United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2016 No. 135

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 8, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES J. FLEISCHMANN 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.

PAUSE AND REFLECT

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we approach the somber anniversary of the attacks of September 11, 2001, to honor the memory of the innocent people who perished on that terrible day and extend our continued prayers and sympathy to their loved ones.

For 15 years, I have stood at firehouses and schools, churches and veterans halls, and heard the stories of bravery and heroism from that morning that forever changed America. New Jersey lost more than 700 residents in the attacks, 81 of them from communities I represent here in Congress.

Each personal story is remarkable in its own way, offering a different memory or perspective on the events of September 11. In hearing stories from that day, Americans relive that morning, recalling where they were when they heard the news of the planes that struck the World Trade Center, the sickening realization that our Nation was under attack, and the tremendous heroism and self-sacrifice of so many in New York, at the Pentagon, and on a plane over Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

Many of these stories are not new but need to be retold as a younger generation comes of age, that their neighbors—innocent people in their communities—were targeted in an act of war upon this Nation, and from such heinous acts came brave first responders, courageously initiating rescues, knowing their lives were in great danger, friends and coworkers helping each other to safety, and many young Americans who then answered a call to service to protect and defend the United States.

It is our duty to instill in the generations that follow respect and honor for the lives lost that terrible day and the lives lost in defense of our Nation in the years that have followed. It is our duty here in Congress to protect this Nation, to provide for the common defense, and vividly to recall the pain of a wounded Nation so that we be aware always of what it takes to keep this Nation safe and free.

The lives lost in the ensuing battles abroad have continued to try the foundation of our will. We have proven steadfast in the commitment to our values. Our freedom and liberty have been protected by brave men and women who selflessly answered the call of service by volunteering for military service.

No matter the challenges we face, we must remember that our Nation is truly blessed. I ask all Americans today to pause and reflect on the tragedy of September 11, 2001. Please pray for the victims and honor their memory. Please pay tribute to the men and women who serve and defend us today against the dangers we still face. May God bless them, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

CROWN POINT, INDIANA, GUN SHOW

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, ''Gun to the right, no gun to the left'' was the greeting I heard as I entered the Industrial Arts Building in Crown Point, Indiana. On this particular sunny Sunday afternoon in July, the enormous building was playing host to the Central Indiana Gun and Knife Show.

The building, which sits on the Lake County Fairgrounds, plays host to garden shows, home improvement and craft vendors; but on this date, the 90-year-old brick building was featuring products that were of an altogether different nature.

As they enter the gun show, visitors carrying weapons had to demonstrate to security that their guns were not loaded, while those not carrying could enter without screening. I paid my $5 entry and was asked if I resided in Indiana. Being an Illinois resident, I answered no and received a hand stamp depicting me as out of State.

At first glance, I saw kids hanging around vendors, munching on hot dogs. There were several hundred people in attendance by lunchtime, mostly White, middle-aged men, but a few women as well. Judging by the license plates in the parking lot, there were a healthy number of gun enthusiasts from my home State of Illinois in attendance.

Printed on recycled paper.

At most tables, you could hear the hagglers looking for a better deal or discussing options for their purchase. They would ask: Chrome-lined or stainless steel barrel? What about a free-float rail? The possibilities seemed endless, as people wandered among dozens of tables.

Sellers were offering everything from high-volume magazines and sophisticated scope systems to attachable bipods and customized stocks. Prices for assault weapons typically ranged from $600 to $2,500, including a bipod and two drum magazines, each capable of holding 100 rounds. One dealer explained that the wide variation in pricing depended on the bells and whistles and the markup.

Not every weapon was particularly pricey. One vendor, who seemed eager to reduce inventory, marked down one of his assault rifles to under $400. There were tables upon tables of handguns for sale, as well as a folding single-shot, .22-caliber rifle, small enough to fit in a backpack, for under $200. Still other vendors offered to help customize your purchase on the spot. You could choose from dozens of barrel lengths and styles to go with your choice in stocks and other components.

There was plenty of ammo to go with any weapon you might purchase. Depending on the caliber and ammunition type, prices started as low as $10 for a box of 50. Boxes of ammunition with a similar number of rounds for many assault rifles cost as little as $20. Another dealer offered high-capacity, 50-round magazines for a gun show special of one for $20 or three for $55.

There was a lot of gear aimed toward women as well, with pink, single-shot rifles, body armor tailored for women, and purses designed for concealed carry. Even local charities got on the scene, with an AR–15 being auctioned off to benefit the Marine Corps League. All you had to do to be included was buy a $1 raffle ticket and give your first name and phone number.

It was a surreal atmosphere within the midst of recent tragedies. It made me wonder if those in attendance were either oblivious or all too aware of those heartbreaking headlines. The gun show returns this month to Crown Point, but given the number of deadly weapons already on the streets of my hometown of Chicago, I think I will wait for the next home improvement show before making a return trip.

KILLING THE INNOCENTS IN SYRIA

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

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you a story. There was a little boy named Ali Daqneesh, age 10, and his little brother is Omran. That is the boy you see in the photo here that was shared across the Internet, worldwide, 2 weeks ago.

Ali was a really good big brother. He loved to play outside, and he was still at that age when kids really get to dream big and imagine their future. I can only imagine the life that Ali looked forward to. Maybe he wanted to be a police officer; maybe he wanted to be a teacher or a doctor. I really can't say for certain because, tragically, his life was cut short by an airstrike.

Ali's death is an all-too-common fate for many of Syria's men, women, and children. These are the people who have lost their chance at life from the brutality of Bashar al-Assad and Vladimir Putin.

Of the over 500,000 dead Syrians, more than 50,000 are Syrian children who have been killed since the evil dictator Bashar al-Assad turned against his own people in 2011. Yet, even as the world continues to be outraged over these atrocities and pictures of dazed and bloody Syrian children like Ali's brother Omran, Assad and Russia and their Iranian backers are still barrel-bombing and launching chemical weapons against civilian targets.

On a daily basis, we hear that Syrian and Russian fighter planes have launched attacks on medical facilities and hospitals across the country. When these facilities are bombed, it is the children who suffer. In fact, the regime's belief is don't target, necessarily, military assets because, when you target innocent civilians, you inflict more collective pain on the population of Syria; and in Assad's estimation, that brings the war closer to an end.

At the end of July, a maternity hospital in Idlib was bombed. A recent story in The New Yorker highlighted the horror that comes with these bombings. In Aleppo, newborns in incubators suffocated to death because a Syrian or Russian airstrike cut off power to a hospital. Who is doing this? And why?

Bashar al-Assad continued the legacy of brutality against his people from his father—his father, who had one goal, and that was to keep power. Power is a crazy motivator for some people. The people of Syria, in 2011, decided they wanted some freedom, as is humanity's right, and they stood up and protested peacefully against Assad.

What did Assad do? Did he respond by saying: Well, let's talk and maybe find a way to have an outlet for your interests or your concerns? No. Assad rolled the tanks. Assad said he would kill his opposition. And what ensued after that was the incubation of a group we know today as ISIS, the opening of a civil war in Syria that is now spreading all over the Middle East, a massive refugee crisis around the world.

I hear some people in political conversations today express admiration for Vladimir Putin. They express admiration for Vladimir Putin's strength, as if oppressing and killing people is something to be proud of. That doesn't show strength. That shows weakness.

Mr. Speaker, Vladimir Putin and Russia are tearing Europe apart. Vladimir Putin and Russia are delivering bombs on medical facilities and on children in Syria. They are no ally of ours. Sometimes the enemy of our enemy is still our enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I hear people sometimes say that dictatorships work in the Middle East. Sometimes they say that this introduction of freedom has somehow been terrible for people who just aren't ready for it. I agree. The introduction of freedom to a society that is not used to it can sometimes be very messy, and sometimes in the course of looking back over 20 years of history we see the success. That happened in our own founding. We went through the Civil War. We went through a bloody Revolution. We went through a time where we kept an entire race in chains. But, Mr. Speaker, when people say that dictatorships work, no, they don't.

This kid, I always wonder what is going through his mind. Probably not much because he was stunned at the bomb that landed on his house and killed his brother.

□ 1015

FUND THE ZIKA EMERGENCY

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we often hear from constituents who are frustrated by Congress' failure to act on many of the most pressing issues facing our country.

Seven weeks ago, as if we were determined to confirm this indictment, Congress adjourned for summer recess with a long list of critical unfinished business. We came nowhere near finishing our appropriations bills, leaving open the question of whether we can even keep the government open past September 30. We failed to pass the most rudimentary gun violence measures, leaving the tragedies of San Bernardino and Orlando unaddressed.

And then there was Zika, perhaps the most incredible failure of all. With an epidemic bearing down on us—an epidemic with disastrous human consequences, but with a prescribed course of action that could do much to prevent and mitigate the catastrophe—still, Congress refused to act.

Now we are back in session, facing daily headlines about the dangers posed by Zika. The number of Zika travel-related cases in the continental U.S. is increasing, the number of pregnant women infected is growing, and the number of babies being born—or worse, lost—with microcephaly or other Zika-related complications is rising. Increasing numbers of mosquito-borne cases have been reported in Puerto Rico and south Florida. I learned this week that five service members and retirees from Fort Bragg in North Carolina are being treated for Zika.

It has been more than 6 months since the President requested an emergency supplemental appropriation of $1.9 billion from Congress to fund Zika preparedness, response, and prevention, as

well as critical research. The request was carefully and comprehensively documented and justified.

In the meantime, our local, State, and Federal public health agencies and authorities have continued to shift funds and reorder priorities in an attempt to get a handle on this public health emergency. Indeed, our own universities and other research centers have been shifting money around for months, as I learned at a conference I helped organize in North Carolina on June 7.

Researchers testified there as to the great promise of the work they are doing, but also as to the great efforts they have been required to make, in the face of inadequate and uncertain funding, to ensure that the work continues. I left that conference impressed and encouraged by the work that was going on. But I also left chagrined and angered at the way Congress, under Republican leadership, with no serious attempt at bipartisan cooperation, is letting these dedicated researchers and the entire country down.

The House and Senate Republican conference report contains only $1.1 billion of the requested funds, but the larger problem is that it robs other critical public health priorities—notably, Ebola, but also disaster preparedness—in order to satisfy Republican budget ideologues.

Adding insult to injury, the Republican conference report also includes several misguided and dangerous policy riders. These poison pills would severely limit access to contraceptives in Puerto Rico, where thousands of cases of Zika have been recorded. It would take yet another shot at Planned Parenthood and would roll back certain clean water regulations, ostensibly to allow for the increased spraying of pesticides.

I recently met with Director Anthony S. Fauci of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, who explained the incredible lengths to which NIH and CDC have gone in order to protect the health of the American people. They have desperately cobbled together a budget, most recently taking money even from vital research into cancer, Alzheimer's, heart disease, and other diseases. Despite such extraordinary efforts, the CDC and NIH will run out of money after October 1.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we honor the President's request of $1.9 billion in a bill free of destructive offsets and ideological riders. It is crucial that Congress take action for the pregnant women in their first trimesters who are scared to leave their homes; for the children born with a range of disabilities, of which microcephaly is only the worst; for the service men and women stationed across the globe who are at particular risk; and for the 25 percent of Puerto Rico's population who will potentially contract this disease.

We can and we must as a country do better than this. Let's do the right thing for our constituents, our country, and for the rest of the world by finally funding this public health emergency. We have long since run out of excuses. We can wait no longer.

OBAMA ADMINISTRATION'S WAR ON POLICE

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, never has an American President been so willing to shoot first and ask questions later when a police officer uses deadly force in self-defense or to protect innocent lives. Never in American history has a President's legacy been a consistent disregard for the rule of law.

Time after time, after police shootings of African Americans, the Obama administration's knee-jerk, racially divisive strategy has been to paint a disturbingly false image of racial bias in police shootings that conflicts with a recent 2016 Harvard University study that found that police are 24 percent less likely to fire upon African Americans than Caucasian Americans.

For emphasis, let me repeat that. A 2016 Harvard University study by African American Professor Roland Fryer, Jr., found that police fire upon African Americans 24 percent less often than police fire upon Caucasian Americans.

On July 7, well before the facts of two police shootings of African Americans were known, President Obama, again, stoked racial prejudice flames by claiming that ''Black folks are more vulnerable to these kinds of incidents.'' President Obama even defended subsequent, sometimes violent, protests as rather benign ''expressions of outrage.''

Shortly after the Obama administration attacked the motives of America's law enforcement officers and, perhaps, helped inspire even more violence against police, a Dallas sniper gunned down five police officers and injured many others during a Black Lives Matter protest. The shooter justified his murders by stating he was upset by police shootings, referenced Black Lives Matter, and stated that he wanted to kill White people, especially White police officers.

Three days later, after these horrific murders of police officers, President Obama reiterated his politically motivated, racial division narrative by blaming the attacks, in part, on a racial prejudice problem that police must fix because ''that is what's going to ultimately help make the job of being a cop a lot safer.''

Showing great hutzpah at the Dallas memorial ceremony for the slain officers, Obama, again, publicly blamed police racial bias as a contributing cause of police assassinations.

Mr. Speaker, when tearful Americans seek solace and unification, the Obama administration dishes out racism and antipolice profiling that helps inspire even more violence against police.

The result of the Obama administration's politics of racial division and hatred?

So far this year, as of September 2, firearms-related deaths of American law enforcement officers are up 56 percent.

The Obama administration's relationship with police has deteriorated so badly that William Johnson, the executive director of the National Association of Police Organizations, accuses Barack Obama of engaging in a ''war on police,'' adding that the Obama administration's ''continued appeasements at the Federal level with the Department of Justice, their appeasement of violent criminals, their refusal to condemn movements like Black Lives Matter actively calling for the death of police officers, that type of thing, all the while blaming police for the problems in this country, has led directly to the climate that has made Dallas possible.''

Mr. Speaker, no one condones illegal shootings by police. Police who illegally use excessive force should be, and are, prosecuted criminally and civilly to the fullest extent of the law. But the Obama administration repeatedly pours gasoline on an open fire, rushing to antipolice judgment before the facts are known, and justice had, thereby helping to incite murders and assassinations of American police who dedicate their lives to our protection.

The solution, Mr. Speaker, is generating more respect for law and order and those who enforce it. That solution is absent in Obama administration pronouncements.

Mr. Speaker, I want the public to know that I stand with the rule of law. I stand with America's brave police officers who protect the rights and lives of all Americans. And I here and now publicly thank America's law enforcement officers for risking their lives to protect law-abiding Americans from crime and anarchy.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, when I traveled around northwest Oregon last month, from town hall meetings to the grocery store, I spoke with Oregonians about the challenges they are facing and what keeps them up at night. Time after time, the conversation turned to the cost of higher education.

It is likely we have all spoken with parents trying to make ends meet who can't save for their young children's education and recent graduates who are worried about finding jobs that will cover their looming student loan payments. But we also hear from too many people who are trying to balance their current student loan debt with child care, housing, and other expenses. Many are getting by, but 1 month of unexpected unemployment or illness

could set them back years. Unfortunately, for too many, the threat of default is already a reality.

Currently, more than 8 million student loan borrowers are in default on their educational debt, and the number is growing. These are hardworking Americans—mothers, fathers, veterans, nurses, teachers, and young people—who are trying to improve their lives, but have been pulled into financial turmoil.

The 8 million people in default—a group, roughly, twice the size of Oregon—are at risk of financial ruin. Their tax refunds and Social Security benefits may be withheld. Their wages can be garnished and they can face legal action. And with damaged credit, borrowing for a home, car, or business, or even renting an apartment can be an impossible task.

What can Congress do for those who are struggling to make their student loan payments?

The answer is SIMPLE.

Today I am pleased to introduce legislation with my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman RYAN COSTELLO. Our bill, the Streamlining Income-Driven Manageable Payments on Loans for Education, or SIMPLE Act, makes it easier for millions of at-risk student loan borrowers to access protections that are already available under the law.

Income-driven repayment plans allow borrowers to make loan payments that are based on how much they earn. So, in other words, what they can afford. As a result, they are much less likely than other borrowers to default on their debt. That is good for the borrower, their families, and local economies.

Unfortunately, too many at-risk borrowers don't know about these plans or they are unable to navigate the complicated application for enrolling, so they don't receive the benefit of lower payments. In fact, 70 percent of borrowers in default from the government's largest student loan program, the Direct Loan program, would have qualified for lower payments.

Even if borrowers enroll in income-driven repayment, they must complete a burdensome process to update information. In one study, more than half of the borrowers did not recertify their income on time. When this happens, a borrower's payments can spike and suddenly push the borrower toward delinquency and default.

In short, the government makes it unnecessarily difficult for people who are weighed down by student debt to get the help the law already affords them.

Our bipartisan SIMPLE Act streamlines the process and removes barriers that prevent borrowers from benefiting from income-driven repayment. The bill uses borrowers' existing income data to automatically provide at-risk borrowers on the verge of default with lower loan payments. The bill provides for automatic updates of borrowers' income information each year, so they continue to pay what they can afford.

As college costs continue to rise and more students leave school with increasing levels of debt, it is clear that this House needs to act to make higher education more affordable for everyone. The SIMPLE Act is part of that broader effort. It works by reaching at-risk borrowers, simplifying the process to get them into a plan with repayment based on income and helping them keep their payments affordable and avoid default.

I thank Mr. COSTELLO for his partnership on this bill and urge all of my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation.

□ 1030

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF DALLAS KNOX

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and legacy of an American patriot, a patriot who served his country with honor and distinction before passing away last month in a boating accident at only 35 years old.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Warrant Officer Dallas Knox of Treasure Island, Florida. Chief Knox faithfully served his country as a Black Hawk Medevac helicopter pilot in the U.S. Army and the Army Reserve. Chief Knox had multiple deployments, including tours in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Kosovo. Chief Knox also served as a Black Hawk instructor pilot.

Having attended his memorial service, his colleagues each spoke that Dallas was one of the most gifted pilots they ever served with, a man of bravery, valor, always thoughtful, and always giving to others.

The medals Knox earned for his service speak volumes about his dedication and his commitment to the country he so loved. Knox was awarded the Meritorious Service Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, the Iraq Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, and the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, among so many other awards.

Described by his family as selfless, compassionate, loving, and full of life, Chief Knox is survived by his mother, Carol, his father, Richard, sister, Kirsten, as well as loving nieces and nephews.

May God bless Chief Warrant Officer Dallas Knox, his family, and his friends; and may God bless the country Chief Knox so proudly fought for, the United States of America.

DISAPPOINTED BUT NOT DEFEATED

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, I stood in this very spot to express my disappointment that my Republican colleagues and leadership showed both cowardice and callousness by failing to call up a single commonsense gun violence prevention measure before leaving town for 53 days.

I rise today not just disappointed. Instead, I am ashamed; I am appalled. Republicans adjourned for a historic 7-week recess from D.C. without fulfilling their duty to the American people, and, once again, our most vulnerable communities paid the price.

I am disappointed, but I am not defeated. So I rise today to remind my colleagues of what 7 weeks of Republican inaction looks like.

In my district in Chicago, gun violence claimed the lives of 90 people and injured 375 more in August alone. This Labor Day weekend, Chicago passed 500 homicides for the year, the first time we have crossed this threshold in two decades.

Outside of my district, 7 weeks of congressional inaction meant that more than 4,100 families lost a loved one to gun violence. In 2016, gun violence has taken the lives of almost 10,000 and wounded more than 20,000; 10,000 people killed by guns in less than 9 months—10,000.

When will this number be high enough for us to take action? Who has to die for us to have the courage to pass commonsense gun legislation? Why does Democrats sitting in protest outrage Republicans, but 10,000 deaths merits no response?

We have heard the majority threaten to admonish Democrats for speaking the truth, but 10,000 lives lost to guns gets nothing—no votes, and 7 weeks of inaction.

In this D.C. bubble, it is easy to forget that 10,000 isn't just a number. They are 10,000 mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters. Behind each gun death is a family who once celebrated a life, but now mourns the loss of a loved one.

Behind each gun death, there is a fearful mother now too afraid to let her children play outside. Behind each gun death, another small-business owner debates closing up shop for good.

While it is no secret that gun violence affects all communities across our Nation, it is our most underserved neighborhoods that are the most devastated. Congressional inaction allows the most vulnerable in our Nation to continue to suffer.

So I urge my colleagues, let's use this time in September wisely. Let's work together and pass legislation that will reduce gun violence in our communities.

I am not just talking about a need to pass commonsense measures that keeps guns out of the hands of those seeking to do harm. I am talking about a comprehensive approach that addresses the root causes of this gun violence epidemic.

Too often we boil down this complex problem to talking points about comprehensive background checks, closing

loopholes, and improving mental health services when, in reality, it is also about economic opportunity, building trust between the community and law enforcement, as well as passing these commonsense gun violence prevention measures.

In April, I launched the Urban Progress, or UP, Initiative to address these root causes of gun violence. UP partners with local community leaders, activists, business leaders, and elected officials to promote economic opportunity, improve community policing, and build on commonsense gun violence prevention strategies.

With the input from the UP Initiative partners and many of my colleagues here in the House, I introduced the Urban Progress Act, a bill that would ensure that the Federal Government remains committed to reducing the gun violence ravaging our communities.

My bill would reinvest in our economically underserved communities, take steps to restore the vital trust between law enforcement officers and the community, and would keep guns out of the hands of those seeking to do harm.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk about these issues in my bill. Let's debate them. Let's vote on them. I urge my colleagues to listen to the American people.

Lastly, I am outraged that anyone would accuse the President of starting any type of racial issue. The President has spoken about gun violence prevention and preventing cops from getting killed and preventing innocent people from getting killed also, so I am outraged to hear these statements.

SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, since September 1, the first day of National Suicide Prevention Month, 944 Americans have died by suicide, including 160 veterans.

Since the passage of H.R. 2646, the mental health reform act, in the House of Representatives in July, 7,552 Americans have died from suicide, including 1,280 veterans.

I had the honor of meeting the parents of Sergeant Daniel Somers, who served bravely in Operation Iraqi Freedom. On June 13, 2013, Daniel took his own life after suffering from PTSD and traumatic brain injury. His family is heartbroken.

He left a letter for his family before he took his own life, and I would like to share his words. He wrote:

> I am sorry that it has come to this. The fact is, for as long as I can remember, my motivation for getting up every day has been so that you would not have to bury me. As things have continued to get worse, it has become clear that this alone is not a sufficient reason to carry on.
>
> The fact is I am not getting better, I am not going to get any better, and I will most certainly deteriorate further as time goes on. From a logical standpoint, it is better to simply end things quickly and let any repercussions from that play out in the short term than to drag things out into the long term.
>
> I really have been trying to hang on for more than a decade now. Each day has been a testament to the extent to which I cared, suffering unspeakable horror as quietly as possible so that you could feel as though I was still here for you. In truth, I was nothing more than a prop, filling space so that my absence would not be noted. In truth, I have already been absent for a long, long time.
>
> My body has become nothing but a cage, a source of pain and constant problems . . . It is nothing short of torture. My mind is a wasteland, filled with visions of incredible horror, unceasing depression, and crippling anxiety.
>
> Is it any wonder then that the latest figures show 22 veterans killing themselves each day? That is more veterans than children who were killed at Sandy Hook every single day. Where are the huge policy initiatives?

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a letter that did not have to be written. I can't even imagine the grief of the parents of Daniel, but I also know that they want to spare other parents the same kind of grief.

I continue to practice psychology at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center at Bethesda. I work with veterans who, like Daniel, suffer from depression and PTSD and traumatic brain injury. I have seen firsthand that, with treatment, these soldiers can and do get better.

When our brave men and women come home, they and their families deserve better care. Yet we do not have enough crisis psychiatric hospital beds. Half the counties in America have no psychiatrists or no psychologists. And for every 1,000 people with an addiction disorder, only 6—only 6—get evidence-based care, and families are blocked from helping by a massive bureaucracy.

So we can read more sad letters like Daniel's, or we can act. The House answered that call on July 6, 2016, when we passed, by a near-unanimous vote, H.R. 2646, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act. But it only works and it only gives help if it is signed into law.

I don't want any more moments of silence for Daniel or the thousands of other veterans or citizens who have died by suicide. We don't need more moments of silence. We need times of action. Those moments of silence are a slap in the face to the mothers and fathers who struggle to get help for their sons and daughters.

So I ask: How can the Senate even contemplate the talk of going home before this is passed with this death toll climbing, even when they have the solution in their hands?

Indecision and politics are overruling compassion and common sense. What about veterans like Daniel, for whom help never came?

On behalf of those silenced voices, I call upon the Senate to take action and pass H.R. 2646 before they go home at the end of September. We must have treatment before tragedy. We must provide mental health support. After all, 90 percent of suicide deaths have a co-occurring mental illness. Otherwise, what will we tell those family members who find the next suicide note, that when there was a chance to act, Congress went home?

These veterans will never go home. These thousands of other people who commit suicide, nonveterans, will never go home again, and the Senate should not go home again in September without passing H.R. 2646.

Remember, where there is help, there is hope.

NATIONAL SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to follow my good friend, Dr. MURPHY, on the floor. I appreciate his tireless efforts in terms of mental health and of suicide prevention. I was pleased this week to introduce with him legislation to recognize September as National Suicide Prevention Month.

We have this ritual of designating certain days, weeks, and months in honor of issues that can be momentous and sometimes arcane, but this one is existential.

We are looking at a time of great division not just in Congress but in American society. Suicide prevention ought to be a great unifier. We lose five lives every hour to a cause that is usually treatable and often preventable. The nature of the suicide epidemic, which has been increasing every year for the last decade, has the power to unite and bring people together to make a difference.

I applaud him for his work on the mental health legislation. I hope that we are all encouraged and emboldened, particularly as relates to our veterans, and his work there is commendable.

We are losing a veteran almost every hour to suicide. It is also the second leading cause of death among young people ages 10 to 34, yet people who commit suicide almost always show symptoms that could be diagnosed and treated.

In addition to the tragic disruption on individuals and families, it is estimated that suicide results in $44 billion in combined economic and work costs. It is a national crisis and a tragedy that has touched almost every family I know.

The area of suicide prevention is one of shared passions that can contribute to solutions. For mental health professionals, it is rich with possibilities. If you are concerned about gun violence, this is an area of opportunity. Those who attempt suicide with a firearm are successful about 85 percent of the time.

Drug and alcohol abuse is a factor in many cases. Due to the underlying substance abuse or issues, individual actions can be clouded by the influence of drug or alcohol when suicide is attempted.

There is a role for each and every one of us to play as advocates, as individuals, for treatment and suicide prevention counseling, recovery, and to support the grief of the family members left behind.

I am excited about the network of organizations across the country, often with major volunteer input, who are making a difference. I visited one recently in my community, Lines for Life, that has volunteers manning 24-hour phone lines to help people in a time of crisis.

□ 1045

It is overseen by licensed clinicians. This one volunteer-driven organization handles nearly 55,000 calls per year, offering immediate assistance to people who want to overcome substance abuse, prevent suicide, and find treatment for happier, more productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that we will, in fact, designate September as Suicide Prevention Month, but that every month will be Suicide Prevention Month and that we will all rededicate ourselves to combating this epidemic that touches lives in every one of our communities.

