Wilmington, Delaware; J.

Michael Pearson, and Howard B. Schiller, both of Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc., Washington, D.C.; and Berna Heyman, Williamsburg, Virginia.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 15 public bills, H.R. 5073–5087; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 707–708 were introduced. **Page H2065**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2067–68**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 706, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4901) to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 88) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term ''Fiduciary''; and providing for proceedings during the period May 2, 2016, through May 9, 2016 (H. Rept. 114–533). **Page H2065**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Jenkins (WV) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1999**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:51 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H2005**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Dr. Wade Stevenson, Gideon Missionary Baptist Church, Waukegan, Illinois. **Page H2005**

Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act: The House passed H.R. 4498, to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law, by a yea-and-nay vote of 325 yeas to 89 nays, Roll No. 171. **Pages H2008–14, H2037–46**

Rejected:

Maxine Waters (CA) amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 114–530) that sought to limit the types of fees ''demo day'' sponsors can collect, limit attendance at ''demo days'' to only individuals with financial sophistication, and require an issuer to be a real business (by a yea-and-nay vote of 139 yeas to 272 nays, Roll No. 170). **Pages H2044–45**

H. Res. 701, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4498) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 240 ayes to 177 noes, Roll No. 169, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 238 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 168. **Pages H2036–37**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2016: H.R. 4923, amended, to establish a process for the submission and consideration of petitions for temporary duty suspensions and reductions, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 415 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 166; **Pages H2014–19, H2035**

No Fly for Foreign Fighters Act: H.R. 4240, amended, to require an independent review of the operation and administration of the Terrorist Screening Database (TSDB) maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and subsets of the TSDB; **Pages H2019–22**

Email Privacy Act: H.R. 699, amended, to amend title 18, United States Code, to update the privacy protections for electronic communications information that is stored by third-party service providers in order to protect consumer privacy interests while meeting law enforcement needs, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 419 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 167; and **Pages H2022–28, H2035–36**

Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016: S. 1890, to amend chapter 90 of title 18, United States Code, to provide Federal jurisdiction for the theft of trade secrets, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 410 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 172. **Pages H2028–30, H2046–47**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2035, H2035–36, H2036–37, H2037, H2045, H2046, H2046–47. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FOCUS ON THE FARM ECONOMY: FACTORS IMPACTING COST OF PRODUCTION

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Biotechnology, Horticulture, and Research held a hearing entitled ''Focus on the Farm Economy: Factors Impacting Cost of Production''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 4909, the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017''.

THE PERSUADER RULE: THE ADMINISTRATION'S LATEST ATTACK ON EMPLOYER FREE SPEECH AND WORKER FREE CHOICE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing entitled ''The Persuader Rule: The Administration's Latest Attack on Employer Free Speech and Worker Free Choice''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee continued a markup on H.R. 4978, the ''Nurturing and Supporting Healthy Babies Act''; H.R. 4641, to provide for the establishment of an inter-agency task force to review, modify, and update best practices for pain management and prescribing pain medication, and for other purposes; H.R. 3680, the ''Co-Prescribing to Reduce Overdoses Act of 2015''; H.R. 3691, the ''Improving Treatment for Pregnant and Postpartum Women Act''; H.R. 1818, the ''Veteran Emergency Medical Technician Support Act of 2015''; H.R. 4981, the ''Opioid Use Disorder Treatment Expansion and Modernization Act''; H.R. 3250, the ''DXM Abuse Prevention Act of 2015''; H.R. 4969, the ''John Thomas Decker Act of 2016''; H.R. 4586, the ''Lali's Law''; H.R. 4599, the ''Reducing Unused Medications Act of 2016''; H.R. 4976, the ''Opioid Review Modernization Act of 2016''; H.R. 4982, the ''Examining Opioid Treatment Infrastructure Act of 2016''; H.R. 4889, the ''Kelsey Smith Act of 2016''; H.R. 4167, the ''Kari's Law Act of 2015''; H.R. 4111, the ''Rural Health Care Connectivity Act of 2015''; H.R. 4190, the ''Spectrum Challenge Prize Act of 2015''; H.R. 3998, the ''Securing Access to Networks in Disasters Act''; H.R. 2031, the ''Anti-Swatting Act of 2015''; H.R. 2589, to amend the Communications Act of 1943 to require the Federal Communications Commission to publish on its Internet website changes to the rules of the Commission not later than 24 hours after adoption; H.R. 2592, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to publish on the website of the Commission documents to be voted on by the Commission; H.R. 2593, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require identification and description on the website of the Federal Communications Commission of items to be decided on authority delegated by the Commission; and H.R. 5050, the ''Pipeline Safety Act of 2016''. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 5050, H.R. 4641, H.R. 4978, H.R. 1818, H.R. 4981, H.R. 4969, H.R. 4599, and H.R. 4982. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 4976 and H.R. 3250.