THE SIMPLE ACT

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Streamlining Income-Driven, Manageable Payments on Loans for Education Act or, more simply, the SIMPLE Act.

I first want to thank Congresswoman SUZANNE BONAMICI for her leadership and hard work on this bill, which I am proud to introduce with her today.

Education is an area where we should be focused on bipartisan solutions because every Pennsylvanian—indeed, every American—deserves the opportunity to succeed, and that path to success starts with an education.

Many of my constituents have expressed concerns about the cost of a college education, including making payments on their student loans after they graduate. The challenge of how to responsibly manage student debt makes this bill so important.

The SIMPLE Act would assist millions of Americans who carry student loan debt. For many young people, student loan debt is the first type of debt they incur, but it can leave them unable to invest in their future, despite being employed and working hard.

Consider that borrowers who miss payments may face lifelong ramifications that make it more expensive and, in some cases, prohibitive to rent an apartment or purchase a home or a car.

Our bill would assist borrowers on the verge of default by notifying them of more affordable repayment plans. ''The SIMPLE Act establishes processes to automatically enroll severely delinquent borrowers in income-driven repayment plans with low monthly payments. The legislation also automates the annual process for updating income information while enrolled in these plans, ensuring that borrowers continue to make affordable payments.''

''This measure uses the information borrowers already have on file at the Internal Revenue Service to eliminate the obstacles to enrolling in an affordable repayment plan and lets borrowers benefit from lower monthly payments.'' But even those enrolled in affordable repayment plans face the paperwork hassle of a complicated process of having to annually recertify their income to keep their low payment. Failure to promptly recertify can, as I mentioned, result in substantial economic detriment. That is, again, why our legislation will responsibly relieve some of that burden by automatically updating a borrower's income.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It will assist borrowers in getting back on track and, in turn, reduce the negative impact of a missed loan payment.

RECOGNIZING 95 YEARS OF EXEMPLARY SERVICE OF THE LIMERICK FIRE COMPANY

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 95 years of exemplary service to the 14,000 residents of Limerick Township, Montgomery County, by the Limerick Township Fire Company.

Organized in 1921 and chartered in 1927, its now 250 members and 35 active firefighters are doing a tremendous job in keeping Limerick Township safe, dedicating thousands of hours every year.

I want to thank the company president, Tom Walters, and all the members of the Limerick Township Fire Department for the great work that they do. I wish them the very best for the next 95 years of service to the Limerick Township Fire Company and beyond.

JULY'S VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, the minority has for many months now begged and pleaded to have a bill come to this floor for a vote on gun violence prevention. We have even had a sit-in. But all that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to do is have moments of silence and then be silent.

The only moments of silence are for those names that are in the headlines. That is not good enough. All of the deaths matter, and all of the deaths from mass shootings in the month of July deserve to be recognized by all of us.

So as I have done each month since the beginning of this year, I will now read the names of all those who were killed in mass shootings in the month of July:

Alex Freeman, 28, and Marcus Cal, also 28, were killed on July 4 in Chattanooga.

Armando Cardona, 45, and Naome Innis, 35, were killed on July 4 in Phoenix.

Charles Jackson, 28, Jamal Dataunte Dixon-Lackey, 26, and Daquarius Tucker, 19, were killed at a Fourth of July block party in Houston, Texas. Daquarius' brother was also shot and killed this summer. Police said both brothers were innocent bystanders.

Demetrius Grant, 39, was killed at a party on July 5 in LA.

Jeffrey Adams, 52, was killed by his neighbor on July 5 in Hiram, Georgia.

Jennifer Rooney, 44, was killed by a mass shooter while driving on July 7 in Bristol, Tennessee.

Five Dallas police officers—Brent Thompson, Patrick Zamarripa, Michael Krol, Michael Smith, and Lorne Aherns—were killed in the line of duty on July 7 in Dallas, Texas.

Domingo Rodriguez Rhines, 40, was killed in Shreveport, Louisiana.

Joseph Zangaro, 61, and Ron Kienzle, 60, both court bailiffs, were killed by an escaping suspect on July 11 in St. Joseph, Michigan.

Jacara Sproaps, 38, and Maurice Partlow, 40, were killed by Jacara's exboyfriend on July 13 in St. Louis, Missouri. Jacara was an elementary school principal beloved by the community.

Eric Gaiter, 22, was killed July 14 in Akron, Ohio, while at a vigil for another gun violence victim.

Three unidentified people were killed at a home in Crosby, Texas.

Joseph Lamar, 38, Janell Renee Knight, 43, and Zachary David Thompson, 36, were killed by their friend on July 15 in Woodland, Washington.

Miguel Bravo, 21, was killed when gunmen open-fired on the house party next door on July 16 in Bakersfield, California.

Three police officers, Montrell Jackson, 32, Matthew Gerald, 41, and Brad Garafola, 45, were killed in the line of duty on July 17 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Edward James Long, 49, was killed on July 17 in Houston, Texas, while standing outside a Walgreens.

Bobbie Odneal, III, 23, and Rickey McGowan, 25, were killed on July 23 at a nightclub in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Erica Rodriguez, 21, her 3-year-old son, and Paula Nino, 20, were killed by Erica's boyfriend on July 23 in Bastrop, Texas.

Kalif Goens, 22, was killed by his brother on July 24 in a bar in Hamilton, Ohio.

Sean Archilles, 14, and Stef'An Strawder, 18, were killed outside an under-18 club on July 25 in Fort Myers, Florida.

Denzel Childs, 25, and Kayana Armond, 34, were killed on July 28 at a

block party in Chicago, Illinois. Jessica Williams, 16, witnessed the shooting and suffered an asthma attack that killed her.

Davon Harper, 23, was killed on July 28 in Baltimore, Maryland.

Anna Bui, Jake Long, and Jordan Ebner, all 19, were killed on July 30 in Washington when Anna's ex-boyfriend showed up at the house party with an AR–15.

Carole Comer, 71; her son, John Comer, 50; and her daughter, Rebecca Kelleher, 45, were killed by their husband and father on July 30 in Bridgeton, Missouri.

Takeeya Fulton, 39, and her children, Nuckeria and Corey, were killed by Takeeya's boyfriend on July 31 in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

A few words about my constituent, Teqnika Moultrie, 30, who was killed on July 31 in Austin, Texas.

She was from San Carlos and worked as a school bus driver for Sequoia Union High School District. She was visiting with her wife's family in Austin when a gunman opened fire as she exited a doughnut shop. She died in her wife's arms. They had only been married for 3 months. After her death, her wife said: We just wanted to live a normal life, an everyday life and raise a family, be good moms and do it together. Now we don't get to do anything.

So many of these people killed at parties, on the sidewalks, and in their homes by people who were supposed to love them don't get to do any of that.

Mr. Speaker, deaths matter. All deaths matter.

ZIKA FUNDING

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to implore Congress to take action to fund Zika response efforts in South Florida, throughout the country, and all over the world. Seven months have passed since the administration made its initial request for $1.9 billion to combat Zika, a request I supported.

As of September 7, the State of Florida alone has seen 596 travel-related cases and 80 Zika infections involving pregnant women. Across the United States, thousands more have been infected with the virus.

Mr. Speaker, Florida has been ground zero for Zika, and we are seeing firsthand the devastating impacts it has not only on public health but on our economy as well.

Neighborhoods in Wynwood and Miami Beach and other communities across Florida are seeing decreased tourist traffic, and some residents, especially pregnant women, are fearful to venture outdoors. My wife and I know pregnant women who have moved away from South Florida to protect themselves and their unborn babies from a potential Zika infection.

Over the months of July and August, I met with the director of the Centers for Disease Control, Dr. Tom Friedman, as well as other government officials, including Senator RUBIO, Governor Scott, and my Florida colleagues from both parties to discuss the progress of the government's response and the importance of funding these efforts long-term.

It is imperative that Congress act on Zika legislation as soon as possible to provide the CDC and other agencies at the national, State, and local levels the tools they need to rid our neighborhoods of this disease. Combating Zika is not a Republican or Democrat initiative. It should be a national priority.

The mosquitos carrying this disease will not discriminate between congressional lines or infect people from only certain States. All Members of Congress from both parties and across the country must appreciate the severity of inaction on passing Zika funding legislation. Let's put politics aside and get this done for our communities and for all Americans.

CONDEMNING AL-ASSAD'S BRUTALITY

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise again to strongly condemn Bashar al-Assad's atrocities against the Syrian people. It has been reported that the government has, once again, unleashed barrel bombs with chlorine gas in Aleppo as the regime continues its brutal siege of that city. Victims of the attack suffered from breathing difficulties similar to the symptoms we have seen in the past when the government ignored international law by assaulting innocent people with chemical weapons.

This was the second recent chlorine attack that affected Syrians who have been cut off from aid and are unable to escape. In spite of repeated warnings, the Syrian Government continues to utilize barrel bombs filled with chemical weapons as a tool to remain in power.

This continued disregard for human life and the well-being of Syrians underscores why Assad must go and not be allowed to take part in the political transition discussions or Syria's future. The death and destruction in Syria is one of the greatest blemishes on human history. The entire world must do more to put an end to it.

BACK TO SCHOOL

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the end of the summer marks the beginning of the school year and a fresh start for teachers, students, and families. As a father of two young students and as a former school board member from Miami-Dade County Public Schools and now the husband of a teacher, I greatly cherish this time of year and the excitement that children feel while preparing to enter the next grade.

Soon after classes started, I visited Redland Middle, a school in my district that has greatly benefited from my amendment to provide students learning English an extra year to become proficient before test scores count against their teachers and schools. Like all students, English language learners must be counted without being counted out, and their teachers deserve our support.

As a proud member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, ensuring young people the brightest future possible is a central focus of my work in Congress. I wish the students, parents, teachers, support staff, and families of Miami-Dade and the Florida Keys much success as this new school year gets underway.

□ 1100

HONORING MS. TANGELA SEARS

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Tangela Sears, a local activist who has spent decades serving the south Florida community. She has been an outspoken leader on many topics, including gun violence and the need to protect young people in our community from these senseless crimes. She is a confident leader who stands up for her beliefs, and a fearless advocate who works to make south Florida a safer place to live.

A year ago, Tangela's son, David, died at the hands of gun violence, a tragedy she had worked her entire life to prevent. Though heartbroken, she used the memory of David as an opportunity to continue spreading the message of nonviolence and justice more than ever before.

I thank Ms. Sears for her years of service, advocacy, passion, and strength to make our community a better place for all, especially those who live in neighborhoods that have seen a troubling spike in violent crimes. We are extremely grateful for your unrelenting dedication to our community, and I know that David is extremely proud of you.

DEMANDING ACTION ON FLINT, MICHIGAN, AND THE ZIKA VIRUS

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues who are demanding action for the families in Flint, Michigan. First, I want to acknowledge many Members of the Michigan delegation, led by Flint's Representative, Congressman DAN KILDEE, who are fighting every day to bring justice to these families. Their work is essential to ensuring the people of Flint have the resources that they need to recover.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in Flint is nothing short of a tragedy, and a tragedy that could have been prevented. Michigan State officials sacrificed the health and futures of Flint's children in order to save a few dollars in water costs. This really is a shame and a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask, would this have happened in a city where the residents had the advantage of wealth? Or do these gross breaches of public trust only happen in cities where politicians believe the residents are expendable?

Sadly, I think we all know the answer to that question. After the incredible harm that has already been done to these families, our elected officials are, once again, turning their backs on the people of Flint. These families deserve better.

The people of Flint were already hurting before the water crisis. The average family income in the city is just $24,834 a year. No one can raise a family on that. Many of these courageous and resilient families struggle to find high-quality child care, access healthcare services, and afford healthy food. And now the costs of this crisis are mounting for families, the schools, and the entire community. We can, and we must, do more for our fellow Americans in their time of need.

Two years since this tragedy began, families are still relying on bottled water for daily life. Imagine using bottled water for everything from brushing your teeth to making a bottle for a hungry baby.

We can do better by these families. They need support, including health care, nutrition, specialized education, and developmental care. And we need to fix the root of the problem: the degraded, dangerous pipes, and infrastructure that caused this tragedy.

The shortsighted, dangerous actions of Michigan officials have already caused unimaginable pain for these families. We cannot allow Congress to betray these families as well.

Let me just say that I was part of a congressional delegation that traveled to Flint, Michigan, to listen to the residents regarding the horrendous impact of these government decisions that led to the poisoning of those children and families. The environmental injustice in Flint is an example of how many low-income communities of color throughout our country, not just in Flint, throughout the United States, an example of how they are treated differently than affluent communities.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman DAN KILDEE and members of the Michigan delegation have introduced legislation that would help these families rebuild their lives and get the care they need for their children. The Families of Flint Act, H.R. 4479, is a comprehensive plan to address their most urgent needs. It would provide for critical investment in Flint's water system to replace the lead pipes that poisoned these families.

This legislation would also provide essential support services to the families of Flint to help these children mitigate and overcome lead exposure.

These are simple, commonsense measures for the people of Flint. Addressing this tragedy really shouldn't be a partisan issue. Every Member of this Chamber should understand the need for urgent action. It could happen in any of our communities. Yet, congressional Republicans have not held one single vote, or even a hearing, on this bill. That is just simply outrageous.

And let me just say that Flint is not the only public health crisis that congressional Republicans have ignored. There are 17,000 Americans—including almost 1,600 pregnant women—who have contracted the Zika virus. The President submitted an emergency request of $1.9 billion for Zika funding more than 6 months ago, and the Republicans have failed to act on it. Now, if we don't act soon, the CDC will be out of money to combat Zika in a matter of weeks.

Congressional Republicans also failed to do their job on gun violence. Every day, more than 90 million people die from gun violence. This, too, is a public health crisis; but congressional Republicans, once again, have refused to take up any commonsense gun legislation, even though 91 percent of Americans support background checks to keep guns out of the hands of terrorists and criminals.

It is clear that the American people need Congress to do its job. The women in Florida who can't leave their homes for fear of a mosquito bite need Congress to do its job. The families who fear gun violence on their block need Congress to do its job.

CALLING FOR ACTION ON PUBLIC HEALTH CRISES FACING OUR COUNTRY

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, House Republicans streamed out of the Capitol as I stood on this floor with my Democratic colleagues calling for action on the public health crises facing our country: gun violence, Zika, and Flint, Michigan's, poisoned water.

It is now nearly 8 weeks later. Congress has returned from the longest summer recess in more than 60 years, but we still have seen no action from the Republican majority on our Nation's most urgent crises.

Meanwhile, we are in the midst of a Zika outbreak. Puerto Rico is on track to see 25 of its population infected. Florida has locally transmitted Zika cases, and it is only a matter of time until we see cases in other States. Actually, we have seen some in other States. Parents who should be looking forward to the birth of a child are terrified that the baby may be born with devastating lifelong health problems.

Yet, Republicans refuse to provide the funding we need to combat this outbreak. Instead of passing a bill with sufficient funding, Republicans insist on making sure, believe it or not, that the Confederate flag can fly at VA cemeteries and on preventing family planning clinics from helping patients with Zika.

That is right. Even though Zika has the greatest impact on women who are, or could become, pregnant, Republicans want to add a rider to stop the family planning clinics that serve women from responding to Zika.

Today, family planning clinics, like Planned Parenthood, are already on the front lines in fighting against Zika. In addition to providing family planning services, Planned Parenthood volunteers are visiting 25,000 households in Florida to find people of reproductive age, especially young women, who have likely not been reached by State or Federal Zika education efforts. They are providing Zika kits for pregnant women, containing items like insect repellent and standing water treatment.

Family planning clinics are an important part of our response to Zika. But instead of recognizing that fact, Republicans have doubled down on their extreme views on women's health.

Dr. Anthony Fauci, the head of the Infectious Disease Institute at the National Institutes of Health, has said in no uncertain terms that if we do not pass additional Zika funding, we will have to stop our efforts to develop a vaccine. Already, Federal agencies have had to borrow money from other critical health priorities to address the Zika problem. We have allowed money to be taken—or the Republicans have—from Ebola, cancer, heart disease, and diabetes. We can't keep fighting back by cutting back our fight against these other diseases.

Republican's refusal to pass Zika funding will have serious, deadly consequences for years to come. Americans can't wait any longer.

At the same time, the people of Flint are still waiting for congressional assistance after the tragic lead poisoning crisis in that city. I joined 25 of my Democratic colleagues in Flint earlier this year. We heard from nearly 200 community members, including parents, worried about their children's future. After that trip, we said we wouldn't forget these families, and Democrats haven't.

Again and again, I have joined with my colleagues to call on Republican leadership to bring the Families of Flint Act—that is a bill—to the floor. Flint's Congressman KILDEE's bill would provide supplemental funding to repair and support this community's needs. Lead has often devastating brain development effects, but families can meet that challenge if we provide the health, education, and the wraparound services that they need.

But months later, we have come up dry. No bill to fund Flint aid. No funding for Zika. No gun safety legislation. Nothing.

What is on the floor this week?

Well, we have bills that will help Wall Street make even more money. And we have a bill to impeach the head

of the IRS, mentioned by exactly no one—zero constituents in my district—over the 7-week recess. We have wasted critical weeks during the summer recess, and Republicans are now wasting our first week back in session.

We have only 15 legislative days before we are scheduled to leave town again. Let's get to work and pass the critical funding for Flint and Zika and do something about gun violence.

HONORING THE CLEAR RIDGE BASEBALL TEAM

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Clear Ridge baseball team on winning the Senior Little League World Series in Bangor, Maine, on August 6. This is the first team from Illinois to ever win this prestigious international tournament during its 56-year history.

The Clear Ridge Senior League Championship team is made up of 16 extraordinary 15- and 16-year-old men from the Garfield Ridge and Clearing neighborhoods in Chicago, all of whom attend area Catholic high schools. Their journeys to becoming champions began as tee-ball players when they were very young. But this Senior League team only came into existence in May of this year. In a short amount of time, they were able to come together to form an extraordinary team.

Clear Ridge showed dominance throughout the summer by not losing a single regular season game. In the postseason, they continued this trend by winning 19 straight games after a single loss to neighboring Burbank National in the first game of the district playoffs.

The championship game pitted Clear Ridge against Asia-Pacific champion, Australia, whom they had already defeated once in the tourney, and who were considered by some to be the team to beat. But Clear Ridge turned out to be that team, prevailing 7–2 to capture the world title.

The following Saturday, I joined hundreds of people at Hale Park to honor players, coaches, and everyone who contributed to the success of the team. The title and the celebration were especially meaningful to me, having played 8 years in Clear Ridge Little League when I was growing up. This team embodies the best of the close-knit neighborhoods on the southwest side of Chicago that I know so well. These are the people who often seem to be forgotten or overlooked in our country today. Many of these kids have parents who are police or firefighters, and all come from hardworking, middle class families.

□ 1115

When I read the names, you will hear a diverse mix of Irish, Mexican, Polish, and other Central European names. The championship players are: Paolo Zavala, Mike Skoraczewski, Bobby Palenik, Gary Donohue, Gage Olszak, Noah Miller, Tom Doyle, Joe Trezek, Tim Molloy, Dave Navarro, Mike Rios, Jake Gerloski, Jake Duerr, Mel Morario, Julian Lopez, and Zach Verta.

Of course, these kids could not do it on their own. Team manager Mark Robinson and coaches Ray Verta and Will Trezek provided the strong leadership and dedication that helped demonstrate the importance of determination and the results that come from hard work.

Clear Ridge is more than just this one Senior League team. Multiple teams of both boys and girls compete in various leagues. Heading up all of these leagues are President Adam Rush, Vice President Ryan Aderman, and Treasurer Jay Derby. Without the work of these men and countless others who prepare the fields, work the concessions, and do all of the other thankless but necessary jobs, Clear Ridge could not function.

Congratulations go to the parents of all of the players. They not only raised champion baseball players, but good, respectable young men.

Mr. Speaker, when I met with the team at the celebration, I told them how proud they make me, and I encouraged them to keep up the good work. Now I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this great achievement by the Clear Ridge Senior League team and in congratulating them on their world championship. I wish each and every player continued success.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 17 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at noon.

PRAYER

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

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

We pray this day, O Lord, for peace in our world, that freedom will flourish, and righteousness will be done.

The attention of our Nation is drawn toward an impending election, but there is work yet to be done.

Send Your spirit upon the Members of this people's House, that they might judiciously balance seemingly irreconcilable interests. Help them to execute their consciences and judgments with clarity and purity of heart, so that all might stand before You honestly and trust that You can bring forth righteous fruits from their labors.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WOMACK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

CONFRONTING THE ZIKA THREAT TO 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 for the third time this week since the House reconvened to demand Federal funding to stop the Zika epidemic that is impacting families throughout our Nation, but especially in my area of south Florida.

Reports have suggested that even those individuals charged with protecting our communities—in this case, a police officer from Miami Beach—are not safe from Zika as they do their jobs to patrol our neighborhoods.

Local businesses in the Miami neighborhoods most impacted by Zika are suffering, including those at the lovely Wynwood Yard, a very popular outdoor food and culture scene, where small businesses are suffering from reduced foot traffic.

Many public outdoor areas are being closed to visitors, including the beautiful Miami Beach Botanical Garden after extensive testing found Zika-infected mosquitos on the ground.

The Zika virus is costing residents their peace of mind and access to their public spaces and outdoor recreational activities.

Mr. Speaker, we need more Federal funding now to confront this threat. When will Congress act? Every day that we delay is a threat to our families in south Florida.

NEW HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY COUNCIL CELEBRATES 50 YEARS

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and celebrate the New Hampshire College and University Council, which recently celebrated its 50th anniversary.

I would also like to recognize Thomas Horgan, the president and CEO of the council, who announced earlier this week that he will be stepping down after 23 years on the job. Tom has been a leader in the higher education field for many years and has made a tremendous impact on our community.

The New Hampshire College and University Council has long been committed to working to strengthen the Granite State's higher education system and ensuring that students are given the opportunities they so deserve. The council works tirelessly to collaborate with both public and private institutions and to promote greater awareness and understanding of New Hampshire higher education at every level, from students, professors, and administrators, all the way to the college presidents.

New Hampshire's colleges and universities are major contributors to our State's economy, employing over 17,000 people throughout the Granite State, with salaries and benefits exceeding $1 billion. Education at every level is vitally important. We must continue to promote higher education in New Hampshire.

RECOGNIZING MR. GUS BELL

(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 Mr. Gus Bell and his 50 years of service to the Hussey Gay Bell Firm, a design and architecture company located in Savannah, Georgia, dedicated to innovating the engineering field.

Mr. Bell joined the company in 1966 and, with his hard work, purchased the company 20 years later. He then led Hussey Gay Bell's expansion to international clients, proving itself an international pioneer in architecture and engineering.

While a big one, this is only one of Mr. Gus Bell's many accomplishments. For the last five decades, Mr. Bell has also dedicated himself to the enrichment of the State of Georgia. He has chaired the board of Mercer's medical school, founded the St. Andrew's School Board, and represented the State of Georgia in a major water dispute. Mr. Bell's influence is felt throughout the region and, certainly, beyond.

I am honored that Mr. Bell is a resident of Georgia's First Congressional District, and I thank him for his dedication to our area.

On a personal note, I thank him for all of his assistance to me while I was mayor of the city of Pooler. I am honored to call him my friend.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a warning, a warning that the voices of the American people are at risk of not being heard.

Outside groups funded by the deepest of pockets have taken center stage in this year's election. The Center for Responsive Politics reported this week that outside spending has already reached two-thirds of a billion dollars in 2016. That is more than twice what these groups spent at this point just 4 years ago. Wave after wave of these ads dominate our screens and turn political debate into a pro wrestling match.

But there is more to the problem. This system gives a small group of the wealthiest Americans a disproportionately loud voice. It affirms the fear that so many Americans have that special interests and deep pockets have undue say. That is not good for the future of our country or of our democracy.

It is time we stood up and said, ''Enough.'' It is time we stood up and said that corporations are not people. It is time we pass campaign finance reform, and it is time we revitalize our democracy and bring people power back.

OBAMA'S CASH PAYMENTS TO IRAN

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, sadly, my remarks condemning the shocking $400 million ransom payment to Iran were understated. Yesterday, The Wall Street Journal revealed:

> The Obama administration followed up a planeload of $400 million in cash sent to Iran in January with two more shipments totaling $1.3 billion . . . lawmakers have voiced concern that Iran's military units . . . would use the cash to finance military allies, including the Assad regime in Syria, Houthi militias in Yemen, and the Lebanese militia, Hezbollah.

Last month, The Augusta Chronicle disclosed: ''No legitimate case can be made that none of the . . . billions . . . will fund terror. It's inevitable. The White House even admits it.''

I appreciate House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ED ROYCE's efforts to advance legislation to ensure this can't happen again for enemies who still chant, ''Death to America. Death to Israel.''

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. The President's legacy is American families at greater risk of attack, ever, with financing.

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN MARK TAKAI

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I attended the funeral of one of our colleagues, my good friend, Congressman Mark Takai of Hawaii, who lost his battle with pancreatic cancer.

Mark was a great leader. He served his country both in the military and the Hawaii National Guard, as well as being a public servant in the Hawaii State House and here in the U.S. Congress.

He was taken from us far too soon. Mark was only 49 and left behind his wife and two children. He was a wonderful father and deserved more time with them.

Pancreatic cancer has one of the lowest survival rates of any cancer. Just 6 percent survive 5 years past their diagnosis. While death rates for other cancers are declining, pancreatic cancer is projected to become the second leading cause of cancer-related death in the U.S. in the next 4 years.

Every year, pancreatic cancer survivors and family members walk the Halls of Congress advocating for more Federal funding for pancreatic cancer research, with the goal of doubling their survival rates by 2020.

For too long, those calls have fallen on deaf ears. But perhaps now, in the wake of losing one of our own colleagues, Congress will do what is right and dedicate much-needed funding to curing this deadly disease.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. PAT WALKER

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Pat Walker of Springdale, Arkansas, who passed away on September 3 at the age of 97.

Pat was a northwest Arkansas icon whose spirit of philanthropy touched so many lives. She not only provided critical resources for charities involved in medicine, the arts, education, and her beloved Razorbacks, but she also inspired those around her to get involved and be of service to their fellow man.

She was steadfastly dedicated to our community, and the honors bestowed upon Pat are evidence of this. A member of the Arkansas Women's Hall of Fame, Pat was named one of the Most Distinguished Women in Arkansas. She was a lifetime member of the Winthrop P. Rockefeller Cancer Institute, the 2002 American Heart Association Tiffany award recipient, inducted into the Towers of Old Main, and was a member

of the University of Arkansas Chancellor's Society and given the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences Distinguished Service Award.

Northwest Arkansas will long remember the contributions made by Pat Walker, and we join her 2 children, 7 grandchildren, and 15 great-grandchildren in celebrating her wonderful life.

VOTING RIGHTS

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of all of those individuals who died or were assaulted trying to register to vote and vote. I rise today in support of all of those individuals who are registering to vote and will vote. I also rise to condemn the assault on Americans' fundamental right to vote.

Across the country, including in my home State of Ohio, we are seeing greater restrictions on voting rights following the Shelby County v. Holder decision. It is no secret these laws are designed to make it harder for Americans to vote, specifically, minorities. They are laws like the one passed by the Ohio Legislature taking away ''Golden Week,'' a week-long period allowing individuals, Mr. Speaker, to both register to vote and cast a ballot at the same time.

Well, I say enough is enough. Our democracy is stronger when all Americans, not just a few select, are able to vote. As our chaplain said today, let us work together so freedoms flourish.

Let us not give up, Mr. Speaker. Let us pass H.R. 885, the Voting Rights Amendment Act, to restore the full power of the Voting Rights Act and right the wrongs created.

RECOGNIZING KIMBERLY BIGOS

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kimberly Bigos, a student at Spring Arbor University in my district.

Kimberly created the moving piece of artwork displayed to my left. I have had the privilege to see it in person, and the picture doesn't do it justice. It is a life-size wheelchair made out of little toy green Army men, innocent as they might be. She used more than 1,000 Army men and spent more than 60 hours to finish it.

The sculpture signifies all the aspects of military service, from fighting on the front lines in battle, to returning home with life-altering injuries, to the supreme sacrifice.

America's veterans sacrifice so much and we often lose sight of the effects of their service. Kimberly's sculpture is a powerful reminder about real life for our wounded warriors. These men and women have displayed incredible courage and heroism in service to our country, and now it is time for us to serve them.

□ 1215

STARBUCKS AND FEEDING AMERICA TACKLING HUNGER

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to kick off Hunger Action Month, today I joined with Representative LYNN JENKINS of Kansas on a tour of Starbucks on Capitol Hill to learn about an innovative partnership between Feeding America and Starbucks to donate unused food.

At the end of each day, Starbucks will package surplus ready-to-eat food that gets picked up overnight and delivered to local food banks. I was impressed by the selection of nutritious food. We often think of Starbucks as a place to stop for a great cup of coffee, but we saw a number of healthy options like salads, sandwiches, and more.

Starbucks will expand the project to all its stores in the next few years. They expect to donate 50 million meals annually, diverting 60 million pounds of surplus food away from landfills and to hungry families in need.

More than 47 million Americans suffer from hunger and food insecurity. In the richest country in the world, we must do all we can to ensure that no family goes hungry, and donating unused food is a key step. Starbucks deserves much credit for being a leader in the effort to end hunger.

SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently, Roger Webb, of the University of Manchester, conducted a study which found that when parents have psychiatric illnesses or have attempted suicide, their children are at increased risk for attempting suicide themselves.

Our healthcare system for families with genetic histories of other biological diseases should be no different from those of psychiatric diseases. We must intervene early before the mental health crisis starts. But, unfortunately, in the United States, with too few psychiatric beds, a shortage of psychiatrists and psychologists, and 112 Federal agencies that are a disjointed mess, no, we are not there yet.

But the House passed the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act in July to make a difference in this. We now call upon the Senate to make a difference as well. They need to make sure they pass this bill and don't pass up the opportunity to save lives.

So far, since September 1, 7,672 lives have been lost related to mental illness; and since the House-passed bill, 61,000. We have to understand we must have treatment before these tragedies and provide help before hope.

I hope the Senate passes H.R. 2646 before they leave in September.

RECOGNIZING SUSAN MARCHESE

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of Omaha's most illustrious athletes, Susan Marchese. Susan has been a dominant figure in Nebraska amateur golf for 40 years, dating back to her first two high school State championships in 1977 and 1978 as a student athlete at Omaha's Duchesne Academy.

After high school, she attended the University of Oklahoma, where she was a four-time letter winner and an individual runner-up in the Big Eight tournament in 1981.

Throughout the course of her post-college career, Susan has won 18 State amateur golf championships, 16 Omaha city championships, and six Nebraska senior women's golf championships. Her success on the green led to her induction as a member of the Nebraska Golf Hall of Fame, Nebraska High School Hall of Fame, Omaha Athletic Hall of Fame, and the Duchesne Academy Sports Hall of Fame.

Now, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I am here to recognize the outstanding career of Susan Marchese.

DEFECTIVE MILITARY EQUIPMENT

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with grave concerns over a recent Justice Department Inspector General report detailing how Federal Prison Industries manufactured defective military equipment that endangered the lives of our troops.

The DOJ investigation into FPI, which is owned and operated by the U.S. Bureau of Prisons found that ''FPI had endemic manufacturing problems.''

This photo of a test mannequin in an NBC News story about defective prisoner-made equipment shows brain damage likely would have occurred from a small 9 millimeter bullet through a helmet.

Making matters worse, the investigation also uncovered that FPI employees instructed inmates to lie and falsely indicate that the helmets being manufactured had passed inspection and met the required safety specifications. This is completely unacceptable, and potentially criminal.

The FPI response? Reassign the employees.

Can you imagine if these were private sector employees rather than government bureaucrats?

In order to hold FPI accountable, I have introduced H.R. 4671, the Small Business Protection Act. It is our responsibility to supply our troops with the highest quality, American-made gear available. FPI does not deliver on that promise, and I request the support of my colleagues in this endeavor.

ZIKA IS A GROWING PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, when we left Washington 7 weeks ago, there were 311 Zika cases in Florida, and no local infections. Now there are over 600 cases, including 56 local infections, and the number of cases in pregnant women has doubled.

Rather than meeting the serious public health crisis with serious policy, Republican leadership is playing a dangerous game by blocking Zika funding to make a political statement about Planned Parenthood and abortion.

We get it. You oppose women exercising their constitutionally protected rights. You would like to live in a world where women don't have access to safe and legal abortion. You want to live in a world where Roe v. Wade is not the law of the land and where women do not have access to contraception. Enough.

In the real world, Zika is spread by mosquitoes and Zika spreads through sex. Safe sex means fewer infections, and Planned Parenthood will help in this fight.

It is time to protect American families in the real world, where the Constitution protects women's health care rights, and where we are facing a public health crisis from the Zika virus.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Republican leaders to listen to anxious Floridians, Democrats and Republicans alike, who want Congress to act for them and not for attempted political gain.

100 YEARS OF SUPPORT FOR MINNESOTA FARMERS

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Anoka County Farm Bureau. As a supporter of agriculture in Minnesota's Sixth District, the Anoka County Farm Bureau does an excellent job promoting the interests of Minnesota's farmers and their products and produce.

For many farmers in Minnesota, farming is not just a job; it is a way of life often passed from one generation to the next. They work 7 days a week, from dusk till dawn, to ensure that our groceries are stocked and that Minnesotans are fed quality food. It is not an easy job, but it is a vital one.

As the backbone of Minnesota's economy, our farmers deserve as much help as possible. Without the constant support of the Anoka County Farm Bureau, our district and our State would not be where it is today. That is why I not only want to congratulate the Anoka County Farm Bureau on this very special anniversary, but I want to thank them for supporting Minnesota farmers for the past century, and we look forward to a long future.

ZIKA VIRUS IS PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the Zika virus, which has now become a serious public health emergency. Officials from the Department of Health and Human Services have spent August reiterating the dire need for funding to protect the American public from Zika and its potential harm.

While the Centers for Disease Control worked furiously to control and research the mosquitoes that carry this virus, and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases labors over finding a vaccine for the virus, Congress has stalled over funding the package.

You have heard the cry from Democrats and Republicans about how serious this is. In the United States, including territories, we currently have 16,832 active Zika virus cases. In south Florida, we now have cases of local transmission that could have been prevented with better vector control and preparedness.

We must give our health professionals the tools they need to fight the spread of this virus. Today I ask that we in Congress do our jobs, please.

COMMEMORATING FRANCIS BELLAMY

(Mr. COLLINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Francis Bellamy, one of the most influential individuals from Mount Morris, New York. Francis Bellamy is the author of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Today marks the 124th anniversary of the Pledge of Allegiance, which was first published in a magazine called The Youth's Companion, on September 8, 1892.

The Pledge was originally written as part of a campaign to put American flags in every school in the United States. In its original form, it read: ''I pledge allegiance to my Flag and the Republic for which it stands, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.''

In 1923, the words ''the Flag of the United States of America'' were added.

In 1954, Congress added the words ''under God,'' creating the 31-word pledge we say today.

Bellamy's words are recited millions of times every day and are ingrained in our society as an expression of national pride and patriotism.

HURRICANE HERMINE AND THE NORTH FLORIDA WAY

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

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, more than 250,000 people were without power. Ten-foot storm surges destroyed homes. Lives were lost. This is what my hometown and north Florida has experienced in the past week as a result of Hermine, the first hurricane to strike Florida in 11 years.

It was one of the worst storms ever to hit north Florida, but throughout all the devastation and destruction, we also witnessed community, kindness, and love, or what I like to call the north Florida way.

Organizations like the Red Cross and Salvation Army sheltered and fed those in need. Churches opened their doors to those suffering, and neighbors took in neighbors to help give them respite and relief from the heat.

Mr. Speaker, it will take weeks and months for us to recover from this storm, but today I want to recognize and thank all organizations, volunteers, workers, and people who have helped us all in our time of need. Thank you from the bottom of my heart. We are truly grateful.

HURRICANE HERMINE

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, this past week, the Tampa Bay Area was impacted by the flooding as a result of Hurricane Hermine. I personally visited the flooded areas in my district throughout the weekend, and I saw families and properties that were devastated. Some of the worst-hit areas were along the Anclote River Basin.

Unfortunately, despite infrastructure improvements throughout the county, this area has been repeatedly impacted by flooding. One potential solution is to dredge the Anclote River to help improve flood water egress through the basin. This will help provide residents with long-term relief.

I have reached out to the Army Corps of Engineers to ask that the agency help craft a permanent, workable solution. The safety of our community is at stake, and I will not rest until we get this done.

ZIKA IS A PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS

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

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, we have got a public health crisis on our hands. We

have to get funding to address the Zika crisis. We now have over 16,000 identified cases. It is a terrible virus, and we have to get ahead of this.

As a doctor and public health expert, I understand the importance of giving our physicians, our healthcare professionals, and our scientists all the tools that they need. The NIH is doing magnificent work getting a vaccine up and running and into clinical trials, but we have to give them the resources; we have to get ahead of this.

We also have to make sure all the patients have access to reproductive healthcare choices, like Planned Parenthood and other assets, so they can prevent the terrible effects of this virus on their fetuses and their babies.

So it is incredibly important, let's get that funding out there. Let's stop playing politics with this, and let's get the help to the places that need it. It is a public health emergency. Let's do our job.

□ 1230

SHAME

(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, too often victims of human sex trafficking are ashamed. But, Mr. Speaker, the traffickers and the buyers are the ones who should be ashamed and shamed.

Buyers and sellers want to remain anonymous, but those days are over. It is time to use public punishment for their dastardly deeds. As a judge in Texas, I successfully used public punishment.

The SHAME Act will give Federal judges the discretion to publish the names and photographs of convicted human sex traffickers and buyers as well as sending them off to prison. Buyers and sellers who force victims to repeatedly sell their bodies should be publicly shamed for all of us to see.

Photos of slave traders and buyers that appear on billboards will also deter other would-be criminals. Such photographs should appear before large conventions or sporting events—events where trafficking, unfortunately, increases. Let the public see the faces of slave traders and buyers of children—children that are sold on the marketplace of sex trafficking.

Shame traffickers, and shame on them.

And that is just the way it is.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon the House of Representatives to address our broken immigration system, one that serves our national security poorly, one that inhibits the ability of law enforcement to keep our communities safe and replace it with comprehensive immigration reform so we know who is here, so that people who are here illegally will be required to register and get right with the law and pay a fine, that we provide a pathway to citizenship for people who are here and playing a productive role in our economy, and that we can make sure that parents aren't taken away forcibly from their American citizen children.

It has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office that immigration reform would reduce our budget deficit by over $200 billion. There are people here today working, Mr. Speaker, and we don't even know if they are paying taxes. We need to make sure that everybody who works in our country pays their just share of taxes, fulfills their responsibilities as legal residents or as citizens of our country, and the only way that we can do that is through congressional action.

I am proud to support comprehensive immigration reform. I call upon Speaker RYAN and the Republican majority to put a bill forward that secures our border, reduces our deficit, and provides a way that people are required to get right with the law and have workplace authentication.

DEMAND ACTION ON ZIKA

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, with summer coming to an end and a new school year underway, the threat of Zika still lingers on, a threat we in the House took up months ago.

The House passed legislation back in June ensuring the administration would continue to have resources in place to protect the public from the threat of Zika. This legislation came with tight restrictions to ensure the funds are spent appropriately. Despite this and after already agreeing to the proposed funding levels, Senate Democrats have repeatedly blocked this much-needed funding. Tuesday night, HARRY REID and Senate Democrats, again, voted to block this legislation—leaving the public's health in limbo.

This is unacceptable. Before the district work period, I joined my colleagues in the Georgia delegation, along with our Senators, ISAKSON and PERDUE, in a letter to the President demanding that we put aside politics and urge immediate passage of Zika funding.

With newly reported Zika cases in our country daily, we should be focusing on protecting Americans from this virus and not petty politics.

I am so thankful that our 12th grandchild, Robin Hampton Wills, born Monday, January 12, did not have to face this threat. That is why I urge Senate Democrats to give up partisan politics and move this legislation forward so that families do not have to face the threat of this terrible virus.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF CAPTAIN ROBERT ''DAVE'' MELTON

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Captain Robert ''Dave'' Melton, who was killed in the line of duty several weeks ago in Kansas City, Kansas, in my district.

Each night we sleep soundly knowing that there are men and women patrolling the streets and guarding our borders to keep us safe and defend our freedom. Like Captain Melton, they put themselves in harm's way out of service to our community and to our country.

When one of these brave Americans loses their life in the line of duty and on our behalf, it is a devastating blow to all who wear the uniform and the families who support them. My heart breaks at each and every loss of one of these heroes.

Captain Melton is a true hero who served 17 years in law enforcement and did tours in the military in Iraq and Afghanistan throughout his distinguished career of service to our country. He did not deserve to have his life cut short at age 46.

Mr. Speaker, may God bless Captain Melton, his family, and all those who serve our great Nation.

RECOGNIZING DEMARCUS COUSINS

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mobile native DeMarcus Cousins for winning an Olympic gold medal as a member of the U.S. Men's Basketball Team.

Throughout Olympic play, he averaged 9.1 points and 5.8 rebounds. While his play on the court is to be commended, I was more impressed by DeMarcus' work back home in Alabama. DeMarcus recently held a free basketball camp for young children at his alma mater, LeFlore Magnet High School.

Following the basketball camp, DeMarcus organized an important conversation about relations between members of the African American community and law enforcement.

Like many communities across the Nation, my hometown of Mobile has faced our share of challenges in this area; but thanks to local leaders and leaders like DeMarcus Cousins, Mobile can serve as a prime example of how to defuse racial tension and increase understanding between all members of our community.

So on behalf of Alabama's First Congressional District, I want to, again, congratulate DeMarcus on his gold

medal and applaud him for his continued leadership in our community.

CONGRATULATING DAVID PLUMMER

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Wayzata's David Plummer on winning the bronze medal in the 100-meter backstroke in this year's Olympic Games.

David's path to the Olympics was not an easy one. David is an alumnus of the University of Minnesota and the very first former Golden Gopher men's swimmer to win an Olympic medal for the United States. After missing the 2012 games in London by a fraction of a second, he thought his Olympic aspirations might be shattered. However, David never gave up and continued to pursue his dream. This year, at the age of 30, he made the Olympic team and reached his goal of competing and winning the bronze medal at the Olympic Games.

On top of his achievements in the pool, David is also a leader in our community. He is the head coach of the Wayzata High School boys' swim and dive team, leading them to a State championship in his first season, as well as winning Minnesota's State Coach of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, we can draw inspiration from David's determination to overcome any obstacle. David has made the State of Minnesota and our entire country proud.

Congratulations, David.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2357, ACCELERATING ACCESS TO CAPITAL ACT OF 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5424, INVESTMENT ADVISERS MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 844 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 844

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2357) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise Form S-3 so as to add listing and registration of a class of common equity securities on a national securities exchange as an additional basis for satisfying the requirements of General Instruction I.B.1. of such form and to remove such listing and registration as a requirement of General Instruction I.B.6. of such form. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-62. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5424) to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 and to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to amend its rules to modernize certain requirements relating to investment advisers, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further 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 further amendment printed in part B of 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 Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, which is a fair rule that makes in order every single amendment submitted to the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016, and H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act of 2016.

This package comes to the floor via the chairman of the House Financial Services Committee, Chairman JEB HENSARLING, who brought this package to the Rules Committee because of the needs of the American people and the needs of the financial services industry that is trying to grow jobs, investment, and opportunity for people in America.

We have an incredible opportunity before us today, Mr. Speaker, an opportunity to take good ideas, good ideas that come directly from the American people. It is called the financial services industry of the United States of America, men and women who get up and handle our financial needs, many men and women who not only have dedicated themselves to the success of this country, but also to the success of the American people.

We are trying to take this opportunity to move those ideas that they bring to us today through the House of Representatives so that we have a bill that we can present on a bipartisan basis to the United States Senate and to the President of the United States and say these are great ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that your work that you do personally to make sure these ideas are brought forth not only to the Financial Services Committee, but to other areas of this Congress to make sure that we are passing legislation that is about jobs, job creation, and the availability of the American people to have a better shot at the American Dream, is why we are here today.

□ 1245

The goal of this rule and the underlying legislation is simple: to keep the flow of capital moving across our capital markets, to make it easier—not harder—to make it easier to overcome barriers for small businesses, entrepreneurs, and startups to have the capital that they desperately need to grow and thrive.

Mr. Speaker, this part of the American Dream is someone who has great ideas, the ability, and the desire, and to take those ideas and match it up with the capital, a marketing plan, and the ability to move forth in that plan.

That is part of the American Dream to make not only your life better but, along the way, a bunch of other people who meet their American Dream also.

Capital is the lifeblood of growing new companies—not a surprise—and access to capital can literally make or break small business. Mr. Speaker, it can make or break a person's great idea also. That is why we are here today on the floor. Good ideas that come from men and women in the industry, men and women who talk to the Financial Services Committee on a partisan basis, men and women of this Congress bringing these great ideas, and it is all on behalf of trying to give people a better shot at the American Dream through growing companies accessing capital and making the hard break become successful.

I have seen firsthand the detriment of overregulation in industries and poorly written laws, and I have also seen the power of the free enterprise system. While serving as chairman on the board of the Greater East Dallas Chamber of Commerce, I saw, firsthand, companies that could not get the capital that they needed because they weren't large enough to qualify or perhaps had some other burden or impediment in front of them.

As we know today, because of technology, time, and people's purpose, we have the opportunity for doing something remarkable. We have the ability today to enact legislation that will bolster opportunities for small businesses to secure capital, to reduce the strain of a one-size-fits-all regulatory regime, and to take that and add an opportunity to overcome these by using the American spirit and killing regulatory things that stand in the way. That is why we are here.

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

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

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, over 6 months ago, the Obama administration actually identified the Zika virus as a public health crisis. It is well reported on. My constituents are aware of it. It has already affected many Americans in States like Florida, Texas, and Louisiana. The Obama administration requested additional resources to combat the virus.

The White House and the CDC correctly predicted that the virus would soon spread to the Southern United States. In fact, just as Congress left for its 7-week break, there were several reports of Zika transmission in south Florida. In fact, just last week, the Director of the CDC warned that, without congressional action, they will soon run out of money for combating Zika.

Now, in a moment, I will talk about the bills we are considering, but I think the American people expect Congress to react to a public health crisis. Had we reacted 7 weeks ago, perhaps we wouldn't be where we are today. I need and call upon this body to act today so that we are in a better situation 7 weeks hence.

In fact, the House is only in session for 15 more days before taking at least a 6-week break in October and November. In the handful of days we have left, it is critical to provide an emergency package to fight back against Zika. That is not currently on the calendar, Mr. Speaker. Instead, we are considering these bills. I will be going into the merits and lack thereof of them; but certainly, I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would agree with the objective assessment that these bills do nothing to combat Zika or address the public health concerns around Zika.

The Senate did pass a partisan Zika funding bill to provide emergency resources. It doesn't have unrelated poison pills unrelated to Zika. Obviously, issues like where or if the flag of the rebel States, the Confederate flag, is displayed, or whether Planned Parenthood is funded, these are contentious issues here, but I think we all agree they have nothing to do with Zika. The Confederate flag does not have an impact on Zika. Planned Parenthood has at least a related aspect to it—reproductive health.

Of course, one of the symptoms or one of the effects of Zika is a higher rate of microcephaly among children that are born to women who suffer from Zika while they are pregnant. So certainly the family planning aspect of it is relevant, but not central, to the issues affecting public health around Zika. We need to make sure that there aren't any of those poison pill provisions and move forward.

Instead, we have different bills here. We have bills related to financial markets.

The first one is the Accelerating Access to Capital Act of 2016. That one brings together several different bills that had been offered.

First, it includes a bill that affects microcap companies, or pink sheet companies, and removes many of the SEC transparency regulations around how they sell stock and how they are listed. It is not a step forward for transparency. In fact, this kind of effort is likely to decrease confidence in our public marketplace. It is likely to hurt the very stock market that presumably it was designed to help.

This would effectively allow microcap companies worth less than $75 million with one class of securities to issue an unlimited number of shares using shelf registration in a 12-month period, not even notifying the SEC ahead of the issuance, and permit unlisted microcap companies to sell up to one-third of the aggregate market value of their common equity using shelf registration in a 12-month period.

In many ways, these provisions are at odds with the other bills that I will talk about, which provides some regulatory relief towards private equity by favoring small cap public companies. It is hard for a small company to be public. It is questionable whether small cap companies should be public.

When we talk about private equity in a moment, we will see that one of the features of that is: A, they have, of course, a more sophisticated ownership; and, B, they have a more concentrated ownership. So, for instance, the issues like runaway executive pay, CEO pay, is less of a problem with private equity and a significant problem with public companies, and, again, in particularly small cap companies with diffuse ownership, which this bill would likely lead to more of.

It would also remove exchange protections like corporate governance requirements. Again, these kinds of measures reduce confidence in the public marketplace, they hurt the stock market, and, in the immediate and long term, they hurt the ability of companies to go public and access public capital because of the reputation of the pink sheets and the reputation of microcap.

It is a fine line. I am sure that we would probably agree on some regulatory relief around small cap companies, but this package is not it. This package would hurt the stock market, hurt access to capital, and hurt the very legitimate players that it is designed to help.

The second bill in here is the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act. It would eliminate Federal and State investor protection around crowdfunding in regulation A under certain conditions.

First, I was an original sponsor of the JOBS bill. I worked with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get that through. I will be among the first to say that I was disappointed with the way that that has been implemented by the administration. Crowdfunding should be easy. It should not have 900 pages of regulations.

The main consumer safeguard that we have in there is that nonaccredited investors are only allowed to invest up to $10,000. That is a very important protection that we have. This would eliminate that protection under several circumstances. One, if there are 35 or fewer purchasers; or, two, the aggregate amount of securities sold by the issuer is $500,000 or less in a 1-year period. It basically does away with one of the legislatively imposed consumer protections in the JOBS Act.

Now, I would agree. I think there has been some regulatory-imposed inhibitions in the JOBS Act that I wish that we could strike out in a laser-like way with a scalpel. In fact, many States, including my own State of Colorado, have implemented more sensible bipartisan crowdfunding legislation that enables it to occur at least within a State in a much easier way than the very cumbersome Federal law which does inhibit both the use of crowdfunding as well as the presence of crowdfunding as part of an overall capital strategy because of the difficulties concerning other types of capital investors and capital partners.

I would love to see reform of the JOBS Act or reform around micro offering, but this particular answer really undermines the entire concept of the consumer protections. It is not targeted. It removes the protections for smaller of the smallest of the small offerings. And again, what you would find and the danger here is folks—we can call them scam artists or folks trying to make a buck off of this and not build legitimate businesses—can simply set up a number of companies each raising under $500,000 to meet the criteria of this exemption. There is not any consumer protection around that. There is nothing to stop a bad actor from asking for significant investments for each of those companies, even from the same individual depleting the savings of that individual rather than sticking to the $10,000 cap, which was in our JOBS Act.

So again, I would like, and many of my colleagues on my side of the aisle would like, crowdfunding to be easier, to be done quicker, to remove some of the excess paperwork and regulation A requirements, but maintaining that basic consumer safeguard and not providing exemptions just because there are 35 or fewer purchasers or $500,000 or less over a 1-year period. It doesn't even address overlapping ownership or related status between, again, multiple companies that might each raise $500,000, might substantially have the same external owners, but would get around the JOBS Act consumer protection provisions by effectively cloning a bunch of small companies and offering them up separately for individual investors. These things need to be thought through.

There is a kernel of an idea in there. I agree that the administration has gone beyond the legislative intent of the JOBS Act in its implementation of the JOBS Act. There is, hopefully, a way that we can work together to empower crowdfunding to play a more central role in capital development in entrepreneurship in our country. This bill is not it.

The final component of that bill, the Private Placement Improvement Act of 2016, would make it very difficult for the SEC to finalize investor protections that it proposed back in 2013. The title would require issuers selling securities under an exemption that allows companies to raise an unlimited amount of money to file within 15 days of sale a single notice of sale, which the SEC would then be required to make available to State and other regulators.

This relates to some current rules that the SEC is moving forward with. I think that, again, there is a way to tweak those rules, but I don't think that this is the way to do it, to allow for unlimited capital to be raised under a single notice of sale. And, of course, this also affects the prerogative of State regulators, and there are a variety of practices there, by requiring the SEC to make it available to State and other regulators.

I think that there is room for improvement in that area, but, again, the bill falls short.

Now, the other bill, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016, a majority of Democrats on the committee support it. Many also voiced concerns. Some were the concerns of the Obama administration about some of those provisions. But I am glad to say that many of those concerns have been addressed by my colleague's, Mr. FOSTER's, amendment.

First, a little bit about private equity and what this bill does and doesn't do.

□ 1300

My State and my district, like, probably, every other district in the country, has seen the benefits and the impact of private equity investment in its providing growth capital to companies, providing stability in ownership. There are over 100 private equity-backed companies headquartered in Colorado that we know of that support close to 100,000 jobs in Colorado. In 2015, private equity firms invested $12 billion in Colorado-based companies. They are real jobs, and they have contributed to the economic growth that Colorado has seen over the last few years and that the country will see over the next few years.

Private equity has helped to create and sustain thousands of jobs and has made substantial investments in every State in the country. It provides returns to public pensions, to university endowments, to many people as part of their own individual retirement plans and savings. It is important both from a capital perspective and from an operating perspective—a very important sector. Firms that are owned by private equity—at least, because, again, there could be some that are not part of this—employ over 8 million people. The private equity industry invested over $600 billion into these companies. For physical infrastructure, for additional hires, for expansion, private equity has been a source of capital for Main Street businesses across our country, in my State, and everywhere else in the country.