HOW CAN THE U.S. MAKE DEVELOPMENT BANKS MORE ACCOUNTABLE?

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade held a hearing entitled ''How Can the U.S. Make Development Banks More Accountable?''. Testimony was heard from Nathan Sheets, Under Secretary for International Affairs, Department of the Treasury.

ADVANCING U.S. INTERESTS: EXAMINING THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2017 BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa; and Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, held a joint hearing entitled ''Advancing U.S. Interests: Examining the President's FY 2017 Budget Proposal for Afghanistan and Pakistan''. Testimony was heard from Richard Olson, Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, Department of State; and Donald L. Sampler, Jr., Assistant to the Administrator, Office of Afghanistan and Pakistan Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development.

EXAMINING FY 2017 FUNDING PRIORITIES IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a hearing entitled ''Examining FY 2017 Funding Priorities in the Western Hemisphere''. Testimony was heard from Francisco Palmieri, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, Department of State; Luis Arreaga, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, Department of State; and Elizabeth Hogan, Acting Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development.

SOUTH SUDAN'S PROSPECTS FOR PEACE AND SECURITY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled ''South Sudan's Prospects for Peace and Security''. Testimony was heard from Donald Booth, Special Envoy to Sudan and South Sudan, Department of State; Bob Leavitt, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian

Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development; and public witnesses.

ISIS IN THE PACIFIC: ASSESSING TERRORISM IN SOUTHEAST ASIA AND THE THREAT TO THE HOMELAND

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a hearing entitled ''ISIS in the Pacific: Assessing Terrorism in Southeast Asia and the Threat to the Homeland''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5046, the ''Comprehensive Opioid Abuse Reduction Act of 2016''; H.R. 5052, the ''Opioid Program Evaluation Act''; H.R. 2137, the ''Federal Law Enforcement Self-Defense and Protection Act of 2015''; H.R. 5048, to require a study by the Comptroller General of the United States on Good Samaritan laws that pertain to treatment of opioid overdoses, and for other purposes; and H.R. 3394, the ''Clarifying Amendment to Provide Terrorism Victims Equity (CAPTIVE) Act''. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 5046, H.R. 5052, H.R. 2137, and H.R. 5048. H.R. 3394 was ordered reported, as amended.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT'S REGULATORY OVERREACH INTO METHANE EMISSIONS REGULATION

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''Bureau of Land Management's Regulatory Overreach into Methane Emissions Regulation''. Testimony was heard from Shawn Bolton, Commissioner, Rio Blanco County, Colorado; Lynn D. Helms, Director, North Dakota Department of Mineral Resources; Gwen Lachelt, Commissioner, La Plata County, Colorado; Amanda Leiter, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior; and Mark Watson, Oil and Gas Supervisor, Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission.

REALIZING THE POTENTIAL OF HYDROPOWER AS A CLEAN, RENEWABLE AND DOMESTIC ENERGY RESOURCE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans held a hearing entitled ''Realizing the Potential of Hydropower as a Clean, Renewable and Domestic Energy Resource''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND MISCONDUCT AT TSA: PART I

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Examining Management Practices and Misconduct at TSA: Part I''. Testimony was heard from the following Transportation Security Administration officials: Jay Brainard, Federal Security Director—Kansas, Office of Security Operations; Mark Livingston, Program Manager, Office of the Chief Risk Officer; and Andrew Rhoades, Assistant Federal Security Director, Office of Security Operations.

THE BEST AND WORST PLACES TO WORK IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled ''The Best and Worst Places to Work in the Federal Government''. Testimony was heard from Lauren Leo, Chief Human Capital Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Angela Bailey, Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Homeland Security; Sydney Rose, Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Labor; Towanda Brooks, Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development; and a public witness.