That is why the bill passed the Financial Services Committee with a majority of Democrats—with strong bipartisan support—and I think it will pass this body with strong bipartisan support as well.

Of course, there have been stories about bad actors in private equity just as there could be bad actors among any type of ownership entity. That is what private equity is. It is a type of entity that may own a local company.

What are the other kinds of ownership that a company may have?

It may have public ownership. It may be public. We talked about that in the microcap bill. In many ways, that is a worse form of ownership in that there is additional administrative overhead that is associated with being public. Even if the regulatory relief were to become the law, there is still significant additional overhead with being public. It is very difficult for a $20 million or a $50 million company.

Two, because of the diffuse ownership, frequently, there is no one watching the shop, meaning that management runs it. We have the problems of excess CEO pay, of excess executive pay. There are horror stories of CEOs making hundreds of times the pay of the line workers. Those kinds of things don't happen in private equity-backed companies. There is someone minding the shop, and the entity that is minding the shop is an entity that is looking for long-term growth, for long-term stability. They are not in and out.

There has been some confusion among Members of this body in discussing hedge funds versus private equity. Private equity is not a hedge fund. Hedge funds have liquidity, and they make transactions rapidly. They don't participate in governance and growth. Private equity is very, very different. It is more analogous to venture capital. They are in there for 5 years, 6 or 7 years, 10 years—long-term investors who are building the companies, serving on boards, recruiting others to serve on boards, providing sound corporate governance, making sure that CEOs and executives aren't paid too much, making sure that talent is in the company, making sure that growth capital is available.

H.R. 5424 just takes a scalpel approach to existing regulations by focusing on aspects of SEC adviser registration that impede the capital formation in the private equity industry. For instance, there are provisions in the bill that would make reporting to the SEC more efficient and effective for their purposes and less costly and burdensome for private equity firms.

Keep in mind that private equity firms do not represent, in any way, shape, or form, a systemic risk to our Nation's financial security. They are simply a type of ownership that Main Street companies have. If a private equity firm invests poorly, runs companies poorly, they will deliver a very poor return for their investors. That does not impact in any systemic way the economy in the way that a hedge fund—placing highly leveraged bets on derivatives or on some other financial instrument—can cause an entire economic meltdown, as we saw during the mortgage-backed security crisis in 2008 and in 2009.

Private equity firms provide patient, stable, long-term capital to privately owned businesses across the country. In fact, they help take the emphasis off of the quarterly financial reports that are so important for public companies.

One of the failures of public company governance is that there is too much emphasis on the short term at the expense of the long term—too much emphasis to pump up the quarter at the expense of medium- and long-term growth—2 years, 3 years, 4 years—in underinvestment in research and in

underinvestment in long-term growth. Having a private equity ownership of an operating company addresses that kind of moral hazard that exists with regard to the incentives of the public marketplace.

Private equity firms have a long-term outlook that results in lower volatility. While the public company model may not perform as well as private equity firms, it, obviously, can provide access to capital, to additional liquidity that private equity doesn't have. The two are related in that, for some private equity investors, their goal is a public offering exit in the 5-to 10-year time frame. That is not always the case, but that can be the case; and having an operable public market in addition to a private equity market is, of course, of interest and importance to the private equity industry as well, which is why the reforms in the other bill are so bad, because they deteriorate confidence in the stock market. They ultimately will result in decreasing liquidity for the good actors, meaning some of the private equity-backed or owner-operator-owned companies that want to have a public partial exit or exit through the public marketplace.

Again, the bill isn't perfect. The White House identified a number of issues. But, fortunately, my colleague, Representative FOSTER, offered an amendment, which has been accepted and, hopefully, that will address a number of these issues.

The amendment removes a provision of the bill that would have allowed certain ancillary or minor funds or entities that are affiliated with a private equity firm to also be exempt from annual audits or surprise inspections. It addresses concerns around transparency by continuing the current requirement that advisers provide information about fees and services in a brochure. It restores the transparency elements while maintaining the concept of the regulatory relief of redundant regulations with regard to capital formation and private equity.

The goal is to enact this commonsense bill that will make it more efficient for private equity firms to operate and continue to grow businesses on Main Street in districts like mine and across the country while simultaneously maintaining the regulatory regime to make sure that nothing untoward is occurring.

The bill does not, as some have falsely argued, allow private equity firms to escape regulation by any stretch. In fact, most private equity firms have embraced the changes that have been implemented under Dodd-Frank. They have compliance teams to make sure they are operating properly under the new regulatory scheme. In any form, they do not represent a systemic risk, but to protect investors, many of them agree with the sensible regulations that have been imposed with the exception of those that we are seeking to remove that are redundant and that create overhead. When you create overhead for private equity firms, that results in less investment in our Main Street businesses. If they have to divert funds to comply with unnecessary regulations for the sake of regulations, it is that much less money and that many fewer jobs in your Main Street businesses located in your districts.

The substitute amendment makes positive changes to the legislation. It addresses many of the concerns that have been raised about the bill. I and many of my colleagues plan to support its passage and also take this occasion to make sure that our colleagues are aware of the contributions of this particular model of ownership to our Main Street businesses. It has been a growth sector, in fact, largely due to showing, over time, superior performance to companies that have a public governance model, in fact, in large part, due to their dissipated owner base and lack of concentration in ownership.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado's not only observations as a business leader from Colorado, but as a member of the Rules Committee. He recognizes the need for ideas to flow up from the industry to Members of Congress, for us to, on a bipartisan basis, approach these issues to where we can provide safety and soundness for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Delano, Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), the gentleman who is offering his legislation, which is a part of title II of the legislation.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, government doesn't create jobs; people create jobs. But with the President, Congress can create Federal policies that establish a pro-worker and pro-business environment to lift people out of poverty, to help families, and to allow Americans to realize their greatest dreams.

One problem today that is impeding job growth is the access to capital for small business. Often, American entrepreneurs can't get the money they need to start a new enterprise or to grow an existing one. In fact, small businesses still create the majority of new jobs in our country today despite the fact that far fewer small business loans are being made today than were being made prior to the 2008 recession.

Compounding this problem even further is the unfortunate reality that entrepreneurs from less affluent communities often have the greatest difficulty in securing the capital they need to make their business dreams come true. As a result, thousands of jobs and hundreds of new products are left on the drawing board as unrealized aspirations of American entrepreneurs. Thankfully, if the rule before us today is adopted, the House can consider four solutions that will address this small business access to capital problem immediately.

The Accelerating Access to Capital Act of 2016 will make it easier for businesses to raise capital. First, thanks to Congresswoman WAGNER, this legislation will make it easier for small companies to comply with SEC security registration requirements by simplifying the process, by eliminating duplicative paperwork, and by, ultimately, allowing people to do their business instead of compliance.

Second, thanks to Congressman GARRETT's Private Placement Improvement Act, the bill will make it easier for small businesses to raise capital under rule 506 of regulation D, ultimately leading to greater access to capital for small businesses and unleashing the full potential of title II of the JOBS Act.

Third, the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act will make it easier for Americans to raise capital from friends and family if three simple criteria are met. These three criteria include that the investor has a substantive preexisting relationship with the owner, that there are 35 or fewer investors, and that the aggregate amount of the investment does not exceed $500,000.

Additionally, this provision would exempt such offerings from blue sky requirements, but with all Federal and State antifraud laws remaining in effect. It is important to note that this micro offering proposal does not create a new law, but, rather, simply clarifies an existing law by making an explicit safe harbor for certain private security offerings under the Securities Act of 1933.

Finally, thanks to Congressman HURT and Congressman VARGAS, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act will modernize the Investment Advisers Act by removing redundancies and making necessary enhancements to increase capital formation.

With American productivity decreasing, wages essentially stagnant, and the U.S. economy struggling to get to historically normal GDP growth levels, these proposals in the Accelerating Access to Capital Act will help jump-start our ailing economy. By providing new opportunities to make the most of capital formation vehicles that are already available or by creating new ones, these proposed reforms will enable American entrepreneurs and small businesses to access the capital they need to grow and to prosper.

I thank the Speaker of the House and the chairman of the Financial Services Committee for prioritizing the consideration of these pro-business, pro-jobs, and antipoverty bills. I encourage my colleagues in the House to support the rule. This is a tremendous opportunity for the House to support Main Street mom-and-pop stores, aspiring entrepreneurs, and established manufacturers to create jobs, wealth, and opportunity for Americans from all walks of life.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I do have a speaker, but I can't locate her right now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you just heard from one of our brightest new members of the Committee on Financial Services. This committee is full, on a bipartisan basis, of men and women who care very much about growing our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee and the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying legislation of this H.R. 2357. It encompasses, by the way, H.R. 4850, and this is the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act.

What I will share with my colleagues is that California is the innovation capital of the world. From Silicon Valley to Orange County, technology startups are reimagining the way that the world works, and these new companies don't have thousands of people on payroll.

□ 1315

They don't need dozens of floors of office space. They don't need billions of dollars to function, but they do need capital. They need that capital to operate. Our current regulatory framework creates impediments to these small businesses tapping into the market.

According to the Federal Reserve, the startup rate has fallen sharply over the past 30 years. It was 14 percent of total companies in a given year, but today it is down to 8 percent. The likelihood of a young firm being a high-growth firm has also declined over the years, and these trends are alarming, if you think about the consequences. These trends need to be reversed.

The Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act turns the tide by lowering compliance burdens for firms seeking low-dollar investments from a small group of investors that they have a relationship with. So the legislation appropriately scales the regulatory oversight of capital formation, while keeping intact investor protections.

The resources that startups would sink into compliance and legal costs could be redirected—to what?—to hiring workers, redirected to creating new products. Uber, Google, and Airbnb, these were all startups. Passage of the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act ensures that the next success story will be told.

I thank Mr. EMMER of Minnesota for his work on this important issue.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the legislation.

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

The gentleman talked about the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act. Again, I think that there is the kernel of a good idea there, if the good idea would be to streamline the excess regulation above and beyond the consumer safeguards that were put in the JOBS Act; if the bill, for instance, were to take some of the best practices from the States, including my home State of Colorado, around crowdfunding and put them into a revised version of Federal direction.

To be clear, I would join my colleagues in agreeing that the administration went well beyond the expressed legislative intent and legislative language of the JOBS Act in creating barriers to micro financing across the country. Unfortunately, that is not what this bill does.

It cuts back by providing gaping loopholes on the consumer protections that Congress very thoughtfully intended to put in the JOBS Act. So these are not the unintended regulatory aspects that the administration added to the JOBS Act. These are cutting away at the very consumer protections which Congress deliberately—including, as one of the coauthors of the bill along with my Republican colleagues, Mr. ISSA and many others, the protections that we actually put into the bill, this would gut. So, again, a kernel of a good idea.

Perhaps the inception of this bill is, hey, we messed up on the implementation of crowdfunding. Let's fix it. Unfortunately, that is not what this bill does. I wish it was what this bill does. It is something I am certainly interested in doing. I think many of my Democratic colleagues are, and we would be happy to work on a bipartisan basis to address the poor implementation of the JOBS Act.

Of course, if there was something expressly provided legislatively, we would be happy to go back and look at that. But this glaring loophole that is opened is simply not it, with regard to if there are fewer than 35 purchasers, under $500,000, some kind of preexisting relationship. These loopholes are simply too broad and would effectively remove the consumer protections that we have in crowdfunding.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the bipartisan no fly, no buy legislation, which I am proud to support. It would allow the Attorney General to bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

If somebody is on the FBI terrorist watch list, they should not be allowed to quietly assemble an arsenal to commit a terrorist act. In fact, the FBI should immediately be on top of the situation, find out their intent, and see what is going on. It is a commonsense bill that would help keep America safe. My amendment would give the House an opportunity to simply vote on this commonsense bill, which so far, unfortunately, the Republicans have not even allowed us to debate. We cannot wait any longer for Congress to take meaningful action to reduce the risk of terrorism in our own country, and this bill would do that.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we have been talking about thoughtful young members of the Financial Services Committee, who work with people all across the United States who are engaged in financial services to bring more capital to bear, not only for small business, but also better investment tools, investor tools. We have had the advantage of having not only Mr. POLIS, a young entrepreneur from Colorado, but we have had ED ROYCE. We have had TOM EMMER.

We now would like to have another very bright, young man who serves on the Financial Services Committee to talk to us, who brings this bill to us from Winfield, Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 844, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act, and H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act.

I know how hard my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee worked in crafting this legislation that will strengthen our economy. I am, also, grateful for the hard work to make sure that this is a bipartisan effort. I was proud to support this legislation in the committee, and I am hopeful it will see a strong vote of approval when voted here on the House floor.

I am proud to join Representatives VARGAS, STIVERS, FOSTER, and SINEMA as a cosponsor of Mr. HURT's legislation, H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act. The modest changes that this legislation would make makes it easier to invest in job creators, our families, and our communities.

Dan Gallagher, a recent Commissioner of the Securities and Exchange Commission, agrees and has testified in the Financial Services Committee that the bill ''preserves the registration regime for private fund advisers while at the same time removing or modernizing—in rather modest ways—some of the more unnecessary, outdated, and overly burdensome requirements of the now 76-year old Advisers Act that drive costs up for funds and investors, and hinder the efficient allocation of capital to help grow businesses and create jobs.''

These changes will make it easier to invest in our communities, and these administrative savings then can be passed on to investors.

The Accelerating Access to Capital Act, led by my colleague on the Financial Services Committee Mrs. WAGNER,

would make it easier for small businesses and entrepreneurs to access the capital they need to grow their companies and create jobs.

It is important that we have smart regulations in place that provide certainty to investors and to our markets. It is equally important that the Securities and Exchange Commission not unnecessarily inhibit capital formation. In fact, the agency has a mission that states these two things should be treated with equal importance.

This important package of legislation includes relatively modest but meaningful changes to our securities laws that will improve access to capital for smaller businesses and entrepreneurs without jeopardizing consumer protection.

Title I of this package authorized by Mrs. WAGNER makes it easier for more small companies to use a less burdensome document when registering with the SEC. Over the last 5 years, the number of smaller companies—those with less than 500 employees—has declined. This is the first time that this has happened since the U.S. Census Bureau began keeping data on the subject.

In 2012, the SEC's Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation report included a recommendation to modernize and expand the utility of form S–3 for a great number of public companies. This is just what Mrs. WAGNER's legislation proposes to do.

Furthermore, the report noted that investor protection concerns have been substantially eliminated with the advanced information technology, including EDGAR, which is the SEC's electronic disclosure filing system.

The Accelerating Access to Capital Act includes two other very important titles. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) has put forth legislation that would exempt certain micro offerings from the registration requirement of the Securities Act of 1933. This important change in law would allow a startup business—the engines driving growth in our economy—to solicit friends and family to invest in their businesses.

Investors with a preexisting relationship with those most committed to the company's success likely have the greatest understanding of its growth trajectory and prospects for generating a healthy return on investment. This will allow small business to access capital without having to navigate more complicated Federal securities registration or win approval of the SEC. Mr. EMMER's legislation will help fuel growth on Main Street and help create the jobs our constituents deserve.

Mr. GARRETT, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises and a strong leader on these issues, has put forth legislation to ensure the SEC returns more of its focus to supporting capital formation, just as Congress intended in the JOBS Act.

Mr. GARRETT's legislation would direct the SEC to revise regulation D, so fewer small businesses are required to register their securities with the agency. It would help eliminate some of the most excessive regulation we hear about far too often from our constituents.

The legislation will allow entrepreneurs and small businesses to go back to doing what they do best—innovating and creating jobs—ensuring families in our communities have a paycheck to put food on the table, can cover the increasing costs of health care, and provide opportunities to help their children be successful in the world.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING and my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee for all of this hard work. I encourage all of my colleagues to support the rule and the legislation to follow.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, in fact, in this colloquy, I do have an additional speaker, and then I would choose to close.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Financial Services has presented a number of their members who have come to the floor today to offer thoughts and ideas on a bipartisan basis, thoughts and ideas that have emanated up from literally financial services experts across the country, commonsense ideas, and investor ideas. They have been vetted. They have been looked at. They have been talked about. They have been marked up on a bipartisan basis; and that is why we are here today, to make capital easier and more available from an investor perspective, as well as from the perspective of the financial services industry.

One of the leaders from the Financial Services Committee for a number of years has been our next speaker, and I am delighted to yield 5 minutes to a favorite son of St. Elizabeth, Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman and friend from Texas, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for that eloquent introduction. I also thank him for all of his hard work on his committee as well as bringing this important bill to the floor.

I also want to recognize my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee, Mr. GARRETT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. HURT, for their tireless efforts on behalf of our Nation's investors and small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, today or tomorrow, the House will consider legislation that will allow small businesses and those starting or investing in small businesses to access needed capital without being subject to burdensome and unnecessary regulation.

As we have seen throughout the financial services sector and across our economy, one-size-fits-all rules are damaging our Nation's businesses, financial institutions, and, as a result, American workers and their families. Main Street has been crushed under the weight of this administration's regulatory regime, as even the ranking member admits.

H.R. 2357, composed of three bills that passed the Financial Services Committee earlier this year, simplifies registration requirements for small companies and facilitates access to capital without triggering costly regulatory expenditures.

H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016, eliminates duplicative requirements for investment advisers, allows for greater capital formation and development, and streamlines elements of the 76-year-old Investment Advisers Act.

I recently met with a company in my district that relied upon private equity to stay afloat and continued to employ my constituents. Capital should be used to create jobs and spur economic growth and, as the chairman mentioned in his opening remarks, to help Americans realize the American Dream. Capital should not be used to fulfill meaningless and unproductive regulatory requirements.

Our economy sits in idle. It is time to put it in drive. Regulation should serve to protect taxpayers and not hurt them. It should enhance the economy, not stymie it. There is no room for regulation that serves to appease bureaucratic demands.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, I come from the business world, and in another life I was a banker on the regulatory side of the table as well as a bank examiner. I have seen the impact of rules and regulations on small businesses and communities, and my community as well. I have looked across the table and helped those small businesses get started. Capital is the lifeblood of these small businesses being able to start businesses, help employ people, and be able to help people have jobs and enhance the communities that they come from. It is extremely important.

These discussions that we are having today are important from the standpoint of enhancing our ability as a nation to continue to thrive and grow, and to stymie what is hurting ourselves. The statistics are there. Small businesses have been deteriorating. We have lost more small businesses in the last several years than we have had. So, therefore, why do you think we have the jobs problem that we have today? It is pretty evident to me.

This rule and the underlying bills we will consider during the remainder of this week will move us towards an economic recovery and a more responsible regulatory environment.

I want to, again, thank my colleagues on the Committee on Financial

Services and the Committee on Rules for their work on these issues and for their advocacy on behalf of our Nation's investors, small businesses, and employees.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Texas prepared to close?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would expect at this time that I have no further speakers and will close when given that opportunity.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, while I do applaud Democrats and Republicans for coming together around H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act, I wish that we had come together around the pressing public health crisis of Zika. I wish we had come together to prevent terrorists from assembling arsenals to commit terrorist acts in our country. Unfortunately, while the Senate has acted in a bipartisan way to address Zika, House Republicans continue to sit on their hands and ignore this critical public health issue. The CDC is quickly running out of money to combat Zika. We have yet to even begin serious discussions on comprehensive immigration reform, with only a couple months left in this session, not to mention the crisis of lead in the pipes in Flint, Michigan. And, of course, in the weeks after the deadliest mass shooting in our Nation's history, Congress has not acted on anything around preventing violence, as well.

We should be voting on those kinds of bills. Many of those are also bipartisan, just as this private equity bill is, but I would argue that they are more timely, more important. Instead of focusing on policies that help save lives, Republicans are instead spending time on two bills, one of which will almost certainly receive a veto from the President. The other one, we hope that Mr. FOSTER's amendment addresses the issues the President had with it, but both of which are not likely to pass the United States Senate.

We are spending more of our time and taxpayer money ignoring the most pressing issues before us, issues that could move through the Senate, issues that I hear about from my constituents every day back home.

Again, I applaud the Democrats and Republicans coming together around the H.R. 5424 bill. This bill, if it were to become law, would absolutely encourage greater investment in mainstream businesses in our communities. It might make the difference of them making that additional hire or two. That might be your neighbor; that might be your cousin; that might be your spouse; it might even be you, that extra job or two or three that is created by encouraging private capital resources to be put into our communities.

Again, private equity had nothing to do with the financial meltdown in 2008 and 2009. There is nothing systemic about it. It is simply ownership groups of companies, and whether those owners are local ownership groups, whether they are founders, whether they are family offices, whether they are private equity, whether they are publicly traded, they all have pros and cons.

We, of course, like to think of the very idealized vision of a mainstream business where it is owned by your neighbor and somebody who is accountable that you know, but those kinds of businesses have transition issues as well. When their owner-operator gets ill or passes on, what is to become of those businesses? What is the route to sustainability? How can we make sure they continue to add value in the community? For many, for transition planning, private equity can provide that answer.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the bill and defeat the previous question so we can reduce the risk of a terrorist attack in our country, and vote ''no'' on this restrictive, misguided rule.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from Texas has 7¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate and thank my colleague, Mr. POLIS. Today has been a thoughtful exercise where there was some disagreement. That is okay. That does not bother me, and it should not bother him that he had to speak his mind in areas that he felt were important.

But today, Mr. Speaker, Mr. POLIS has very objectively been able to critique the bill in front of us, to provide his analysis of that bill, acknowledging it is a bipartisan bill, acknowledging that this bill is about jobs, job creation, making life better, albeit that it might be one or two people in a neighborhood. This country is full of neighborhoods and full of people who want a better job, people who want a better opportunity to invest, people who want to have their ideas taken up, and this bill came directly to us today from back home, back home people who have ideas, back home people who are looking at rules and regulations and saying, wow, that is an impediment to my good idea.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. EMMER, Chairman ROYCE all said, oh, by the way, they have an American Dream they are trying to live up to also, and there are things that are getting in the way of their dream. So they do the things that are necessary to float their ideas up to their Member of Congress. It came to the Committee on Financial Services. The young chairman, JEB HENSARLING, creates ideas that are able to move to legislation. That is why we are here on the floor today, subscribing ideas that provide more capital that is available.

The cost of securities regulation continues to fall heaviest on small companies. Small companies are the engine of our economy, where many of the bright people who today, by graduating from college, going to business school, learning things, they realize as they enter the marketplace, wow, there is another hurdle out there.

That is why we are here today. They want to bring their ideas to the marketplace. We are here to help them through safety and soundness, through working through the instruments of government, and to do so so that traditional financing options are available for small companies that work.

Our predatory administration—that is this Obama administration—is using Dodd-Frank as its main weapon against the free enterprise system today. This administration is using the weapons that they have available to them to stop and stifle and to make more difficult the creation of jobs, the creation of more wealth, the creation of investment, and it is all done. We see this, Mr. Speaker, when we look at GDP growth. Our country is stagnant.

Yesterday, when we were having the motion to recommit, the young gentlewoman from the Democratic side acknowledged most forthrightly, these are difficult financial times. All across America there are terrible financial times because of an administration that chooses to strike at the heart of the free enterprise system: the heart of the free enterprise system in health care, the heart of the free enterprise system in banking, and regulations on the energy industry, striking at the heart of people trying to get homes and keep jobs and to move things.

This administration has a constant attack against jobs, job creation, and, I believe, the American worker, yet they find it easier to give lots of money to other people but not Americans for our own job creation. That is why we are here today. But we are not going to cast this as what this is about.

What this is about is a positive effort about the American Dream, about good ideas, about bipartisanship, about following the rules to get things through a committee, to get things to the Committee on Rules, to get things on the floor, to get people to vote on a bipartisan basis.

We have, essentially, four bills in this rule, four bills that I believe are desperately—I will use that word, ''desperately''—needed by small business to grow and innovate ideas. What is on the other side of that? We have already said it 10 times, the American Dream. But it is also freedom. When issuers sell securities to the public, that means more money goes into the company, money that can be used to hire more people, push a product and make it successful. That is why we are here. We are here to take the ideas, a process, in a bipartisan way.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter which addresses an issue that my dear colleague has

talked about, and that is the Zika funding issue.

The letter was written to the President of the United States on July 14, 2016, and among other things it says: ''The House passed a conference report that would provide an additional $1.1 billion in emergency supplemental funding to continue to prepare for, and prevent, Zika both domestically and internationally. It is unfortunate that Democrats have blocked action on this legislation in the Senate.'' Mr. Speaker, they continue to do it today.

This letter—which was signed by the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman HAL ROGERS; the gentleman THAD COCHRAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; Chairman TOM COLE, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services; ROY BLUNT, chairman, Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services; KAY GRANGER from Fort Worth, Texas, chairwoman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations; LINDSEY GRAHAM, chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations—very clearly says: Mr. President, until that block by Senate Democrats is stopped, we give you authorization to reprogram money that would be available. You seem to find lots of money that is available to bring people to this country who might be displaced in other places around the world. Why don't you spend a little bit of money on important issues like the Zika virus?

We are on record. We are waiting for the Senate to move the bill. Mr. Speaker, I want you to know your time that you have allocated today, the precious time of this House, was done today for bills that came to us from ideas from the American people that floated on a bipartisan basis directly up to the Committee on Financial Services, which brought these bills forward. They have been talked about, marked up, and vetted. They are good to go, and I am in full support of not only this rule, but this legislation; and for that reason, I urge my colleagues to continue to support this rule and the underlying bills.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE SENDS JOINT HOUSE AND SENATE LETTER TO THE WHITE HOUSE URGING ACTION ON ZIKA FUNDING

WASHINGTON, July 14.—House Appropriations Committee Chairman Hal Rogers, along with Senate Appropriations Chairman Thad Cochran and other senior members of the House and Senate committees, today sent a joint letter to President Obama urging White House action on Zika funding.

Senate Democrats today again blocked legislation that would immediately fund efforts to prevent and fight the spread of the Zika virus. Chairmen Rogers and Cochran wrote that given the critical need for these funds and absent the funding that was blocked today, the White House should ''aggressively use funds already available to mount a strong defense against the virus.''

The full text of the letter is below:

JULY 14, 2016.

President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your Administration has asked Congress to provide additional resources to prepare for, and prevent, the spread of the Zika virus. We have responded by both supporting the reprioritization of existing resources and passing through our respective chambers legislation that would provide additional Zika response funding.

On February 18, 2016, we called upon your Administration to repurpose available funds to be spent immediately to fight the disease. On April 6, 2016, you did so through the use of existing authorities, repurposing $589 million for Zika response activities. Given the urgency of your request, we were surprised last week when Politico reported the following based on information shared by Administration officials: ''The Obama administration has so far distributed only about one-sixth of the unspent Ebola funding that it diverted to combat the Zika virus.'' This money is available immediately to prepare for and combat Zika, yet is seemingly not being spent.

The House passed a conference report that would provide an additional $1.1 billion in emergency supplemental funding to continue to prepare for, and prevent, Zika both domestically and internationally. It is unfortunate that Democrats have blocked action on this legislation in the Senate. The conference report provides the same amount of funding that every Senate Democrat previously supported. It fully funds vaccine research, and increases funding for mosquito spraying and eradication, Zika surveillance, and advanced development of treatments and diagnostics. The conference agreement provides the same access to health services as your supplemental request, contains no new prohibition on any health service, and expands access to health services in Puerto Rico beyond your initial request.

If Senate Democrats continue to block consideration of Zika legislation, we urge you to aggressively use funds already available to mount a strong defense against the virus. We also note that the fiscal year 2016 appropriations bills allow the Administration access to additional funds. The Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services has transfer authority that can be used as an additional source for Zika preparedness. The previous Secretary did not hesitate to use this authority to support the failing Affordable Care Act Exchanges. The Secretary of State also has authority to reprogram funding to provide additional foreign assistance to address the Zika virus outside the United States.

We urge you to use available funding now to ensure our nation is prepared.

Sincerely,

REP. HAL ROGERS,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee.

SEN. THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee.

REP. TOM COLE,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services.

SEN. ROY BLUNT,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services.

REP. KAY GRANGER,
Chairwoman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations.

SEN. LINDSEY GRAHAM,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 844 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to fmal passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

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

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

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

Mr. 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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered; and suspending the rules and adopting H. Res. 660.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 180, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 489]

AYES—238

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

NOES—180

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

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (GA)
Brown (FL)
Clarke (NY)
DesJarlais
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Nugent
Palazzo
Reichert
Ross
Sanchez, Loretta
Walters, Mimi
Westmoreland

□ 1405

Mr. WALKER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 181, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 490]

AYES—237

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann

Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
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
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
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—181

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

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (GA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Crawford
DesJarlais
Johnson, Sam
Nugent
Palazzo
Reichert
Ross
Sanchez, Loretta
Walters, Mimi
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1412

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.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY OF GEORGIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 660) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives to support the territorial integrity of Georgia, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 6, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

YEAS—410

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
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)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
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
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions

Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—6

Amash
Duncan (TN)
Jones
Massie
Rohrabacher
Smith (TX)

NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (GA)
Brown (FL)
DesJarlais
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Huelskamp
Johnson, Sam
Nugent
Palazzo
Reichert
Ross
Sanchez, Loretta
Walberg
Walters, Mimi
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1419

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCELERATING ACCESS TO CAPITAL ACT OF 2016

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, H.R. 2357, to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise Form S–3 so as to add listing and registration of a class of common equity securities on a national securities exchange as an additional basis for satisfying the requirements of General Instruction I.B.1. of such form and to remove such listing and registration as a requirement of General Instruction I.B.6. of such form.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 844 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2357.

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

□ 1423

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2357) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise Form S–3 so as to add listing and registration of a class of common equity securities on a national securities exchange as an additional basis for satisfying the requirements of General Instruction I.B.1. of such form and to remove such listing and registration as a requirement of General Instruction I.B.6. of such form, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, regrettably, we know that we continue to be mired in the slowest, weakest, and most tepid economic recovery in the history of the Republic, and our fellow citizens continue to suffer. The economy continues to not work for working people.

Now, we hear a lot of happy talk coming out of the administration, and they throw statistics at us telling us how happy we should be with this economy. But the economy is limping along at 1.5 to 2 percent of economic growth when the historic norm is 3.5 percent; and if you can't grow America's economy, you cannot grow the family economy.

So all this happy talk coming out of the administration, try to convince the 8 million Americans who don't have a job that this is a good economy. Try telling that to the 6 million Americans who want to work full time but only find part-time employment. Mr. Chairman, tell that to the 94 million Americans who are out of the workforce entirely. So many of them have just given up ever being able to find any type of gainful employment in this economy.

Again, it is falling so far short of its potential. All across America, American families are worrying: How are they going to pay the bills? How are they going to pay the mortgage? How are they going to be able to pay their skyrocketing healthcare premiums under ObamaCare?

We must—we must—get this economy moving again, but, Mr. Chairman, our great challenge is the job engine of America is broken, and the job engine is small business. One of the primary challenges for small business is they cannot access capital. Right now, bank lending to small businesses is at a 25-year low. Entrepreneurship, the launching of new business, and innovation, Mr. Chairman, is at a generational low. We have more small-business deaths than we do births in America today. This cannot be allowed to stand.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I am so happy that today the House Financial Services Committee is putting together a package of bills that will help unleash capital for our innovators, for our entrepreneurs, and for our small businesses.

It is all part of the House Republican Better Way. We don't have to be stuck in this lackluster Obamanomics economy that is not working for working people. We can do better, and we must do better. So I am happy today that we will soon be voting on H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act, sponsored by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), who has been a real leader in access to capital.

This is a bill which simply amends a registration form with the Securities and Exchange Commission to eliminate unnecessary cost for small private companies.

This overburdensome regulation that has nothing to do with consumer protection is strangling small businesses. We need to pass this bill, again, because the cost of securities registration is falling heaviest—heaviest—on our small companies.

Another bill in this package, Mr. Chairman, is H.R. 4850, the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act sponsored by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER). This would give really small businesses and startups more flexibility to raise funds from existing relationships without having the added cost of having to register with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The third bill in this package is H.R. 4852, the Private Placement Improvement Act sponsored by the chairman of our Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), and it helps the bipartisan JOBS Act reach its full potential by maintaining a clear and commonsense approach to regulations for private offerings.

Again, it simply helps smaller companies raise capital. You cannot have the benefits of capitalism for American families without capital.

I commend each of my colleagues on the House Financial Services Committee for authoring these bills, for furthering these bills, and for what they will do to ensure that we can have economic growth for all, bank bailouts for none.

Now, we will soon hear from the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, and if history is our guide, we will have great angst, wailing, and gnashing of teeth that somehow this is hurting consumers. Nothing—nothing—in this package does anything to detract from the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Investment Company Act of 1940, the Investors Advisers Act of 1940, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, and the list goes on. Fraud is fraud. Fraud is illegal. You cannot have competitive, efficient markets with it.

□ 1430

But the SEC has a tri-part mission. Part of that mission is capital formation, and they have failed. They have failed. We must succeed on behalf of American families.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am going to oppose this bill because I think it rolls back too many investor protections. But I understand and appreciate the chairman's goals here. We all support the goal of increasing capital formation. We just disagree on the best way to accomplish it.

My view is that the best way to stimulate investment is to treat investors well and protect them, and that means strong investor protections. I firmly believe that markets run more, and better, on confidence than on capital.

Unfortunately, this bill goes in the wrong direction. It strips away protections that investors want in order to feel comfortable investing in startups and small companies.

I have particular concerns with title I of this bill, which would allow very small and thinly traded companies to sell securities using the faster shelf registration process. This raises serious market manipulation concerns. Let me explain why.

Shelf registration allows companies to register securities in advance and then sell them later on short notice, without getting SEC approval. Traditionally, shelf registration has been limited to larger, well-known companies, like GE or Apple, that are already widely followed by the markets, in other words, companies that investors are already very familiar with.

In 2007, the SEC decided to expand the number of companies who are eligible to use shelf registration. In doing so, however, the SEC was very careful to balance this against the need to maintain strong investor protection.

The SEC was comfortable allowing certain very small companies to have a limited ability to use shelf registration to offer securities, but only on the condition that the company have at least one class of securities listed on the exchange. This was because the exchanges have their own standards that companies must meet in order to get their securities listed on the exchange. These listing standards provide investors with sufficient assurance that the company is legitimate, has a reasonably wide investor base, and will have enough trading interest to assure a reasonable amount of liquidity in the stock.

Without the comfort provided by the exchange's initial screening procedures for these companies, however, I am not sure we should be comfortable allowing these very small companies to use shelf registration. But that is what this bill would do. It would allow very small companies that trade in over-the-counter markets to sell securities using shelf registration.

Allowing a small company, whose stock is very thinly traded to quickly sell a large amount of securities under the shelf registration raises real concerns about potential market manipulation. A company could easily bid up the price of its stock and then immediately dump a large amount of new stock to investors at the artificially inflated prices.

As Columbia Professor John Coffee noted in his testimony before the Financial Services Committee on this proposal last Congress: ''Letting a small company with a modest $50 million public float use shelf registration to attempt to sell $150 million in securities invites potential disaster and investor confusion.''

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD his entire, very critical testimony of the dangers of this legislation.

STATEMENT OF PROFESSOR JOHN C. COFFEE, JR., ADOLF A. BERLE PROFESSOR OF LAW, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL, APRIL 9, 2014

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO ENHANCE CAPITAL FORMATION FOR SMALL AND EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES

Chairman Garrett, Ranking Member Waters, and Fellow Members of the Committee:

Introduction

I thank you for inviting me. I have been asked to comment on seven proposed bills, some of which appear to be a still early stage of drafting. Reasonable people can disagree about several of these provisions, but others are beyond the pale. Still, my overarching comment is that each of these bills represents a piecemeal attempt to ''tweak'' something in our existing system, but collectively they are uncoordinated and lack any consistent vision. If there is any common theme to these bills, it is that better integration and coordination is desirable between our twin disclosure regimes under the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. That could well be true. If so, the appropriate starting point might be to mandate a study by the SEC (within, say, a realistic two-year period) of how to better coordinate both (1) these two disclosure systems, and (2) public and private offerings. Absent such an attempt at coordination, we will obtain only piecemeal (and fumbling) reforms that resemble the seven blind men groping at the elephant. In particular, as these proposals suggest, private placements may soon overtake public offerings—without adequate attention being given to the appropriate role of each.

More generally, we seem to be moving from JOBS Act I to a JOBS Act II without any serious evaluation of the impact of the first round of changes. On balance, the JOBS Act may have had only modest impact, and the proposals that are being considered today will likely have less. Because my time is limited, I will analyze these proposals in terms of the intensity of my reaction, moving from those that I feel are likely to cause real harm to those that are understandable (but that probably do not require legislation). I will 509 begin with a provision (the definition of ''well-known seasoned issuer'') whose impact has not been adequately or candidly explained.

1. The Definition of ''Well-Known Seasoned Issuer.'' This may be the most radically deregulatory of the seven proposals now before this Subcommittee, but it has not been adequately explained just how far reaching this proposal would be. The proposal derives from the 2011 Report of the SEC Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation, where it was the 19th out of 25 recommendations made by that body. Frankly, it received only lukewarm support. The recommendation there made was to:

''Expand the availability of the special public offering provisions currently applicable only to ''well-known seasoned issuers'' (WKSIs) to all public companies, including smaller reporting companies and foreign private issuers. This would permit such companies to, *among other things:*

a. File a universal shelf registration statement;

b. Test the waters;

c. Pay as you go; and

d. Use forward incorporation by reference for Form S–1 registration statements.'' (Emphasis added)

Each of these ''benefits'' can be debated. For example, a WKSI is exempt from the ''gun jumping'' and ''quiet period'' restrictions of Section 5(c) of the Securities Act of 1933, and there can be reasonable debate about the wisdom of freeing smaller companies from these rules. Still, the key implication of expanding the definition of ''well-known seasoned issuer'' has not been explained: it would permit the majority of public companies to qualify for ''automatic shelf registration.'' This may not have been the intent, but it is the consequence.

Under Rule 405, a ''Well-Known Seasoned Issuer'' generally qualifies for ''automatic shelf registration.'' Since 2005, the instant that a ''well-known seasoned issuer'' files a registration statement, the registration statement becomes ''effective'' and the securities can be sold under it—without any prior SEC review. As a practical matter, allowing a company to qualify for automatic shelf registration both (1) denies the SEC's staff any opportunity to review and correct the registration statement before sales are made, and (2) makes it much more difficult for the issuer, its investment bankers, and its other agents to conduct a pre-offering ''due diligence'' review of the registration statement's contents (because there no longer is a pre-offering period between the filing of the registration statement and its effectiveness). Further, the SEC has a substantial staff in its Division of Corporation Finance that conducts a pre-effectiveness review of the registration statement and engages in a dialogue with the issuer. This provision short-circuits that review and largely renders them irrelevant for such issuers.

At present, a ''well-known seasoned issuer'' (or ''WKSI'' in the parlance) basically must either (i) have a ''public float'' of at least $700 million (that is, the worldwide market value of its common equity, voting and nonvoting, held by non-affiliates must equal or exceed $700 million), or (ii) have issued over the last three years $1 billion in non-convertible debt securities. These are high standards. By some estimates, only about a third of the issuers on the NYSE meet this standard.

Under the proposed legislation, the $700 million standard would be reduced to $250 million. At that point, probably a majority of the issuers on both the NYSE and Nasdaq could become WKSIs—and in most cases could use ''automatic shelf registration.'' Many of these issuers might be followed by only a single securities analyst, and do not necessarily trade in an efficient market. The SEC's staff that reviews registration statements would be unable to focus on these offerings and would be left to concentrate on IPOs and very smaller issuers. This seems a poor allocation of the SEC's resources.

Since 1933, prior review by the SEC's staff of the registration statement has been one of

the bedrock protections of our federal securities laws. Thus, I suggest to you that it is a fairly radical step to deny the SEC's staff any opportunity for a pre-offering review of the securities to be issued by most issuers. Yet, that is what this proposed expansion of the definition of WKSI does. This result may or may have been intended, but it both invites misbehavior (if an issuer knows it will not be subject to prior review) and encourages costly litigation (if errors are later discovered).

Even if this proposal were cut back so that it only permitted smaller issuers to use ''universal shelf registration,'' I would still have some concerns. When shelf registration was first introduced in 1983, the issuer had to allocate the gross dollar value of its offering to specific types of securities (i.e., debt, equity, warrants, etc.). Then, in 1992, the SEC permitted unallocated shelf registration. In such a ''universal'' shelf registration, the issuer may pre-register debt, equity and other classes of securities in a single shelf registration statement without any allocation of offering amounts among these classes. In 509 1992, the SEC lowered the threshold for Form 5–3 and universal shelf registration to $75 million (well below the $250 level here proposed).

Thus, smaller issues can already make use of universal shelf registration. What then is achieved by expanding the definition of WKSIs (other than entitling the issuer to use ''automatic shelf registration'')? A partial answer is that WKSIs can uniquely register securities for sale for the account of selling shareholders without separately identifying ''the selling security holders or the securities to be sold by such persons'' until the time of the actual sale by such persons. See General Instruction ID(d) to Form 5–3. In short, by expanding the definition of WKSI, we facilitate not primary offerings by the issuer, but secondary sales by large shareholders. This does not raise capital for the issuer or create jobs, but essentially encourages a bailout by insiders. Such secondary sales, which do not have to be disclosed in the original registration statement, seem particularly problematic in the case of smaller companies.

To sum up, this provision is not what it seems. It does not simplify the issuer's access to capital, but it does both (i) strip the SEC of its pre-offering review authority, and (ii) facilitate secondary bailouts by insiders.

2. HR 2659 (''Accelerated Filer''). This provision would modify the definition of ''accelerated filer'' in SEC Rule 12b–2 (17 C.F.R. 240.12b–2), which today makes an issuer an ''accelerated filer'' if it has a ''public float'' of between $75 million and $700 million (that is, the value of its equity shares not held by affiliates). Under the proposed revision, the new test would be moved up to $250 million (instead of $75 million), and in addition the issuer would need to have ''annual revenues of greater than $100,000,000 during the most recently completed fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available'' (see Section 2 of H.R. 2629). Thus, many issuers today deemed accelerated filers would escape that label under this revised test, including some with very large market capitalizations.

What is the consequence of this change? First, it will allow many companies to escape Section 404(b) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and its requirement of an annual audit of internal controls. The JOBS Act already did this with respect to ''emerging growth companies'' (at least for a five-year ''on ramp''), but this provision would exempt older companies that did not qualify for that exemption. Also, the exemption could continue forever and not just for five years. Second, under the instructions to Form 10–Q, an ''accelerated filer'' must file its Form 10–Q within 40 days after the end of the fiscal quarter, whereas all other issuers must file within 45 days after the end of the quarter. This is a further small step away from transparency.

If the goal is to cut back further on the scope of Section 404(b), this might best be done directly without causing any other collateral consequences. Still, some estimate should be made of just how many companies will escape Section 404(b) by this back door. Finally, the JOBS Act had a stronger rationale for its Section 404(b) exemption, (namely, that it permitted a temporary accommodation for young and emerging companies), whereas this bill's exemption covers old companies and potentially forever.

3. Raising the Disclosure Exemption Under Rule 701(e) from $5 million to $20 million. Currently, Rule 701 exempts from registration sales by non-reporting issuers of their securities to employees, consultants and advisors (and their family members) pursuant to a written compensatory benefit plan or compensatory contract. Effectively, this rule shelters non-reporting companies from the potentially expensive obligation to register stock options and similar equity compensation under the Securities Act of 1933. But under Rule 701(e), some minimal disclosure is required, including financial statements and ''information about the risks associated with investment in the securities.'' This limited obligation to provide such information is not applicable if the issuer sells less than $5 million of its securities under this exemption during any consecutive 12-month period. The proposed bill before this Committee would raise this $5 million level to $20 million.

Because the disclosure obligation under Rule 701 is minimal and does not require the preparation of any formal disclosure document, this proposal to raise the exemption by 400% to $20 million seems hard to justify. First, there is no rationale advanced for the $20 million threshold. Second, there is little hardship or burden in giving your financial statements to your own employees. This proposal did not even seem to win substantial support within the small business community (as it has not been regularly cited at the SEC's Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation).

Further, once the volume of sales under Rule 701 exceeds $5 million and begins to approach $20 million, the cost of providing minimal disclosure falls as a percentage of the total transaction. It may seem a nuisance to an issuer to provide disclosure when its Rule 701 sales are minimal, but if the sales fall into the $5 to $20 million range, this is a major (and probably recurring) activity for the issuer.

4. Expanding the Availability of Form S–3. Today, eligibility for use of Form S–3 (and thus the ability to use shelf-registration) generally requires that an issuer have a ''public float'' of at least $75 million. See General Instruction IB(1) to Form S–3. In addition, other registrants can use Form S–3 if (i) the aggregate market value of securities sold by the registrant during the period of 12 calendar months immediately preceding and including the sale does not exceed one-third of its public float (i.e., the aggregate market value of its common equity held by non-affiliates—see General Instruction IB(6)(a) to Form S–3), (ii) the issuer is not a ''shell company,'' and (iii) the registrant has at least one class of common equity registered on a national securities exchange (General Instruction IB(6)(c) to Form S–3). In effect, this alternative test allows listed companies with less than a $75 million public float to use Form S–3, but places a ceiling on the size of the offerings that they may do using Form S–3 that is equal to one-third of their public float, Letting a small company with a modest $50 million public float use shelf registration to attempt to sell $150 million in securities invites potential disaster and investor confusion.

Nonetheless, a bill before this Committee, known as the ''Small Company Freedom to Grow Act of 2014'' would permit this by eliminating most of these limitations. Effectively, it would allow any company, which is not a ''shell company'' (as defined in Rule 405) and that has not been a ''shell company for at least 12 calendar months, to use Form S–3. Under this provision, even microcap companies could thus use shelf registration and offer securities from time to time in any amount, at least if they were reporting companies and were current in their 1934 filings (to thereby satisfy General Instruction IA).

This would represent a significant change in long-standing SEC policy, and I suggest that Committee consult the SEC to hear its view. Traditionally, shelf registration was limited to seasoned issuers with a sizable market capitalization and an established market following. Under this provision, even companies traded only on the Pink Sheets or the OTC Bulletin Board might use shelf registration and make a sizable offering with no prior notice. As a practical matter, I doubt that the market will accept such offerings or that reputable underwriters will feel comfortable with them, but the door is at least opened (and in a frothy market, anything can happen and has).

5. Blue Sky Preemption. The above-noted ''Small Company Freedom to Grow Act of 2014'' would also preempt state ''Blue Sky'' laws in the case of ''smaller reporting companies'' and ''emerging growth companies.'' Currently, Section 18 of the Securities Act preempts only ''nationally traded securities'' that are either (i) listed on certain national securities exchanges (under SEC rules that look to their listing standards), or (ii) are issued in certain exempt transactions involving qualified purchasers. This proposal would extend the scope of Section 18's preemption of state blue sky law by an order of magnitude. Potentially, companies traded on the Pink Sheets (or not even traded at all) would be exempted if the issuer was a reporting company.

This makes little sense at a time when the SEC is resource-constrained and cannot Challenge every transaction. The cases most likely to sneak under the SEC's radar screen are precisely those involving local or regional companies that are traded over-the-counter, on the OTC Bulletin Board, or on the Pink Sheets. Unfortunately, these are exactly the low visibility companies that this statute would exempt from the scrutiny of state regulators.

Perhaps, the sponsors of this bill see state ''Blue Sky'' regulators as difficult, overly suspicious, bureaucratic, or prone to delay. I believe such a characterization is unfair. State regulators are hard-working, have more than enough to do, and typically focus their attention on precisely those smaller companies that the SEC is most likely to overlook. Preempting state law simply because an issuer files reports with the SEC places excessive reliance on the SEC and invites fraud and misconduct.

6. Form S–1 and Forward Integration. For some time, the SEC's Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation has called for changes to permit smaller reporting companies that have filed a Form S–1 to incorporate by reference documents filed with the SEC. Effectively, this would make the Form S–1 ''evergreen'' in the sense that it would not become stale. Of the various proposals before this Committee, I believe this one does have real efficiency justifications and could help smaller issuers.

Again, I believe the Committee should seek the views of the SEC on this matter, and I do not suggest that Form S–1 should be expanded to become a vehicle for shelf registration (which should instead require that the issuers qualify for the use of Form S–3). But I do see merit in this proposal.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I share Professor Coffee's concerns about this proposal.

I also oppose title II of this bill, which would create another exemption for the securities law for certain microcap offerings of less than $500,000.

Unfortunately, history has proven that there is a good deal of petty fraud in microcap offerings. So ensuring that there is proper oversight of microcap offerings—ideally, by State securities regulators—is important if your goal is to protect retail investors from fraud.

Finally, title III of the bill would strip away even the most modest investor protections that the SEC has proposed for unregistered, private securities. It is important to note that we are already seeing a trend toward much greater use of unregistered, private securities rather than publicly registered securities. In fact, the private securities market is now larger than the public securities market. In 2014, companies raised $2.1 trillion through the private securities market compared to only $1.35 trillion through the public securities market.

What this means is that more securities are being sold with fewer investor protections. Title III of this bill would take away yet another investor protection by allowing companies to sell unregistered, private securities without having to file any information with the SEC first.

I think this bill goes in the wrong direction. We should be talking about strengthening investor protections, not weakening them.

I would also like to note that President Obama has issued a veto threat on this bill and states that all three titles are dangerous for investors. He states that markets function more efficiently when they are transparent, well regulated, and trusted by investors and insurers alike.

These bills would reduce transparency, inhibit effective regulatory oversight of our capital markets by the SEC, and would undermine not only the health and integrity of our markets, but the very capital formation process they claim to promote.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD this veto.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2357—ACCELERATING ACCESS TO CAPITAL ACT OF 2016—REP. WAGNER, R–MO)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act. The Rules Committee Print of H.R. 2357 contains the text of H.R. 2357 as reported (Title I), as well as texts of H.R. 4850, the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act, as reported (Title II), and H.R. 4852, the Private Placement Improvement Act, as reported (Title III). Markets function most efficiently when they are transparent, well-regulated, and trusted by investors and issuers alike. These bills would reduce transparency and inhibit effective regulatory oversight of our capital markets by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). These bills would undermine not only the health and integrity of our markets, but the very capital formation process they claim to promote.

H.R. 2357 (Title I) would weaken investor protections by reducing the quality or availability of information needed to make informed investment decisions. By compelling the SEC to amend Form S–3, the bill would: (1) allow microcap companies traded on an exchange to issue an unlimited number of shares using shelf registration within a 12-month period; and (2) permit unlisted microcap companies, including those listed on the ''pink sheets,'' with less than $75 million in common equity to sell up to ⅓ of the market value of their common equity using shelf registration in a 12-month period. This bill would harm investors by reducing disclosure requirements and infringe on the SEC's ability to appropriately respond to market developments. Such changes would increase the risks posed by accounting fraud, market manipulation, insider trading, and the sale of artificially-inflated stock.

H.R. 4850 (Title II) would similarly undermine investor protections and the integrity of capital formation for small businesses. Specifically, the bill eliminates all existing investor protections for crowdfunding and Regulation A offerings, provided that the securities: (1) are sold to purchasers with a substantive pre-existing relationship with individuals affiliated with the company, including controlling investors; (2) involve 35 or fewer purchasers; (3) do not exceed more than $500,000, annually; and (4) do not involve a person who has violated the securities laws. These criteria do not negate the need for consumer protections embedded in current regulations.

This legislation would create yet another unnecessary and unwarranted exemption from the Securities Act of 1933 to enable the sale of microcap offerings (those involving sales of securities valued at $500,000 or less in a single year) without appropriate regulatory protections. While the legislation would limit the total number of investors in such offerings, it lacks a requirement that those investors have the financial sophistication to understand potential risks of the offering or the financial means to withstand losses. It requires only that they have a ''preexisting relationship'' with an officer, director, or major shareholder of the issuer, a condition that provides no meaningful protections.

Finally, H.R. 4852 (Title III) runs counter to SEC efforts to enhance disclosure requirements, limiting the SEC's ability to finalize previously proposed investor protections, and would weaken other key consumer protections and provisions of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. Additionally, H.R. 4852 bars the SEC from taking appropriate actions to provide needed oversight of the financial markets, encourages widespread non-compliance with existing SEC filing requirements, and undermines the SEC's informed policymaking.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2357, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I would just like to close by reminding our colleagues on both sides of the aisle why these investor protections were put in place. We still have not recovered from the 2008 crisis where literally millions of Americans lost their homes, lost their jobs, and, depending on which economist you listen to, $15 to $18 trillion of wealth in this country lost and down the drain.

I just came from a hearing of the Joint Economic Committee where testimony included a statement that this was the first financial crisis in the history of our country that could have been prevented by better regulation and oversight of our markets. I do not understand why anyone in this body would want to support rolling back investor protections. This merely keeps in place protections that have worked well for this country and for investors.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the author of H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

I am proud to sponsor the Accelerating Access to Capital Act, H.R. 2357. I would also like to thank and congratulate my colleagues, Representative EMMER and Chairman GARRETT, for their legislation as well.

Regulatory burden is one of the reasons why we are still in the slowest recovery of our lifetime since the financial crisis. Small businesses are finding it more and more difficult to find financing in order to grow and expand their business.

Dodd-Frank has made traditional bank lending for small businesses more scarce. Smaller companies that wish to go to the capital markets are finding compliance and regulatory requirements too extensive and far too costly.

This legislation builds upon other efforts by this committee to provide simplified disclosure and reduce burdens for smaller companies in order to lower the cost of raising capital.