SOAR REAUTHORIZATION ACT; HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO THE DEFINITION OF THE TERM ''FIDUCIARY''

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 4901, the ''SOAR Reauthorization Act''; and H.J. Res. 88, disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term ''Fiduciary''. The committee granted, by record vote of 7–4, a structured rule for H.R. 4901. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Additionally, the rule grants a closed rule for H.J. Res. 88. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. The rule provides

one motion to recommit. In section 3, the rule provides that on any legislative day during the period from May 2, 2016, through May 9, 2016: the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment. In section 4, the rule provides that the Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3. Finally, in section 5 the rule provides that the Committee on Armed Services may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Wednesday, May 4, 2016, file a report to accompany H.R. 4909. Testimony was heard from Chairman Chaffetz and Representatives Norton, Roe of Tennessee, and Scott of Virginia.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5049, the ''NSF Major Research Facility Reform Act of 2016''. H.R. 5049 was ordered reported, as amended.

S IS FOR SAVINGS: PRO-GROWTH BENEFITS OF EMPLOYEE-OWNED S CORPORATIONS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''S is for Savings: Pro-Growth Benefits of Employee-Owned S Corporations''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine counter-ISIL (Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant) operations and Middle East strategy, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining, to hold hearings to examine the impacts of invasive species on the productivity, value, and management of land and water resources; to conduct oversight on the National Invasive Species Council's new framework for early detection and rapid response; to examine improved cooperative tools for control and management, including S. 2240, to improve the control and management of invasive species that threaten and harm Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: business meeting to consider S. 2848, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, S. 2808, to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, S. 2824, to designate the Federal building housing the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives Headquarters located at 99 New York Avenue N.E., Washington, D.C., as the ''Ariel Rios Federal Building'', Army Corps of Engineers Study Resolutions, and General Services Administration resolutions, 9 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine mental health in America, 2 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of State, H.R. 2494, to support global anti-poaching efforts, strengthen the capacity of partner countries to counter wildlife trafficking, designate major wildlife trafficking countries, S. 2845, to extend the termination of sanctions with respect to Venezuela under the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014, S. Res. 442, condemning the terrorist attacks in Brussels and honoring the memory of the United States citizens murdered in those attacks, and offering thoughts and prayers for all the victims, condolences to their families, resolve to support the Belgian people, and the pledge to defend democracy and stand in solidarity with the country of Belgium and all our allies in the face of continuing terrorist attacks on freedom and liberty, S. Res. 340, expressing the sense of Congress that the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS or Da'esh) is committing genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes, and calling upon the President to work with foreign governments and the United Nations to provide physical protection for ISIS' targets, to support the creation of an international criminal tribunal with jurisdiction to punish these crimes, and to use every reasonable means, including sanctions, to destroy ISIS and disrupt its support networks, S. Res. 418, recognizing Hafsat Abiola, Khanim Latif, Yoani Sanchez, and Akanksha Hazari for their selflessness and dedication to their respective causes, S. Res. 394, recognizing the 195th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States, S. Res. 436, supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day, S. Res. 381, honoring the memory and legacy of Michael James Riddering and condemning the terrorist attacks in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso on January 15, 2016, and the nominations of Swati A. Dandekar, of Iowa, to be United States Director of the Asian Development Bank, with the rank of Ambassador, R. David Harden, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and Christine Ann Elder, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Liberia, Kelly Keiderling-Franz, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, Elizabeth Holzhall Richard, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Lebanese Republic, Stephen Michael Schwartz, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Somalia, Adam H. Sterling, of Virginia, to