Specifically, this would extend to smaller reporting companies the ability to utilize Form S–3, a much more simplified registration for companies that have already met prior reporting requirements with the SEC. Allowing small companies to use this form would provide significant benefits with its shorter length, allowing forward incorporation by reference and the ability to offer securities off the shelf, which are all things that larger companies are currently able to enjoy.

Streamlining disclosure will lower compliance costs associated with filing redundant paperwork, which will in turn allow companies to direct more resources to growing their business. Fuel Performance Solutions, which is a fantastic company based in my hometown of St. Louis, has spent the last 10 years working on exciting fuel products that could potentially save Americans money at the pump and reduce harmful emissions.

In order to fund this research in breakthrough technology, Fuel Performance Solutions eventually decided

to register with the SEC and go public to raise more capital and expand their business.

The company conducted a study, Mr. Chair, and found that, instead of filling out a 100-page registration form which takes about 4 to 6 weeks to complete, this legislation would allow them to fill out a 20-page form which only takes 2 days to complete. As a result, they would have incurred less legal fees, less accounting, and less investment banking fees and saved close to $225,000.

Additionally, under this job growth legislation, they could have received SEC approval in days, rather than months, and thereby obtain certainty in regard to funding their business.

I am proud that the greater Metropolitan St. Louis region is the fastest growing startup scene in the country. But we must provide opportunities for these businesses and many others to grow and drive and thrive in the marketplace.

Extending these cost-saving provisions to smaller companies that large companies are currently able to enjoy is absolutely critical and can make the difference in their ability to issue an additional offering, expand their business, and create more jobs. The Accelerating Access to Capital Act will do just that.

I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act.

Mr. Chair, 7 weeks ago, the Republican majority recessed the House for the summer district work period—7 weeks. Seven weeks is a long time, time that we in Congress could have spent addressing the many pressing issues that are facing the country right now.

The 7 weeks did, however, provide me and my colleagues an opportunity to go back to our districts, meet with our constituents, and learn about what their priorities are, what the priorities are that the American people have for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

I, for one, heard from my constituents on a number of things. They are concerned about the arrival of Zika in the United States, and they want a more comprehensive Federal response to that outbreak.

□ 1445

They were shocked by the devastation in Flint, Michigan, and worried about their own water quality.

They were bewildered that the gun lobby continues to block sensible gun safety reforms in the face of increasingly routine mass shootings and senseless gun violence on our streets.

Incredibly now, Mr. Chairman, we have returned; and what are we doing in our first days? What are we doing? What are some of the first things that we are bringing up in spite of what the public has said its priorities are?

Yet again, we are voting on a bill that is designed to roll back the important oversight of our financial markets and to eliminate critical consumer protections that guard against unscrupulous securities sales. This bill, H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act—or, as I call it, the ''Wolf of Wall Street Enhancement Act''—would jump-start fraud in our capital markets. Each of the bill's three titles would reduce transparency, weaken consumer disclosure, and fuel fraud in our financial markets.

I want to ask my colleagues: Who are the people out there who are asking for these changes in our securities law? Did anyone hear in a town hall that they did? Did anyone hear at those meetings this summer about the need to expand shelf registration for unproven companies? Who back home is clamoring for unregistered, undisclosed security offerings? Who wants to further tie the hands of the SEC's in adopting even the most modest disclosure requirements?

Yet again, Congress' agenda has been warped by the undue influence of narrow special interests. Yet again, we are ignoring the real priorities of the American people. Mr. Chairman, we have more important business than this. I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Republican leader and the leader of our Innovation Initiative.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, innovation is the key to America's future. With it, America can continue to be the economic and cultural leader of the world while providing important and good-paying jobs here at home. With it, our government can spend more time and money in helping Americans who need it and less in supporting a wasteful, ineffective, and outdated bureaucracy. I have seen firsthand the power of innovation in America, and it is not just in Silicon Valley. Centers of innovation are growing across our country and are bringing with them new opportunities and second chances.

I recently visited a company called ZeroFOX in south Baltimore. They provide social media security and they gather intelligence on the threats that are facing employees, businesses, and other organizations online. ZeroFOX is a bright spot in a city, like so many others in America, that was hit hard by a recession but that was struggling long before then. These communities were centers of industry—they manufactured and thousands were employed. Then some companies closed up shop; manufacturing declined; and people lost their livelihoods.

But America is not a story of decline. Even today, you can see communities rising again, not by trying to recreate the past, but by looking to the future. New centers of innovation from south Baltimore to San Antonio and from North Carolina to Louisiana are spreading across America and are bringing with them new economic activity, new construction, new jobs, and, especially, new hope. That is what our country needs. That is what working people across America need.

The package of bills we have before us today is part of the Innovation Initiative—our legislative project to bring innovation into government and to allow innovation to thrive in the private sector. What this package of bills does is to help innovators gain access to capital. You can ask any business owner or dreamer out there. They know that ideas and work ethic are fundamental but that it takes capital to be able to make those ideas a reality—to make even more success stories in communities across our country like in south Baltimore.

I thank those Members who worked on these bills: ANN WAGNER, TOM EMMER, SCOTT GARRETT, and, especially, Chairman JEB HENSARLING. We need more practical solutions like these to create new opportunities for the American people, not in theory, but in their everyday lives.

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

I am really underscoring that my colleagues should vote against this bill because it rolls back investor protections.

Why in the world do we want to roll back investor protections?

We have heard some of my Republican colleagues suggest that, because the bill does not alter the securities laws regarding fraud, it has no bearing on fraud and will only help small businesses. This is wrong for a number of reasons. Let me try to explain this with a real life example.

Robbie Dale Walker was a former police officer who was living with his mother in Dripping Springs, Texas. Mr. Walker approached his mother's best friend, Dolores ''Pokey'' Conn, and offered to sell her an investment in an oil and gas drilling program. Mrs. Conn was a 96-year-old widow at the time of the solicitation. After gaining her trust, Mr. Walker sold Mrs. Conn an investment of $100,000 in an oil and gas drilling program. Later, he convinced her to invest another $100,000. Mr. Walker convinced two other individuals to invest an additional $55,000.

In this case and in similar instances, State securities regulators often get calls asking whether an issuer or a dealer is selling legitimate securities. If the securities are not registered and have not filed a Form D with the SEC, the State securities regulators can warn investors about a potential red flag. In addition, the regulators' enforcement divisions can open investigations into the matters.

If title II of H.R. 2357 is enacted, the Texas regulator in this case would not

be able to quickly provide a red flag to a concerned investor like Mrs. Conn because Mr. Walker would not have to provide any disclosures to investors or regulators.

Although I don't doubt that the Texas regulator eventually would have caught Mr. Walker, the most likely outcome would have been that he and fraudsters like him would have been able to have run their schemes for several more years, further defrauding other seniors like Mrs. Conn. Today, Mr. Walker is serving a 25-year prison sentence for this fraud, and Congress should not be making it easier for the next Mr. Walker to defraud another grandmother.

Again, I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say, with regard to the gentlewoman's anecdote, if the gentleman engaged in fraud, apparently, he went to prison. Fraud is against the law, and people who perpetrate it should be in prison. Apparently, they are, and nothing in this bill changes that.

I was also struck by the previous speaker from the Democratic side who cited all of these constituent priorities and who didn't once mention the plight of middle-income workers, who are falling behind, whose paychecks are stagnant, and whose savings have been decimated. The National Small Business Association has found that 20 percent of small businesses had to reduce the number of employees as a result of tight credit. That is why we are working to get access to capital for small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the chairman of the Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee, and who also happens to be the author of H.R. 4852, the Private Placement Improvement Act.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act of 2015.

I also want to thank Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. EMMER, and all of my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee who have continued to support legislation that will allow our economy to grow and to expand opportunities for all Americans across this country.

Mr. Chairman, as I spend time with my constituents in the Fifth District, the message I hear from them is largely the same one I have been hearing for the last 8 years. People are concerned about jobs. They are concerned about their economic security and retirements. Perhaps, most importantly, they are concerned about whether their kids—their children—are going to have the same kinds of opportunities that they have enjoyed.

You see, there is no more ambiguity remaining about the economic legacy of the Obama administration. Last month's news that the economy grew at an abysmal 1.1 percent during the second quarter merely confirms what we already knew: we are mired in the weakest economic recovery since World War II. Some economists now think we are heading into another recession. It appears that all of the promises that came with the passage of Dodd-Frank, ObamaCare, the $800 billion stimulus package, and the thousands of regulations in the last 8 years were just that: promises.

Fortunately, for the last 5 years, the Financial Services Committee has been an oasis in a desert of bad ideas. Our committee has been at the forefront of putting forth job-creating, bipartisan legislation—most notably, the JOBS Act of 2012, as well as a number of other important measures that were signed into law in 2015.

Here we have H.R. 2357. It is a compilation of bills, if you will, that have passed our committee and would help empower entrepreneurs and small businesses, not bureaucrats and Washington insiders.

First, we have Mrs. WAGNER's bill, which would expand the number of companies that could take advantage of the short form registration. Allowing more companies to use the form would significantly reduce paperwork and man-hours. As she has indicated, last year, it would have saved 70,000 man-hours and over $84 million in compliance costs. Allowing expanded use has been a frequent recommendation of something called the SEC's Government-Businesses Forum on Small Business Capital Formation; but it is not surprising that the SEC has ignored those ideas year, after year, after year.

H.R. 2357 also includes Mr. EMMER's ideas, under the Securities Act of 1933, to allow the so-called micro offerings. What this means in layman's terms is that a business would be allowed to stand up before a local Chamber of Commerce or Kiwanis Club and solicit an investment without running afoul of all of the securities laws. This really is an innovative idea, and it requires Congress to step in and facilitate it.

Finally, you have mine. You have the Private Placement Improvement Act, which I authored. This is part of the package, and it would prohibit the SEC from implementing onerous, new regulations or requirements on companies that raise capital—how?—through private channels that they proposed back in 2013. As several experts have testified before our committee, the mere existence of these amendments by the SEC is preventing more job creation.

Taken together, finally, Mr. Chairman, all of these bills continue the good work of the Financial Services Committee, under our chairman, JEB HENSARLING, over the last 5 years, to bring our capital markets into the 21st century and create opportunities for American businesses and their families.

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

I would like to respond to the chairman of the Financial Services Committee in that the point of these investor protections is to enable regulators to stop the abusive practices and fraud, as was being perpetrated on the friend of Mr. Walker's mother. Because they had disclosure requirements and he had not disclosed or filed with the SEC, they knew it was a fraud securities and were able to intercede and stop the fraud and arrest Mr. Walker.

I feel that these rollbacks are really very dangerous to investors, and I cannot understand why anyone would want to make it easier for a ''Mr. Walker'' to defraud grandmothers in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member.

□ 1500

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate Congresswoman MALONEY holding down the fort while I was away today, and I appreciate the work that she has put in this committee on these issues. I am very pleased to be here with her today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2357, a toxic package of bills that would outright encourage fraud in our financial markets and put retail investors and small businesses at risk. Instead of addressing a host of critical issues facing the American people, including helping the people of Baton Rouge, for example, where there has been a loss of 160,000 homes, instead of helping to come together with this side of the aisle to deal with Zika, instead of helping to deal with the problem we have of water up in Flint, or dealing with the idea that we need to expand Social Security, here we are.

Those people in Baton Rouge, who have just suffered all these devastating losses following the historic flooding last month, are looking to us for help and support. Here we are under the leadership of our Republicans prioritizing a bill that would make it easier for companies to scam investors by escaping regulatory scrutiny.

In particular, H.R. 2357 would allow small companies that are not listed on a national stock exchange to publicly offer their stock as an accelerated filer, without first alerting the Securities and Exchange Commission or gaining its approval.

Currently, this accelerated filer status is reserved for larger companies that meet the standards of and are traded on a national stock exchange. They also are closely followed by analysts, giving investors more insight into their activities. Small companies traded off exchange simply don't have the same safeguards in place.

Providing this type of quick access to our securities markets without sufficient oversight and transparency would

lead to accounting fraud, market manipulation, insider trading, and sales of unofficially inflated stock. Anyone who has seen the movie, ''The Wolf of Wall Street,'' can tell you just how bad this would be for our investors and their savings.

Next, the bill would recreate a private securities offering that would be exempt from Federal and State securities laws. The bill would carve out a scenario where a private company could sell stock to certain investors without providing them or the SEC with any information. This stock could then be distributed to the public at large without restriction and, again, without any information.

What is more troubling is that the SEC previously eliminated this exact type of offering exemption after concluding that it, in fact, facilitated fraud. Specifically, the exemption had been used frequently in fraudulent pump-and-dump schemes where these early investors aggressively promoted the stock to artificially inflate its price and then dump their shares on unsuspecting investors.

The provision also ignores the fact that the JOBS Act created similar, yet responsible, exemptions to facilitate small company offerings under the crowdfunding rules in regulation A. As a result, this bill would simply create a big loophole for companies to secretly conduct public offerings and swindle investors.

Lastly, the bill would stop the SEC dead in its tracks in advancing important investor protections in the trillion-dollar private securities market. In particular, it would block the Commission from requiring companies to file a short, simple notice of a sale to alert the SEC and State regulators to possible fraud.

It also would prevent the SEC from stopping private equity funds and hedge funds from using misleading advertising materials. This would essentially allow bad actors to run wild and sell stock to unknowing investors about their true intentions.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that this bill represents reckless shortsightedness and woeful disregard for the history of fraud in the securities market by undoing much-needed disclosure requirements and investor protections. The administration has threatened to veto this bill saying it would ''undermine not only the health and integrity of our markets, but the very capital formation process they claim to promote.''

I therefore strongly urge my colleagues to join me, investor advocates, and State securities regulators in opposing H.R. 2357.

I close by raising the questions: Why is it, coming back from break, with all of these important issues facing the American public, do we move so quickly to protect Wall Street, to protect private equity, to protect hedge funds? Who are we looking out for in the Congress of the United States of America? Do we have to go back and remind people what happened in this country in 2008 when we put so many families and communities at risk because we didn't have the oversight, we didn't have the transparency, we didn't have the watchful eye of the cop on the block really doing the work we needed to protect our investors and our citizens? Why are we doing this? Why are we spending this time?

I am hopeful that my colleagues will join me and vote against this bill and send a message to our citizens and our constituencies that we are on the side of Main Street, not Wall Street.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to answer the ranking member's question. We are here because we care about the plight of the working poor. We care about the fact that middle-income families are falling behind. The other side of the aisle has had 8 years of their economics, and we don't have a healthy economy. So we are growing the economy through this bill, and that is why it is so vitally important.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, I think it is the first time since coming here as a Member of Congress that I have heard a Hollywood film cited as an authority. If I recall the film, the guy went to jail, as he well should have.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), the author of H.R. 4850, the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act which would give our very small businesses and startups more flexibility to raise funds and create jobs for a better economy.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, with real unemployment at almost 10 percent, labor force participation at an all-time low, and a mere 1 percent economic growth last quarter, it is clear that the American economy is just not working.

Contributing to the problems are the regulatory burdens caused by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act, which has reduced the number of credit unions and community banks in my State of Minnesota by nearly 25 percent over the past 6 years.

Because of this, it is increasingly difficult for entrepreneurs to find the capital they need to start a new business or expand an existing one. In fact, today there are 3 million fewer small business loans made annually than prior to the 2008 crisis.

This is particularly alarming because small business creates roughly 70 percent of the new jobs. And today's small businesses, as we all know, are tomorrow's Fortune 500 companies. Just think of all the great businesses in this country that started with a dream in a garage: Amazon, Apple, Microsoft, Disney, Harley Davidson, and Minnesota's own Medtronic.

I fear that with our current lack of access to capital, many of them would not have gotten off the ground today. Who knows what future American success story we may not be able to witness due to these issues. In fact, according to the Kauffman Index, a measure that tracks business startups in each State, America has dropped from prerecession highs when it comes to starting new businesses.

Our legislation, the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act, which is included in this proposal before us, will fix the access to capital problem that is limiting sustainable growth in our communities. It will make it easier for entrepreneurs to borrow money from their friends and family. Minnesotans will be able to launch their business ideas and encourage the creation of jobs, wealth, and opportunity for everyone.

Specifically, this legislation allows Americans to do a private security offering, free from any hoops to jump through by the SEC if they meet these three simple criteria: the investor has a substantive preexisting relationship with the owner; there are fewer than 35 investors; and the aggregate amount from all investors is no more than $500,000.

Not only will this help Americans, but the other two bills we are considering today are equally important. The Accelerating Access to Capital Act will make it easier for certain companies to register securities, and the Private Placement Improvement Act will make it less complicated to issue securities under regulation D.

Together, these bills will generate economic prosperity, boost wages, and help Americans from all walks of life find good paying and rewarding jobs.

I want to thank Congresswoman WAGNER, Congressman GARRETT, and Chairman HENSARLING for their leadership on these issues.

I urge all of my colleagues to support these proposals.

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

Again, I want to underscore that this bill is bad for investors, bad for the financial industry, and bad for our country. It moves us in the wrong direction. It treats investors terribly. They were treated awfully in the financial crisis where millions lost their jobs, millions lost their homes, and well over $15 trillion of private money evaporated from the economy of this great country.

Now, investor protections are there to protect investors. I cannot understand any valid reason why anyone would want to roll back protections, some of which have been on the books since the Great Depression.

Again, I urge a ''no'' vote on it.

I would like to inform the chairman of the Financial Services Committee that I have no further speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the House Small Business Committee who knows how desperately these bills are needed to aid our small business growth.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act of

2015. I especially want to voice my strong support for the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act, which is now an integral part of this bill and which I was happy to cosponsor when it was first introduced.

I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and all of the folks on the Financial Services Committee for working on behalf of small businesses all across the country. I happen to chair the House Small Business Committee, as was mentioned.

Small businesses are hurting across America. There is no question about that. Access to capital is a critical issue for America's 28 million small businesses.

At the Small Business Committee, we like to acknowledge that every small business started with an idea. Those ideas can become jobs. In fact, those ideas create about 7 out of every 10 new jobs created in this country every year, but access to capital is the key ingredient.

A lot of our existing laws and far too many Federal regulations make access to capital harder for small business. It is harder for them than it is for larger companies, larger corporations, and hedge funds. H.R. 2357 takes an important step in addressing this problem. By clarifying the law in a way that allows small businesses to raise capital through limited, smaller scale, nonpublic offerings, we are cutting through the red tape that has kept far too many new investors just out of reach from a lot of our small businesses.

□ 1515

This legislation also addresses the unfair share of the Federal regulatory burden that our small businesses carry. At the Committee on Small Business, we hear countless examples of businesses that have to decide between meeting regulatory costs and meeting their payroll, and that affects many, many families, American families all across the country that depend on these small businesses.

That is what happens when regulators don't consider the impact of what they are imposing on businesses of every size. A regulation that might be workable for a large company can prove devastating for a small business. The Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act, which the House passed last year, addresses this problem. Today's legislation also fully recognizes that the Federal Government's regulatory approach cannot be a one-size-fits-all, especially where small businesses are concerned, and that is why I am here to support it.

I again want to thank Mr. HENSARLING and all the folks on the Committee on Financial Services for their hard work in this area. We have to do something about helping small businesses all across the country. The regulatory burdens that come out of this city, out of Washington, D.C., are killing companies all across America. They are killing jobs. Thank you very much for working hard on this legislation.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT), vice chairman of our Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Accelerating Access to Capital Act. Like many of us here, when I first ran for Congress, I ran because I believed that Washington had become too far removed from the people it is supposed to represent. I was concerned then, as I am today, that Washington's policies are negatively impacting Fifth District Virginians and the future for our children and grandchildren.

I represent a sweeping district along the Blue Ridge Mountains that spreads from Fauquier County south to the North Carolina border. Within our district, there are few areas with robust economic activity. In fact, most of our district is comprised of rural countryside and Main Street courthouse towns. Unfortunately, much of our district has suffered devastating unemployment, at times reaching double digits. That is why I am pleased with the work that we have done on the Committee on Financial Services under the leadership of Chairman HENSARLING, as it has a real impact on the economic growth of our small companies and their access to our capital markets. Our Nation's small businesses are our most dynamic job creators, and helping them grow and expand ultimately creates jobs.

This bill is not about Wall Street. This bill is, indeed, about Main Street. H.R. 2357 is comprised of three titles, the first being authored by Representative WAGNER. This measure would amend the Securities and Exchange Commission's Form S–3 registration statement to expand eligibility to small reporting companies. The cost of securities regulation falls heaviest upon smaller companies, and title I eliminates unnecessary costs by expanding the use of Form S–3 to smaller reporting companies. This would lower compliance costs and would not eliminate the SEC's ability to bring enforcement actions. Every one of the investor protection provisions in Federal securities laws would remain unchanged.

Title II of the legislation is Mr. EMMER's Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act. This measure would amend the Securities Act of 1933 to provide an exemption for small, private offerings of securities known as micro offerings. For this exemption to apply, each investor has to have a preexisting relationship with the owner, there must be 35 or fewer purchasers, and the amount cannot exceed $500,000. Again, the SEC still has the authority to bring enforcement actions, and every investor protection provision in the Federal securities laws remains intact.

Finally, title III, Mr. GARRETT's Private Placement Improvement Act, would direct the SEC to revise reg D to eliminate the SEC's harmful proposed rule that is hindering small businesses' ability to raise cash. As we all recall, the purpose of the bipartisan JOBS Act we passed in 2012 was to make it easier for startups to market their securities; but when the SEC implemented the new law, the SEC proposed a separate rule that would impose new regulatory requirements on small companies seeking to use the rule 506 to raise capital. This is not consistent with Congress' intent, and now companies seeking to raise capital using rule 506 would be required to submit additional form D filings on an ongoing basis. The SEC has not acted on this proposed rule, which is why it is incumbent upon Congress to prevent it from doing so.

In closing, the SEC has the responsibility to facilitate capital formation while remaining true to its duty to protect investors. The legislative package before this body today is about ensuring that our Nation's small businesses are in the best position possible to do what they do best: to innovate, grow their businesses, and create jobs. These commonsense proposals will help them do just that.

I urge my colleagues to support this good bill, and I thank the chairman for the time.

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

I include in the RECORD a letter from the North American Securities Administrators Association, where they come out strongly against this bill. They say that it shifts ''policies in the wrong direction, weakening the oversight of our capital markets and placing retail investors needlessly at risk.''

NORTH AMERICAN SECURITIES ADMINISTRATORS ASSOCIATION, INC.

Washington, DC, September 8, 2016.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Re H.R. 2357—Accelerating Access to Capital Act of 2016

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the North American Securities Administrators Association (NASAA), I write to express strong concern regarding H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act, which may be considered by the House of Representatives this week. State securities regulators have taken steps to help expand opportunities for small businesses to access investment capital including implementation of intrastate crowdfunding regimes and support of the SEC's recent proposal to modernize Rule 147 and increase the offering limits of Rule 504. We are, however, very concerned that the provisions of the H.R. 2357 that are discussed below would shift policies in the wrong direction, weakening oversight of our capital markets and placing retail investors needlessly at risk.

SECTION 2: (THE MICRO-OFFERING SAFE HARBOR ACT OF 2016)

Section 2 of the Accelerating Access to Capital Act would amend Section 4 of the Securities Act to create a new transactional exemption from registration for certain securities offerings, including offers to retail investors. As presently constituted, the bill would permit the offering of private or unregistered securities to an unlimited number of unaccredited investors that may lack financial sophistication or wherewithal. For reasons that NASAA has already discussed extensively in comments to the Financial Services Committee regarding this legislation, state securities regulators continue to question the practical necessity of this proposed exemption and the nature of the issuers it is intended to serve, We note that there are already several provisions at the state and federal level that small, microcap issuers can rely upon for limited offerings to unaccredited investors, including intrastate crowdfunding and other limited offering exemptions.

Further, Section 2 would preempt state authority to review securities offerings that are by their nature local, state-based offerings. Preemption for this type of localized offering is inconsistent with investor protections afforded by state review, and would handcuff the regulators best positioned to regulate the marketplace for these offerings.

SECTION 3: (THE PRIVATE PLACEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2016)

Section 3 of H.R. 2357 would prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'') from adopting proposed rules to implement common-sense reforms for Regulation D, Rule 506 offerings.

Title II of the Jumpstart Our Business Startups (''JOBS'') Act repealed the long-established prohibition on general solicitation and advertising of securities under Rule 506. When the SEC adopted rules to implement Title II, on July 10, 2013, it also voted to propose rules that could mitigate the risk to ordinary investors from 506 offerings, including by requiring a pre-filing of ''Form D'' when issuers intend to advertise Rule 506 securities to the general public, and by imposing meaningful penalties on issuers who fail to file a Form D. Section 3 of H.R. 2357 would effectively prohibit the SEC from adopting these rules.

State securities regulators, pursuant to their antifraud authority, are the primary regulators of offerings under Regulation D, Rule 506, and fraudulent offerings involving Rule 506 offerings are routinely among the most frequent violations reported by state securities regulators. The SEC's proposal to require the timely filing of Form D and establish consequences for issuers who fail to file a Form D when conducting a Regulation D, Rule 506 offering, is a common-sense step that is long overdue.

Form D is a short form that captures basic information about the issuer including the issuer's business address, officers, directors, business type, and minimal information about the securities being offered. The information contained in a Form D is crucial to state securities regulators, who regularly encourage investors to ''investigate before you invest.'' When investors contact their state regulators, particularly after learning about an offering through an advertisement or solicitation, Form D is often the only information available about an issuer when an investor calls. In addition to furnishing information that may allow regulators to look for ''red flags'' indicative of a fraudulent offering, Form D provides regulators with the only direct source of information about the ''private placement'' market generally. The modest burden that Form D may impose on issuers is vastly outweighed by the essential role that it plays in state and federal efforts to understand and police the Rule 506 marketplace.

State securities regulators oppose Section 3 of H.R. 2357 or any action by Congress that would further diminish the ability of regulators to effectively regulate the private placement marketplace, effectively address investor protection concerns associated with these offerings, or gather important data that provides minimal transparency of this otherwise opaque market.

Thank you for your consideration of NASAA's views. Please do not hesitate to contact me or Michael Canning, NASAA's Director of Policy, if we may be of any additional assistance.

Sincerely,

JUDITH M. SHAW,
NASAA President and Marine Securities Administrator.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Again, I urge a ''no'' vote on this. I feel it is a very dangerous bill, but I would also like to point out to my good friends on the other side of the aisle that keep talking about the economy, and I would like to point out that when President Obama took office, this country was shedding 700,000 jobs a month, and because of his leadership and Democratic policies, we have climbed out of that deep red valley of job loss and we are gaining jobs. Since March of 2010, this country has gained 14.6 million private sector jobs. That is a lot better than losing 700,000 jobs a month.

When President Obama walked into office, we were at 10 percent unemployment. We are now at 4.9 percent unemployment. I can assure you, no Democrat will be satisfied until every American who wants a job has a good American job, but this is a shift in the right direction of an improved economy. We have had well over 74 months of private sector job growth and, again, we are climbing—we would like to be doing better, but, again, it is a lot better than shedding 700,000 jobs a month.