be Ambassador to the Slovak Republic, and routine lists in the Foreign Service, all of the Department of State, 10 a.m., S–116, Capitol.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 247, to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality, S. 2348, 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, S. 2577, to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA and other forensic evidence samples to improve and expand the forensic science testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of forensic evidence, to provide post-conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to support accreditation efforts of forensic science laboratories and medical examiner offices, to address training and equipment needs, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, S. 2840, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds for active shooter training, and the nomination of Patrick A. Burke, to be United States Marshal for the District of Columbia, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit, hearing entitled ''To Review the Impact of Capital Margin Requirements on End-Users'', 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Nutrition, hearing entitled ''Focus on the Farm Economy: Food Prices and the Consumer'', 2 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 4843, the ''Improving Safe Care for the Prevention of Infant Abuse and Neglect Act'', 11 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 4978, the ''Nurturing and Supporting Healthy Babies Act''; H.R. 4641, to provide for the establishment of an inter-agency task force to review, modify, and update best practices for pain management and prescribing pain medication, and for other purposes, as amended by the Subcommittee on Health; H.R. 3680, the ''Co-Prescribing to Reduce Overdoses Act of 2015''; H.R. 3691, the ''Improving Treatment for Pregnant and Postpartum Women Act''; H.R. 1818, the ''Veteran Emergency Medical Technician Support Act of 2015''; H.R. 4981, the ''Opioid Use Disorder Treatment Expansion and Modernization Act''; H.R. 3250, the ''DXM Abuse Prevention Act of 2015''; H.R. 4969, the ''John Thomas Decker Act of 2016''; H.R. 4586, the ''Lali's Law''; H.R. 4599, the ''Reducing Unused Medications Act of 2016''; H.R. 4976, the ''Opioid Review Modernization Act of 2016''; H.R. 4982, the ''Examining Opioid Treatment Infrastructure Act of 2016''; H.R. 4889, the ''Kelsey Smith Act of 2016''; H.R. 4167, the ''Kari's Law Act of 2015''; H.R. 4111, the ''Rural Health Care Connectivity Act of 2015''; H.R. 4190, the ''Spectrum Challenge Prize Act of 2015''; H.R. 3998, the ''Securing Access to Networks in Disasters Act''; H.R. 2031, the ''Anti-Swatting Act of 2015''; H.R. 2589, to amend the Communications Act of 1943 to require the Federal Communications Commission to publish on its Internet website changes to the rules of the Commission not later than 24 hours after adoption; H.R. 2592, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to publish on the website of the Commission documents to be voted on by the Commission; H.R. 2593, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require identification and description on the website of the Federal Communications Commission of items to be decided on authority delegated by the Commission; and H.R. 5050, the ''Pipeline Safety Act of 2016'' (continued), 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''America as a Pacific Power: Challenges and Opportunities in Asia'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled ''U.S. Policy Toward Lebanon'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, hearing entitled ''Transferring Guantanamo Bay Detainees to the Homeland: Implications for States and Local Communities'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1887, to amend certain appropriation Acts to repeal the requirement directing the Administrator of General Services to sell Federal property and assets that support the operations of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center in Plum Island, New York, and for other purposes; H.R. 4743, the ''National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium Act of 2016''; and H.R. 5056, the ''Airport Perimeter and Access Control Security Act of 2016'', 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, hearing on H.R. 5063, the ''Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2016'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the False Claims Act'', 4 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Federal Lands, hearing on a discussion draft of the ''Locally-elected Officials Cooperating with Agencies in Land Management Act'', 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''The Consequences of Federal Land Management along the U.S. Border to Rural Communities and National Security'', 2:30 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Criminal Aliens Released by the Department of Homeland Security'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Examining EPA's Predetermined Efforts to Block the Pebble Mine, Part II'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3209, the ''Recovering Missing Children Act''; H.R. 5053, the ''Preventing IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act''; and H.R. 3832, the ''Stolen Identify Refund Fraud Prevention Act of 2015'', 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, April 28

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 2028, Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, April 28

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.J. Res. 88—Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term ''Fiduciary'' (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E611
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E599
Castro, Joaquin, Tex., E603
Chaffetz, Jason, Utah, E597
Clarke, Yvette D., N.Y., E610
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E608
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E606
Comstock, Barbara, Va., E601, E602, E604, E604, E606, E607, E609
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E611
Cook, Paul, Calif., E602, E609
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E613
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E597
Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E610
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E605
Dold, Robert J., Ill., E603
Donovan, Daniel M., Jr, N.Y., E598
Doyle, Michael F., Pa., E601, E607
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E603, E610
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E600
Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E598
Graves, Garret, La., E606
Graves, Sam, Mo., E608
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E604
Hanna, Richard L., N.Y., E606, E611
Hurt, Robert, Va., E601
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E613
Labrador, Raú R., Idaho, E607
Long, Billy, Mo., E600, E602, E602, E604, E607
Loudermilk, Barry, Ga., E604
Moulton, Seth, Mass., E599
Murphy, Patrick, Fla., E599
Olson, Pete, Tex., E611
Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J., E597
Poe, Ted, Tex., E611
Ribble, Reid J. E612
Rogers, Harold, Ky., E609
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E598
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E597, E599
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E606
Smith, Lamar, Tex., E606
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E610
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E605, E612
Walberg, Tim, Mich., E609
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E603, E608
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E598
Yarmuth, John A., Ky., E599
Young, David, Iowa, E600, E600, E602, E603, E604, E605, E606, E607, E608, E612
Young, Todd C., Ind., E612

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.