One of the ways that we grow an economy is by having safety and soundness in our financial institutions, trust in our financial institutions, trust that investors will be protected, and that is why I feel so strongly that this bill is going in the wrong direction. We should be protecting investors, not putting them more at risk.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how much time is remaining on each side, please.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), a distinguished member of our Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I was just listening to my friend from New York, and I would like just sort of a little consistency. At one point we talk about job growth and the desperate need for more job growth, but then how many have come behind the microphones today and talked about a little technical problem we have. We are shedding—closing—more small businesses than we are opening, and this has been going on for years now.

So those of us who were involved in the JOBS Act a few years ago—and remember, it was a bipartisan discussion saying we desperately need to find ways to move capital to the little businesses that are just trying to find some cash, some way to grow, some way to expand. And then you look at a piece of legislation like this, and let's be brutally honest with each other, these are little tiny things that do good, but this isn't necessarily a revolution of Dodd-Frank. It is not a revolution of the capital markets. These are silly—excuse me, these are simple—simple—logical, obvious steps.

Let's take a look at some of the small offerings. If I am reaching out to people who know me, know my business, it is limited to, what, 35? That is somehow a risk to the financial stability of the country that I am a small entrepreneur and I may be able to reach out to people who know me and my business and ask them to invest in my capital formation so I can grow and create those jobs and expand the business as I desperately need?

How about cleaning up what we all agreed to, what, 4 or 5 years ago in regards to reg D offerings of how it mechanically was going to work? Remember, we sat there over and over for weeks discussing how reg Ds were going to work, and then the SEC decides they are going to change what we all thought the understanding was. How is that a danger to capital markets, fixing where we already thought we were?

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. In some ways it breaks my heart, and I wish we could get over this game we play around here where it is a Republican piece of legislation, and a couple of my friends on the left feel obligated to stand up and oppose it, even though you and I know when we had the conversations of building parts of this just 4 years ago, 5 years ago, these were the very things we talked about we were agreeing to.

We desperately need economic expansion if we are going to keep the social entitlement promises of this society, and to stand in front of even the small attempts to expand the economy—we need to get on the same page here.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to my good friend on the other side of the aisle.

Democrats certainly support expanding and growing capital markets and liquidity in the markets. I was one of the lead sponsors on portions of the

JOBS Act, and I supported the JOBS Act, but I do not support rolling back protections for investors.

The protections that are in the law now, that they are attempting to roll back—which they will not be able to because the President has said he will veto it—these protections are not Dodd-Frank. These have nothing to do with Dodd-Frank, although I understand there will be a markup totally repealing it next week, so I have been told. But these are protections that have been on the books for decades. Title III, in particular, concerns a $2.1 trillion market. Now, that is not a small deal. $2.1 trillion is a lot of money.

We just are recovering from massive rollbacks of regulations which economists say led to the worst economic downturn in the history of this country. Christina Romer testified before this Congress that the economic shocks at the time she was the head of the President's Council of Economic Advisers were three times deeper and stronger than the Great Depression. So I am mystified why anyone would want to roll back protections for investors that have worked well for people in this country.

We have the strongest markets in the world. More people invest here, come here because they trust our markets. Why in the world do we want to undermine that trust? I would say that the best way to stimulate investment is to treat investors well, and that means strong investor protections.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I simply want a little colloquy with the gentlewoman from New York about what she just alluded to. I think she said something about we will be faced with legislation very soon that would roll back all of the work we have done with Dodd-Frank? Did I hear her say something like that?

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. As the ranking member knows, there is a bill before the Committee on Financial Services which would completely roll back Dodd-Frank. I was clarifying that these rollbacks have nothing to do with Dodd-Frank.

□ 1530

These are protections that have been on the books since we recovered from the Great Depression. But, apparently, that is on the agenda, or so I have been told. I am not in charge. The gentleman across is the chairman. He knows the schedule, but I have been told that that will be before the committee next week.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. I thank the gentleman from the great State of Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chair, we are at a time when the American people are forced to comply with crushing regulations that stifle business growth and strip Americans of their livelihood. At this time, Congress must take steps to reduce the red tape in the private sector.

Earlier this year, the American Action Forum reported that the Dodd-Frank Act is costing Americans and consumers more now than any time since it was enacted. What ObamaCare has done to the cost of health care, Dodd-Frank has done to our financial sector.

Since it was enacted, this law has resulted in 73 million hours of paperwork and $36 billion of harmful costs riding on the backs of taxpayers. In fact, The Wall Street Journal reports that regulatory compliance is now the fastest growing job field in the financial services sector.

To put that in perspective, Dodd-Frank takes 37,000 full-time employees just to comply with the law for 1 year. These statistics are evidence of Ronald Reagan's warning that ''government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem.''

H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act, would expand the number of companies that are eligible to use a simplified registration form for public offerings, which will allow companies to obtain SEC approval in a matter of days instead of months.

For too long, the SEC has been a barrier to investment capital, which is contrary to its mission. This change would allow private companies to focus more on growing their businesses and creating jobs and less on complying with excessive regulations.

Mr. Chair, at a time when our Nation is in the slowest economic recovery since the Great Depression, we must take bold and decisive steps to reduce the excessive reach of government in our lives and foster a healthy economy. H.R. 2357 achieves these goals, and I encourage my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the American people continue to suffer in this lackluster economy.

I don't care what happy talk there is from Washington politicians, the American people know the economy is not working for them. They have anxiety about how they are going to pay their bills. Their paychecks are stagnant. Their savings have been decimated. And they look around, and where is the economic opportunity? Small business has been decimated in America. The job engine of America has been decimated.

As one of my constituents from Henderson County told me, when regulations get out of control, they put many small businesses out of business. And that is what we are seeing today, Mr. Chairman. People aren't getting ahead.

We need to unlock capital for our innovators, for our entrepreneurs, for our small businesses. We have three modest bills today that are doing just that. And yet we are being fought tooth and nail by those who want to grow Washington's economy and not the Main Street economy; those who believe that Washington bureaucrats always know what is best.

This House must enact the Accelerating Access to Capital Act. You can't have capitalism without capital. Small businesses can't get it, innovators can't get it, entrepreneurs can't get it.

So it is time that we move forward. And there is great news for the minority, who must not realize—I wish they would study and see this—we still have the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Investment Company Act of 1940, and it goes on.

You can't have an effective market without consumer protection. But guess what? We also must have capital formation if we are going to have a healthy economy for working families that are falling behind after 8 years of Obamanomics. We must pass H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, today I rise in support of H.R. 2357, the Accelerating-Access to Capital Act, which continues to build on the successes of the JOBS Act to stimulate capital formation for small businesses to help grow the economy and create good-paying jobs.

Last week, I visited the Venture Center in Little Rock, Arkansas, with my good friend Mrs. WAGNER, the lead sponsor of this bill.

The Venture Center has been working with the public financial services IT company, Fidelity Information Systems (FIS) to launch the VC FinTech Accelerator, a program that will bring innovators and entrepreneurs from across the world to Little Rock.

I had the pleasure of attending their Demo Day last month, where FIS and the Governor of Arkansas announced a two-year partnership with the program.

This exciting program has only been active for a short time, but has already proven its ability to assist in our efforts to grow new technology jobs across the region.

These start-ups, however, often face significant and costly hurdles to obtain funding in the capital markets that is necessary to continue to grow or go public, as the cost of securities regulation disproportionally falls on small companies.

H.R. 2357 helps reduce some of this regulatory burden by making it easier for small companies to register with the Securities and Exchange Commission and creates a cost-effective way for small companies to raise capital through ''micro-offerings,'' so long as the sale meets certain criteria.

It also prevents the SEC's costly and complex proposed Regulation D rules from taking effect, which are inconsistent with the JOBS Act and Congress' intent to make it easier for small businesses to raise capital.

We need regulation in our capital markets, but we need smart regulation that does not unduly burden startups across the nation, who are at the forefront of innovation and job creation.

I thank my colleagues on the Committee—Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. EMMER, and Capital Markets Subcommittee Chairman GARRETT—for

their work on this thoughtful legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–62. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 2357

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 ''Accelerating Access to Capital Act of 2016''.

TITLE I—ACCELERATING ACCESS TO CAPITAL

SEC. 1. EXPANDED ELIGIBILITY FOR USE OF FORM S–3.

Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise Form S–3—

(1) so as to permit securities to be registered pursuant to General Instruction I.B.1. of such form provided that either—

(A) the aggregate market value of the voting and non-voting common equity held by non-affiliates of the registrant is $75,000,000 or more; or

(B) the registrant has at least one class of common equity securities listed and registered on a national securities exchange; and

(2) so as to remove the requirement of paragraph (c) from General Instruction I.B.6. of such form.

TITLE II—MICRO-OFFERING SAFE HARBOR

SEC. 2. EXEMPTIONS FOR MICRO-OFFERINGS.

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

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

''(8) transactions meeting the requirements of subsection (f).''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) CERTAIN MICRO-OFFERINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the transactions referred to in subsection (a)(8) are transactions involving the sale of securities by an issuer (including all entities controlled by or under common control with the issuer) that meet all of the following requirements:

''(A) PRE-EXISTING RELATIONSHIP.—Each purchaser has a substantive pre-existing relationship with an officer of the issuer, a director of the issuer, or a shareholder holding 10 percent or more of the shares of the issuer.

''(B) 35 OR FEWER PURCHASERS.—There are no more than, or the issuer reasonably believes that there are no more than, 35 purchasers of securities from the issuer that are sold in reliance on the exemption provided under subsection (a)(8) during the 12-month period preceding such transaction.

''(C) SMALL OFFERING AMOUNT.—The aggregate amount of all securities sold by the issuer, including any amount sold in reliance on the exemption provided under subsection (a)(8), during the 12-month period preceding such transaction, does not exceed $500,000.

''(2) DISQUALIFICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The exemption provided under subsection (a)(8) shall not be available for a transaction involving a sale of securities if any person described in subparagraph (B) would have triggered disqualification pursuant to section 230.506(d) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(B) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—The persons described in this subparagraph are the following:

''(i) The issuer.

''(ii) Any predecessor of the issuer.

''(iii) Any affiliated issuer.

''(iv) Any director, executive officer, other officer participating in the offering, general partner, or managing member of the issuer.

''(v) Any beneficial owner of 20 percent or more of the issuer's outstanding voting equity securities, calculated on the basis of voting power.

''(vi) Any promoter connected with the issuer in any capacity at the time of such sale.

''(vii) Any investment manager of an issuer that is a pooled investment fund.

''(viii) Any person that has been or will be paid (directly or indirectly) remuneration for solicitation of purchasers in connection with such sale of securities.

''(ix) Any general partner or managing member of any such investment manager or solicitor.

''(x) Any director, executive officer, or other officer participating in the offering of any such investment manager or solicitor or general partner or managing member of such investment manager or solicitor.''.

(b) EXEMPTION UNDER STATE REGULATIONS.—Section 18(b)(4) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) section 4(a)(8).''.

TITLE III—PRIVATE PLACEMENT IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 3. REVISIONS TO SEC REGULATION D.

Not later than 45 days following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise Regulation D (17 C.F.R. 501 et seq.) in accordance with the following:

(1) The Commission shall revise Form D filing requirements to require an issuer offering or selling securities in reliance on an exemption provided under Rule 506 of Regulation D to file with the Commission a single notice of sales containing the information required by Form D for each new offering of securities no earlier than 15 days after the date of the first sale of securities in the offering. The Commission shall not require such an issuer to file any notice of sales containing the information required by Form D except for the single notice described in the previous sentence.

(2) The Commission shall make the information contained in each Form D filing available to the securities commission (or any agency or office performing like functions) of each State and territory of the United States and the District of Columbia.

(3) The Commission shall not condition the availability of any exemption for an issuer under Rule 506 of Regulation D (17 C.F.R. 230.506) on the issuer's or any other person's filing with the Commission of a Form D or any similar report.

(4) The Commission shall not require issuers to submit written general solicitation materials to the Commission in connection with a Rule 506(c) offering, except when the Commission requests such materials pursuant to the Commission's authority under section 8A or section 20 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77h–1 or 77t) or section 9, 10(b), 21A, 21B, or 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78i, 78j(b), 78u–1, 78u–2, or 78u–3).

(5) The Commission shall not extend the requirements contained in Rule 156 to private funds.

(6) The Commission shall revise Rule 501(a) of Regulation D to provide that a person who is a ''knowledgeable employee'' of a private fund or the fund's investment adviser, as defined in Rule 3c–5(a)(4) (17 C.F.R. 270.3c–5(a)(4)), shall be an accredited investor for purposes of a Rule 506 offering of a private fund with respect to which the person is a knowledgeable employee.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114–725. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 1 and amendment No. 2 will not be offered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2357) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise Form S–3 so as to add listing and registration of a class of common equity securities on a national securities exchange as an additional basis for satisfying the requirements of General Instruction I.B.1. of such form and to remove such listing and registration as a requirement of General Instruction I.B.6. of such form, and, pursuant to House Resolution 844, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. KILMER. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kilmer moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2357 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of title III the following:

(7) CYBERSECURITY RISK DISCLOSURE.—The Commission shall revise Rule 506 of Regulation D to condition the availability of the

exemption under such Rule on an issuer's disclosure to the Commission of the issuer's cybersecurity risks. The Commission is authorized to tailor such disclosure requirement based on the size of the issuer making the disclosure.

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support the motion to recommit, which is about protecting the personal information of the American people. It would require that those who are soliciting investments directly from individuals to develop a plan to ensure their personal financial data is protected against cyberattacks.

Before coming to Congress, I spent a decade working in economic development professionally, and before that, I was a business consultant advising some of the Nation's leading technology companies. I actually agree with my Republican colleagues that we need to help small, innovative companies raise additional capital so that they can grow, bring their ideas to market, and create jobs. However, we need to make sure that these new companies are taking seriously the risk of cybersecurity to ensure that those who are putting up capital to fund these companies aren't subject to identity theft or other cybercrimes.

Last month, I met with a group of cyber professionals from my State who told me that the threat of cybercrime is growing exponentially. According to these experts, every single business that has access to confidential personal data should have a plan in place to protect that data and to quickly respond in the event of a cyber attack.

This isn't just anecdotal. We can look at the statistics. In 2005, cybercrime cost the average business just $24,000. By 2015, that number had jumped to over $1.5 million for the average American business.

We all want small and emerging companies to succeed. We also need to be sure that they are prepared to deal with the growing threat of cybercrime so that the personal information of their investors is protected.

We also know that the financial services industry is a particularly ripe target for cybercriminals. The Securities and Exchange Commission is already taking action on a case that resulted in the private records of more than 100,000 individuals being compromised. Commission Chair Mary Jo White has called cybersecurity the biggest risk to the financial system.

We also know the impacts of cybercrime can be real. For an individual, a stolen identity can be devastating. It can lead to financial losses, lost time at work or with family dedicated to the stressful and extensive effort of clearing up financial records. These impacts are even greater when the victim is a senior citizen, who are often targets of cybercrimes.

We need action for the future growth of our economy and to give investors confidence that their personal information will remain secure. The motion to recommit would do that. It would require companies taking advantage of rules that allow them to solicit investments directly from wealthy individuals to disclose their cybersecurity risks to the Securities and Exchange Commission. This will provide the SEC with a better approach to helping smaller companies deal with the threat of cybercrime.

The MTR is sensitive to the needs of smaller companies by allowing them to develop a plan that can be tailored to the size and risk profile of the company.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sensible approach to addressing a real and growing threat. It allows small companies to continue to take advantage of expedited procedures while protecting investors from identity theft and other crimes.

I encourage my colleagues to adopt the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I have some good news for my colleague from Washington. The Financial Services Committee has already passed a robust cybersecurity bill, and passed it on a strong bipartisan basis: 46–9. We look forward to working with all of our colleagues in the House to forwarding this bill, working with our colleagues on House Energy and Commerce Committee and others. It is a serious topic.

But I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this extra disclosure, if cybersecurity is material, it already must be disclosed under current law. And I would add that, yet again, this is just one more burden, the subject matter of the motion to recommit, when we are trying to ease burdens on capital formation.

I would remind all of my colleagues again that a recent report from the National Small Business Association released just this week showed that 41 percent of small businesses said that the lack of capital is hindering their ability to grow their business. If they can't grow their business, they can't give raises, they can't expand, they can't promote. Twenty percent said they had to reduce—actually lay off employees—as a result of tighter credit. That is the whole purpose, Mr. Speaker, of why we are passing this bill today. It is to grant greater access to capital.

We have heard from so many small businesses and angel investors across the Nation about the need for capital formation for our entrepreneurs, for our small businesses, for our innovators. We have heard from the cofounder and CEO of NextSeed: ''Obtaining traditional financing from banks is still a tall order for many small businesses, especially for smaller amounts.''

Well, we want to respond to that.

□ 1545

We don't need yet one more hurdle from the motion to recommit to get in the way of small businesses' end capital. It is also one more out-of-pocket cost. We heard from the senior partner at Centerfield Capital: ''These out-of-pocket costs and time spent by our professionals on SEC registration and compliance detract from our mission of empowering small businesses to grow.''

We want to empower small businesses on Main Street to grow, yet the motion to recommit would do just the opposite.

Nothing could be more obvious than a quote from the gentleman, the CEO of Wilde & Company: ''When corporations access capital, they hire people.''

We want people hired. We want people promoted. We want people on good career tracks. We want middle-income people to rise. We want the working poor to become members of middle-income America, and they can't do that unless we access capital.

The choice again is: Are we going to have another top-down, Washington-grown economy, or are we going to build our economy from Main Street up?

House Republicans say it is time to build it from Main Street up. So it is time that we reject the motion to recommit and assure that our small businesses can access capital so that we can grow this economy, grow the family economy, and have a better America.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 233, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

YEAS—180

Adams	Becerra	Boyle, Brendan F.
Aguilar	Bera	Brady (PA)
Ashford	Beyer	Brownley (CA)
Bass	Blumenauer	Bustos
Beatty	Bonamici	

Butterfield
Capps
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
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
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.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—233

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

NOT VOTING—18

Bishop (GA)
Brown (FL)
Capuano
DesJarlais
Guinta
Johnson, Sam
Katko
Lynch
Nugent
Palazzo
Reichert
Rooney (FL)
Ross
Sanchez, Loretta
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Walters, Mimi
Westmoreland

□ 1608

Messrs. DENHAM, ZINKE, Mrs. BLACK, Messrs. ROSKAM, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, WEBSTER of Florida, NEWHOUSE, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. POLIQUIN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. JACKSON LEE changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. 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 236, noes 178, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

AYES—236

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

NOES—178

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

Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
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
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Ashford
Bishop (GA)
Brown (FL)
DesJarlais
Guinta
Higgins
Johnson, Sam
Lynch
Nugent
Palazzo
Reichert
Rooney (FL)
Ross
Sanchez, Loretta
Swalwell (CA)
Walters, Mimi
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1616

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF WAUBONSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Waubonsee Community College, which is celebrating 50 years of service to northern Illinois.

Founded in August of 1966, it was named after a Native American chief, whose name means ''early dawn,'' and provides innovative education to its students. Offering career programs, business training, and professional learning, the college has stayed true to its mission of fostering a literate, democratic society through accessible, quality, and innovative institutions.

This month, Waubonsee will reopen its Aurora Fox Valley Campus, dedicated to health programs. Critical to Waubonsee's success is President Dr. Christine Sobek.

As a member of my Higher Education Advisory Committee, she regularly provides me with advice and wisdom on the needs of community colleges and guidance on improving education policy at the Federal level. I am grateful for her friendship and leadership in offering students high-quality education.

Congratulations, Waubonsee, on your 50th anniversary. Your hard work helps our community's students succeed.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE HACKING

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, 2016 is shaping up to be a banner year for cybersecurity, and not in a good way. From attacks on the Ukrainian power grid to attempts to undermine American electoral confidence through the dissemination of hacked documents from the Democratic National Committee, cyber tools are fully emerging as instruments of state power.

If these incidents seem to be disproportionately affecting us and our allies, it is because our cybersecurity posture has not yet matched the threat we face. That being said, we recognize, of course, it is easier to attack than to defend.

Thankfully, there are steps we can take to protect our networks. We can invest in our cyber defenses, we can clarify cybersecurity roles and responsibilities within government, we can build our workforce to take on these new challenges, and we can also build our resilience.

The goal of our adversaries is not necessarily just to leak emails, but it is to shake faith in our electoral system. We cannot allow that to happen.

PENNSYLVANIA WILDS CENTER FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP

(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, in August, I was proud to announce a grant of $500,000 from the Appalachian Regional Commission to the Pennsylvania Wilds Center for Entrepreneurship, located in Warren County in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District.

The Pennsylvania Wilds region includes 2 million acres of land in the north central and northwestern portion of Pennsylvania and includes 12 counties. Tourism in that area has increased dramatically in recent decades, with plenty of opportunities for fishing, hunting, kayaking, and canoeing, not to mention plenty of forestland for hiking.

This grant will be dedicated to the Center's Nature Tourism Cluster Development in the Pennsylvania Wilds, which is intended to develop a network of small businesses to support the increased need for products and services in the Pennsylvania Wilds region.

The Pennsylvania Wilds Center for Entrepreneurship currently offers two business development programs, assisting prospective businessowners one on one to connect them with lenders, technical assistance providers, marketers, public lands managers, and other resources needed to start a business.

Mr. Speaker, tourism is one of Pennsylvania's largest and most vibrant industries. I look forward to seeing what this initiative can do to help grow the industry in the communities of the Pennsylvania Wilds.

GUN VIOLENCE IN NEW YORK CITY

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, Tiarah Poyau was young and full of life, like my daughters. She was the same age as many of the interns in my office. Like them, she had big dreams and she was full of promise. She completed her bachelor of science at St. John's University in my district and was pursuing a master's degree. She dreamt of being an accountant.

At 22, she had the promise of being a successful young woman and an outstanding and upstanding member of society. But those dreams and that promise, they ended this past weekend. They ended when Tiarah's life was cut short by a bullet in New York City.

That same night, less than a block away from where she was shot, 17-year-old Tyreke Borel was gunned down—less than a block away.

Behind every gun death is a person like Tiarah and Tyreke, a person with dreams and with promise. These victims of gun violence and their families and friends have received thoughts and prayers from this Congress, but because of the Republican majority, they haven't received action.

Victims and their loved ones deserve better. They deserve a debate and a vote on commonsense gun reform on the House floor.

In this Nation, we encourage our kids to dream big. We tell them that with hard work, they can transform their potential into success. We let them down if we fail to protect them, and so far, that is exactly what we have done.

HONORING HOWARD ''RED'' McCARRICK

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Howard ''Red'' McCarrick, a World War II veteran from Lake Orion, Michigan.

On a whim, Mr. McCarrick signed up for the United States Army Air Corps in 1942. He had to wait until his 18th birthday in 1943 before officially joining. Initially, Mr. McCarrick trained to be a pilot, but he changed his focus and volunteered to be a ball turret gunner.

After graduating gunner training as a corporal, he flew B–24s on national

security missions until the end of World War II and was honorably discharged in 1946.

After his time in the Army Air Corps, Mr. McCarrick continued down the path of public service, working for the Rochester Community Schools for 31 years.

Mr. McCarrick is an American hero—a patriot, a father, and a proud member of the Lake Orion community. He was recently honored by Chief Jerry Narsh and the Lake Orion Police Department as the 2016 Lake Orion Honored Veteran.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have such an outstanding American hero in my district.

Thank you, Mr. McCarrick, for your service to our country and your commitment to our community.

RECOGNIZING CLARESSA SHIELDS

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a remarkable young woman from Flint, my hometown. Her name is Claressa Shields. Her accomplishments as an athlete and as an Olympian and continued commitment to our State and to our community really make us proud.

Introduced to boxing at a young age, Claressa has built an impressive career that boasts two consecutive gold medals from the 2012 Olympics in London and the 2016 Olympics in Rio de Janeiro.

That feat makes her the first American, male or female, to win back-to-back gold medals in boxing. She also made history in 2012 at the Olympics in London when she became the first American woman ever to win gold in boxing.

Through her victories, Claressa has inspired the dreams of young people in Michigan and across the country. She is an extraordinary young woman who credits her success to hard work and to her faith.

Claressa Shields represents the resilience of the American Dream and the strong, proud spirit of our mutual hometown of Flint. I applaud her for her dedication to her sport, and thank her for her dedication to our hometown. The good news is Claressa Shields is just getting started.

RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA'S LUNAR AND PLANETARY LAB

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, it is launch day. I rise today to recognize the dedicated men and women at the University of Arizona's Lunar and Planetary Lab, who are leading NASA's historic OSIRIS-REx space mission.

Launching from Cape Canaveral, Florida, tonight, the OSIRIS-REx spacecraft will embark on a 7-year journey to the Bennu asteroid, where it will collect samples before returning to Earth. If successful, the mission will mark the first time a spacecraft has gathered samples from a moving asteroid.

The University of Arizona's leadership of the OSIRIS-REx mission adds to its already impressive reputation in planetary sciences.

I would like to extend my best wishes to all of the scientists at UA and elsewhere working on this project for a successful launch and mission.

□ 1630

JEFF AND DERALYN'S 60TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Jeff and Deralyn Davis of Fort Worth, who celebrated 60 years of marriage on August 25 of this year.

Jeff met his beloved Deralyn and began a courtship that led them to the sacred union of marriage on August 25, 1956, in Corsicana, Texas. For 55 years of their union, they have been residents of the city of Fort Worth. Throughout the years, Jeff and Deralyn have been very, very active in the community.

Jeff is a member of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity and has served as the assistant superintendent of the Everman Independent School District. Jeff's influence in education was such that he was commemorated by having a school named after him—the Jefferson Davis 9th Grade Center.

Deralyn was a graduate of Jackson High School in Corsicana and was a graduate of Huston-Tillotson University in Austin. She is also active in AKA, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated, the Fort Worth chapter. Deralyn was also very instrumental in the creation of the Texas Coalition of Black Democrats during its heyday.

The Davises have two children—daughter Jefflyn Davis and their son, Jock Kevin Davis, who passed away in 2005—and three grandchildren.

I congratulate Jeff and Deralyn on 60 years of marriage.

IN MEMORY OF ROBERT KERSTIENS, SR.

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate a man who, I think, is bigger than life. He is a longtime resident of Red Bluff, California. He is a cattleman. His name is Robert Kerstiens, Sr. He just passed recently here at the age of 92.

Mr. Kerstiens was a World War II veteran and was also a ranger with CAL FIRE in California. He was a well-respected and revered figure in the community, known for his selfless service, caring personality, and strong leadership.

Straight out of high school, Bob joined the Army and was immediately sent off to training. When recalling his time in serving the country, we learned he was involved in the Battle of the Bulge and in the Battle of Remagen, which earned him a Bronze Star as well as a Presidential Unit Citation for his group. These are places I have read about in history and that movies have been made about. Bob Kerstiens has lived that, and he was an integral part of helping win those battles—very important ones for us in winning the war in Europe.

Following his return from the war, Kerstiens continued his path of service in a new role—as a firefighter foreman for CAL FIRE, where he worked his way up the ranks to the department's ranger in charge, after which he was appointed to the State Board of Forestry. His service and contributions to our community and State left a lasting impact that shaped many of the policies that keep our forests safe and healthy.

In the community, his involvement never went unnoticed. An eight-time board president on the Tehama District Fair Board, a shareholder in the Red Bluff Round-Up Association, and a beloved judge of the Wild Horse Race Rodeo, his involvement never went unnoticed. He was a true cattleman, a true gentleman, a great man from Tehama County in northern California. He will be missed.

PASS THE FAMILIES OF FLINT ACT

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the ongoing crisis in Flint, Michigan, is a clear reminder that this Congress has unfinished work to do.

Our constituents will rightly judge our job performance by our work, not by our finger-pointing, not by empty expressions of concern. We need to get to work, and we need to work together to provide clean water for the people of Flint; but we can't stop there because Flint is not an isolated incident. We have seen dangerous lead levels in schools that are outside of Fresno, California, and that are even in our own Capitol buildings here in Washington, D.C.

What has happened in Flint is a symptom of a much greater ill of underinvestment in our Nation's clean water infrastructure. A generation ago, it was a Republican President and a Californian, Ronald Reagan, who signed significant updates to the Safe Drinking Water Act in 1986. He knew then that clean water infrastructure was not a partisan issue. Thirty years

later, it is our turn. The bipartisan case for investing in clean water infrastructure has never been stronger.

Every single American deserves access to clean and safe drinking water. So let's get to work. Let's pass the Families of Flint Act, and let's work on a national clean water infrastructure plan to prevent another disaster like this from happening in the future.

THE ZIKA VIRUS AND GUN SAFETY

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to echo the pleas of the American people, especially those in my own home district of the United States Virgin Islands, in calling for this Congress to pass a Zika funding bill and to pass commonsense gun safety legislation.

It has been more than 6 months since the President submitted a plan to this Congress and almost 3 months since House Democrats took to the floor to call for a vote on commonsense gun safety legislation. Instead of passing these bills, Congress has decided to focus its attention on politically charged investigations into investigations. While this Congress was in its longest recess in 60 years, the number of overall confirmed Zika cases and the number of Americans killed and wounded by gun violence continued to grow.

There have been 4,500 lives lost to gun violence in the time that we have been out in recess. This number, sadly, includes the lives of almost a dozen young men and women in the Virgin Islands, including the lives of two police officers and a firefighter. Additionally, there are now more than 11,000 confirmed cases of Zika in the United States, 243 of those confirmed cases being in the U.S. Virgin Islands, and 14 of those are pregnant women.

The lifetime cost of treating a child with microcephaly is estimated to be more than $10 million for that child—a cost that will only exacerbate the financial woes of this country's and the territories' public health apparatus. The lack of funding for these public health activities will put hundreds of thousands of pregnant women at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I call on this Congress to act quickly and fully fund the President's emergency request to fight the Zika virus as well as to pass lifesaving, commonsense gun safety legislation.

THE ZIKA VIRUS: A PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, you have heard the cries of our colleagues. You have heard the cries of the American people. Redundancy is not a question here. It is telling the truth. In fact, our health professionals have indicated that the Zika virus presents an unprecedented threat to the people of our Nation, especially to pregnant women. We cannot hear this often enough, and although busy with the beginning of the school year and with going back to work, it is important to warn the American people of this impending and ongoing threat.

While we are fiddling and doing things that have no impact on providing a portion of the $1.9 billion that is needed by the American people, we have 1,600 cases of Zika virus in the United States—200 plus women who are pregnant and 35 known transmitted diseases here in the United States of the Zika virus. We also now know, through health professionals, that it is sexually transmitted. We know that the entire United States is vulnerable, but most of the vulnerable States are in the Gulf region.

It is time now to address the question of funding without riders, like preventing Planned Parenthood from getting funding, and without riders for allowing the Confederate flag to be in a veterans' cemetery.

Where is our concern about the American people—for the people in Louisiana with a lot of water? for the people in Texas with a lot of water? in Florida? in Puerto Rico?

It is important that this funding comes now to rapidly expand mosquito control programs and to accelerate a vaccine. That is really important—to be able to provide the American people with a vaccine. They are in the midst of the research. They need the funding. The CDC and the NIH have reprogrammed more money than they have to try to help those who are desperate.

I make the argument that it is time now for us to do the job. The other body needs to engage in providing a bill, and this body, this House, needs to stop playing those kinds of politics and provide the funding—the funding that does not take from Ebola but the funding that the American people need to be safe.

Mr. Speaker, we are currently in a state of a public health crisis as a result of the growing rate of Zika infections across the country.

Sadly, we are failing as our nation's leaders in our ability to respond to this crisis.

As days and month go by it is alarming and the level of action and inaction my colleagues are taking to hamper the ability of our federal government to respond to this rapidly growing public threat.

In particular, I am concerned that we—as a body of Congress—have not taken the critical steps to move forward and appropriate necessary funding that will help screen, treat, vaccinate and test deadly cases of Zika infections.

According to the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, Congress should be looking for ways to strengthen our nation's regulatory system by identifying gaps and instituting new science-based safeguards for the public.

I cannot agree more—as we are now in perilous times where the Zika virus presents unprecedented threats to the people of our nation.

As cited by Tom Frieden, Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Anthony Fauci, Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases at the National Institutes of Health in an op-ed, dated August 21, 2016:

There have been more than 16,800 cases of Zika infection reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in the U.S. and its territories, including more than 2,700 on the mainland.

Laboratory tests have confirmed that 1,595 pregnant women have been infected with the virus, and tragically, 17 babies have been born with birth defects related to Zika.

As highlighted by Frieden and Fauci—"We have an obligation to meet the Zika threat and protect this country"—as "the potential cost of a funding shortfall will be measured in human misery and even death."

Now is not the time to pass measures or engage in futile debates that will undermine or slow the ability of our federal and local governments to address and respond to this growing threat and active cases of Zika infections.

Rather, we need to invest in stopping this deadly, but preventable virus, before it is too late.

We cannot afford to stand by with our hands tied any longer.

Our limited time as the days in September wain down cannot be wasted.

We should be focused on the crucial mission of protecting our nation's people.

That is why, in these critical times of need, I am calling upon my colleagues to place the growing epidemic of the Zika virus at the top of our priorities and demand no less than fully financed measures to timely and adequately respond to this devastating and deadly public health emergency.

[From Time, Sept. 7, 2016]

HOW TO FIGHT ZIKA AND CURE NATION'S AILING PUBLIC HEALTH SYSTEM—ENACT A LAW TO RESPOND QUICKLY TO THREATS

(By Sheila Jackson Lee)

There is an excellent model that demonstrates how the U.S. should reform the current reactive model of public health emergency management—it is the solution found to address disasters established by the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act. Under the Stafford Act, enacted in 1974 and later updated in 1988, authorizes the President of the United States, when disaster strikes, to deploy the coordinated efforts and resources of the federal government to save lives and property, and restore communities hit hard by a calamity. The federal government provides warnings of hurricanes and floods, and in cases of wildfires dispatches resources to extinguish flames before they threaten people and property.

The knowledge of public health experts, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, policy makers, health-care professionals and patient advocacy organizations should be brought together with the relevant committees in the House and Senate to develop measurable criteria to create baselines for defining, responding and mitigating public health threats to effectively and immediately without the delay engendered by the need for Congress to pass an emergency supplemental appropriations.

The U.S. must be capable of responding quickly to emerging threats that are identified anywhere in the world. The Ebola and Zika viruses for examples existed in other

nations for many years before they became a clear and present threat to public health in the Western Hemisphere and the U.S. The cost of waiting until a public health threat is present in the U.S. increases the threat to our nation's public health systems; it reduces the likelihood of success in winning the battle against a pathogen and it risks a new contagious disease becoming endemic—akin to the common cold. In addition, the cost of putting down a public health threat increases as time passes.

There is a long history of threats to public health posed by pathogens. In March 1918, in Kansas, the U.S. had its first case of the Spanish Flu, which is recorded as the first H1N1 flu epidemic. This pandemic killed 50 million persons worldwide it ended abruptly in 1919. The mortality rate of the Spanish Flu was as high as 1 death for every 5 infections and 50% of the deaths, or about 25 million, occurred in the first 25 weeks of the outbreak. We are now in the 31st week of the Zika Virus global health emergency, which was declared by the World Health Organization on Feb. 1, 2016.

The world is still battling the HIV/AID global pandemic, which became known to public health experts well before the disease made it into the United States. Still, it took President Clinton's efforts to put the full force of the federal government behind finding an effective treatment for HIV that slowed the progression of the disease from becoming full blown AIDs. By 2011, more than 6o million people globally had been infected by AIDS and 25 million had died.

The legislative process has proven itself not to respond in a timely manner to public health threats. The U.S. to be more robust enough needs to have in place mechanisms designed to respond systemically to federally declared public health emergencies and deliver assistance to support state and local governments in carrying out their responsibility to protect the public health. This is the second time in three years that a global health emergency has been declared that required Congress to act by passing a new law to fund the national response. This is the second time that the legislative process failed to act quickly when the public health threat was known and its consequences were clearly understood by domestic infectious disease experts.

On Aug. 24, 2014, the Democratic Republic of the Congo Ministry of Health notified the World Health Organization of an outbreak of Ebola virus. On Oct. 8, 2014, Ebola claimed the life of Thomas Eric Duncan after he presented symptoms at the time of admission to an emergency room. He had recently traveled to a country where the disease was actively being transmitted; he had a fever over too degrees accompanied by abdominal pain, dizziness, nausea and headache. Communications had gone to public health officials, hospitals, and health-care providers from the Centers for Disease Control stating that all patients should be asked whether they had traveled to West Africa recently; and checked for sytnptoms of Ebola, which include a dangerously high fever, abdominal pain, nausea and headache. Unfortunately, Mr. Duncan having all of the symptoms to be considered a possible Ebola patient was not admitted for observation, tests, and treatment, but instead sent home.

As of April 13, 2016, globally there were 28,652 suspected Ebola cases; 15,261 laboratory confirmed Ebola cases and 11,325 deaths from Ebola. Today, the CDC continue to monitor for Ebola disease outbreaks. We can no longer act as if a disease outbreak in a nation on the other side of the world has no relevance or importance to the public health status of communities within the U.S. In fact, we know that this is not the case. H1N1, Ebola, and Zika viruses are hard lessons to the global health community teaching that the world has changed and that it is time the U.S. adjusts by becoming proactive and cease being reactive in preparing for and defending against public health threats and emergencies.

Establishing a model that is quantitative and based upon measurable changes in public health conditions around the world as well as within the U.S. and having the capacity to react quickly can save lives and assures public health system stability. Our nation has some local health-care systems that are second to none, such as the Houston Medical Center, but our national public health system has glaring weaknesses when handling pathogens that may be as dangerous as Ebola and as contagious as the Spanish Flu. There are only four hospitals in the U.S., and a total of 15–16 beds, for persons infected with a human viral hemorrhagic fever: Emory University Hospital in Atlanta has two Ebola beds, St. Patrick Hospital in Missoula, Montana, has one or two; National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Maryland, has the capacity to treat two patients in its Special Clinical Studies Unit, according to the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases at the NIH; and Nebraska Medical Center in Omaha, reportedly has a biocontainment facility with 10 beds total.

The public health challenge for our nation is to effectively address the sudden emergence of a highly contagious pathogen with a mortality rate of 1 in 5 so that the public health threat may be identified within hours of patient zero, a team of public health experts deployed with the requisite equipment and resources within 24 hours to any point on the globe, establish field labs, hospitals, coordinate with local public health officials, communicate with public health and disease experts globally; type and identify the threat; its method of transmission; and determine what is needed to contain the threat; while beginning work on treatments and potential cures. Their work would also be to calculate mortality rates and the point when the disease may become endemic over a 25 week time period to stop its spread, which should include communicating to local, state and tribal public health officials' the information they will need to prepare to face the threat that may be just a flight away.

A Public Health Relief and Emergency Assistance Law is overdue—I urge the leadership of the House and the Senate to work in a bipartisan fashion to put on the desk of the President of the United States a law that will be the cure for the weaknesses in our nation's public health system when it is faced with public health emergencies.

President Obama is calling on Congress to fight the Zika virus by providing $1.8 billion in emergency funds to:

Rapidly expand mosquito control programs.

Accelerate vaccine research and diagnostic development

Educate health providers, women, and partners about the disease.

Improve health services and support for low-income pregnant women.

Help Zika-affected countries better control transmission.

HOW IS ZIKA TRANSMITTED?

Zika is primarily spread to people through the bite of infected Aedes mosquitoes. It can also be transmitted from a pregnant mother to her baby during pregnancy, though we do not know how often that transmission occurs.

There is also evidence that the Zika virus can be sexually transmitted by a man to his partners. At this time, however, there is no evidence that women can transmit the Zika virus to their sex partners. You can learn more about the Zika virus and guidance to avoid sexual transmission.

WHERE ARE PEOPLE CONTRACTING ZIKA?

People are contracting Zika in areas where Aedes mosquitoes are present, which include South America, Central America and the Caribbean. As the CDC notes, specific areas where the Zika virus is being transmitted are likely to change over time.

WHO IS AT RISK OF BEING INFECTED?

Anyone who is living in or traveling to an area where the virus is found is at risk for infection.

WHY ARE THERE SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PREGNANT WOMEN?

There may be a link between a serious birth defect called microcephaly—a condition in which a baby's head is smaller than expected—and other poor pregnancy outcomes and a Zika infection in a mother during pregnancy. While the link between Zika and these outcomes is being investigated the CDC recommends that you take special precautions if you fall into one of these groups:

If you are pregnant (in any trimester):

You should consider postponing travel to any area where the Zika virus is active.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FLOODING IN LOUISIANA

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the opportunity to come and update the House on the flooding conditions in the State of Louisiana. I talked about how this is, potentially, the fourth most costly flood disaster in U.S. history. Louisiana received 31 inches of rain in a 36-hour period, which is what the American average rainfall is. It would translate to nearly 25 feet of snow if it were a snowstorm.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put this in a personal context. Think about a person who owns a $200,000 house. That person's house is now worth $100,000 because it is flooded and gutted. That person is going to have to pay $120,000 to finish his mortgage, which means he is upside down on his mortgage. It is going to cost him $80,000 to rebuild his house, $40,000 to replace his car, $10,000 to replace his wardrobe.

Mr. Speaker, the Stafford Act is insufficient to address these financial situations that people are facing today. This isn't one person. This is tens of thousands of homeowners and businessowners across south Louisiana who are facing this impossible financial decision before them in the coming weeks.

I urge the White House to immediately send a supplemental appropriations request to the Congress. Let's get working on this and resolve this issue. Make this an easy decision for folks back home so we can get back on our feet.

15TH ANNIVERSARY OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, September 11, marks the 15th anniversary of the vicious attacks on America.

I very much appreciate the leadership's scheduling a commemoration on the steps of the Capitol tomorrow morning, but more needs to be said as, I fear, time and events have dulled our memories.

In addition, our Nation has grown by over 60 million since September 11, 2001—children born after the towers came down, including the 13,000 babies who came into this world on that incredible day. Unlike the rest of us, they have no direct memories of these horrendous events that changed our Nation forever as hate-filled extremists struck in the streets of Lower Manhattan, in the fields of Pennsylvania, and at the Pentagon. Over 700 citizens from my State of New Jersey died on that day.

Our mere words cannot possibly capture the sentiments that surround September 11. So in lieu of extended, formal remarks, I would like to read, as I have in past years, ''The Names,'' a poem written by the then-poet laureate Billy Collins, which he read before a congressional joint session in New York City just after the attacks which Members of Congress heard firsthand.

''THE NAMES''

By Billy Collins

Yesterday, I lay awake in the palm of the night.
A soft rain stole in, unhelped by any breeze,
And when I saw the silver glaze on the windows,
I started with A, with Ackerman, as it happened,
Then Baxter and Calabro,
Davis and Eberling, names falling into place
As droplets fell through the dark.
Names printed on the ceiling of the night.
Names slipping around a watery bend.
Twenty-six willows on the banks of a stream.
In the morning, I walked out barefoot
Among thousands of flowers
Heavy with dew like the eyes of tears,
And each had a name—
Fiori inscribed on a yellow petal
Then Gonzalez and Han, Ishikawa and Jenkins.
Names written in the air
And stitched into the cloth of the day.
A name under a photograph taped to a mailbox.
Monogram on a torn shirt,
I see you spelled out on storefront windows
And on the bright, unfurled awnings of this city.
I say the syllables as I turn a corner—
Kelly and Lee,
Medina, Nardella, and O'Connor.
When I peer into the woods,
I see a thick tangle where letters are hidden
As in a puzzle concocted for children.
Parker and Quigley in the twigs of an ash,
Rizzo, Schubert, Torres, and Upton,
Secrets in the boughs of an ancient maple.
Names written in the pale sky.
Names rising in the updraft amid buildings.
Names silent in stone
Or cried out behind a door.
Names blown over the Earth and out to sea.
In the evening—weakening light, the last swallows.
A boy on a lake lifts his oars.
A woman by a window puts a match to a candle,
And the names are outlined on the rose clouds—
Vanacore and Wallace,
(let X stand, if it can, for the ones unfound)
Then Young and Ziminsky, the final jolt of Z.
Names etched on the head of a pin.
One name spanning a bridge, another undergoing a tunnel.
A blue name needled into the skin.
Names of citizens, workers, mothers and fathers,
The bright-eyed daughter, the quick son.
Alphabet of names in a green field.
Names in the small tracks of birds.
Names lifted from a hat
Or balanced on the tip of the tongue.
Names wheeled into the dim warehouse of memory.
So many names, there is barely room on the walls of the heart.

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

□ 1645

IGNITING AMERICA'S ECONOMY WITH FAIRTAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am down here with some of my colleagues to talk about one thing, and one thing only in our time, and that is about igniting America's economy.

We can talk all we want to about putting people back to work; but nibbling around the edges of the American economy isn't going to solve the problem for the men and women in the Seventh District of Georgia, nor the men and women in the great State of Texas, nor the men and women in Alabama, or anywhere across this country.

What we need is a competitive advantage on the rest of the world. We have the most capable workforce on the planet. We have the hardest working workforce on the planet. We have the best infrastructure on the planet. We have the most freedom on the planet.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that we then would not have the most robust and growing economy on the planet? I tell you it is for one reason, and one reason only, and that is the burden of the American Tax Code on the American entrepreneur.

It is the burden of the American Tax Code on those men and women who want to make America great, who want to put people back to work, but who cannot do it because the Tax Code disadvantages them relative to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, there is an idea in this Chamber—and you know it well—it is called the FairTax, and it is H.R. 25. Anybody in America can look it up. It is at www.congress.gov.

In just over 100 pages, H.R. 25 describes how we could rip this United States Tax Code out by the roots and replace it—where we can rip this Code out by the roots and, rather than having the single worst Tax Code on the planet, have the single best Tax Code on the planet. It describes how we could rip it out by the roots and, rather than punishing people for how productive they are, begin to tax people based on how much they take out of the economy, a consumption tax. That is the way our Framers founded this country, and that is the way we could fund this country again.

Mr. Speaker, right now is the time. With the economic challenges, the headwinds blowing against America as they are today, right now is the time. I do not want to compete with the rest of the world based on low wages. I do not want to compete with the rest of the world based on unsafe workplaces. I do not want to compete with the rest of the world based on whose air is dirtier or whose water is unsafe.

I want high wages. I want safe workplaces. I want clean water, and I want clean air. But I do want to compete with the rest of the world based on whose Tax Code makes the most sense.

Mr. Speaker, I was elected in 2010, just 5½ short years ago. One of the Members in that freshman class with me was MO BROOKS from northern Alabama. He's down here on the floor tonight. When I got ready to introduce the FairTax in that Congress, MO was one of the first folks out of the box to say, ROB, we can make a difference, we can make a difference for the country, and we can make a difference for individual families; put me down as a sponsor of the FairTax.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for the opportunity to stand with him tonight as we discuss the FairTax. Quite frankly, I wish my eloquence was that of yours. Certainly, my passion is for the FairTax, with all the economic benefits that it would yield to the American people, the job creation it would yield, and the simplification of the headaches that occur every March and April as American people, including job creators, have to try to figure out how much taxes they have to pay.

In that vein, I have some prepared remarks, but I am available for any colloquy that you may want to have afterwards.

Mr. Speaker, America's Tax Code is so complex as to border on impossible for any one person to understand. According to the National Taxpayers Union, in 2016, American taxpayers suffered an economic loss of $234 billion from the 1.9 billion hours of time spent trying to figure out and pay their taxes.

Making matters worse, from 1986 when President Reagan signed the Tax

Reform Act into law to today, the Tax Code has grown from 30,000 to 70,000 pages, more than doubling in size. Further, the corporate tax rate has skyrocketed to 39.1 percent, easily claiming the highest rate in the industrialized world.

I cannot emphasize enough the detrimental impact America's complicated Tax Code has on our economy and the burden it creates for taxpayers and job creators alike.

As such, I strongly support Representative ROB WOODALL's FairTax Act to abolish the Federal income tax, employment tax, and estate and gift tax, and replace them with a national sales tax and prebate that eliminates the effect of sales taxes on low-income families.

Businesses and families know how to best spend their hard-earned money. We need a system that puts power back into the hands of the taxpayer, not government bureaucrats. The FairTax proposal makes this possible. In particular, it eliminates the income tax and stops the Federal Government's snooping into American citizens' incomes, savings, and bank accounts, while still producing the revenue needed to fund the Federal Government.

The FairTax is simpler, thereby saving taxpayers billions of hours and hundreds of billions of dollars in trying to determine tax liability.

In addition, the FairTax dramatically stimulates America's economy by eliminating costly income tax and compliance costs for America's employers, thus cutting the cost of producing American goods and services by roughly 15 to 20 percent, a huge competitive advantage in an increasingly tough international marketplace. This competitive advantage for American job creators means more jobs and higher incomes for American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to bring the FairTax legislation to the House floor for a vote to simplify the Tax Code, return American individual freedom, and grow the economy.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, I encourage the Members of the House of Representatives to support this plain, commonsense way of collecting taxes, stimulating the economy, and getting the Federal Government more so out of our own personal lives.

Mr. Speaker, to the extent Congressman WOODALL has more that he wants to discuss, I am available.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman had me at more jobs and higher wages for workers. You had me there.

One of the things we don't ever talk about is the snooping that you describe. Now, ''snooping'' is a powerful word. As you were talking about that, it dawned on me that the Federal Government knows more about my finances than any member of my family. Think about that. The Federal Government knows more about me and my finances than I am willing to tell any member of my family.

When I think about freedom in this country, when I think about what the government needs to do to keep us safe, to keep the economy growing, I don't think about that degree of invasiveness as being necessary today.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is not just the snooping. It is also the coercion where the Federal Government uses, Washington uses the Tax Code to compel people to engage in conduct that they otherwise would not engage in, or to not engage in conduct that, under normal circumstances were they free to do so without potential retaliation by the IRS, they would engage in.

We have some issues, by way of example, where the Internal Revenue Service has been used to try to achieve political gains, where the Internal Revenue Service has been used to punish people because they have chosen to exercise their freedom of speech rights or their religious rights or because they chose to associate with some people rather than other people, all rights guaranteed in the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The power that we have given the Federal Government and the Internal Revenue Service through the Tax Code can all be taken away from the Federal Government by going to the FairTax.

The reasons to support the FairTax so far greatly outnumber any potential harms that detractors may describe. Again, I urge the Speaker of the House to allow this legislation to come up for a House floor vote so that we can support it, so that we can pass it through the House of Representatives. Should it fail, the American people will know who was on record in support of liberating the American people from the Internal Revenue Service and who wants to keep the Internal Revenue Service as our masters with our being in bondage to their whims. So there are lots of advantages and very few disadvantages.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia and the people of the great State of Georgia who have sent him here so that he can advocate on their behalf and advocate for a FairTax that just makes sense.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I have appreciated the gentleman's friendship and his leadership since he and I arrived here together just two terms ago.

While the gentleman from Alabama was speaking, I put up a poster that has a postmark that reads April 15. You were talking about what it means to make March and April less intimidating, less frightening. He talked about coercion and intimidation.

I would wager there is not a single American citizen age 16 or older—anyone who has ever held a job and had a paycheck—that when I put up a postmark of April 15 they don't know exactly what that means. That means that is the day the tax man is going to come calling.

I am going to do the very best I can to get it right. But if I don't because it is too complex and I just can't figure it all out, the Federal Government and criminal enforcement are going to come calling. It is a frightening day for folks to do a civic responsibility, and that's to help keep the government open.

If I had to choose a region of the country that led as aggressively as Alabama leads, as Georgia leads, it would have to be the great State of Texas. We are joined tonight by the chairman from the great State of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY.

I believe, if I went back and counted all the cosponsors of the FairTax, the FairTax is the single most widely cosponsored tax reform bill in the entire United States House of Representatives. I believe we have more cosponsors from the State of Texas than any other State in the Nation. Of course, Texas has abolished their income tax and is governed by a consumption tax.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure Texas ever had an income tax, and I am pretty sure we are not ever going to have one.

As part of my professional background, I am a CPA and my license is still current. Before I joined Congress, I spent 30-plus years helping clients cope, deal, understand, and pay their taxes.

Speaking of the IRS and the intimidation factor, as a CPA, if I get a letter from the IRS addressed to me, my heart rate goes up before I open it. Now, it shouldn't be that way. It shouldn't have that kind of impact on any of us because I work really hard, as you might expect, to make sure that I get my taxes done.

My colleagues have both hit many of the high points on the FairTax. The choices we have out there now: there is the current Code, and there are advocates for that; there is a flat tax, and there are advocates for that; then there is a national sales tax, and I have cosponsored it after six terms and am proud to do that.

There are several reasons I have settled on the sales tax. One, it eliminates the IRS. Every government needs taxes in order to run. That tax collection scheme should have no other purpose, other than collecting the minimum amount of money needed to fund that government.

The current Code from '86 forward—and back, actually, to 1916—has been used over and over and over to manipulate this behavior, to incentivize that, disincentivize this, reward this half, punish, all these kinds of things.

□ 1700

That is manipulative and it is inefficient, and it is just the wrong use of a Tax Code. We shouldn't be using it that way. So that is why I have settled on a national sales tax. The reason I do that versus a flat tax is because, quite frankly, the flat tax, as most people understand it, leaves in place the IRS,

leaves in place the opportunity for the mischief that goes on with the current Code.

We could go to a flat tax, as we did sort of in 1986. The 1986 act was more in that direction. It reduced rates, flattened the rates out, eliminated some, those kinds of things. Thirty years later, we are more complicated today than we were in 1986. The flat tax leaves all of that opportunity for mischief in place going forward.

So the ink wouldn't be dry on the flat tax until somebody would say, hey, you know, if you give us a little relief on that flat tax thing for this area, look how it would prosper, grow the economy, create jobs, all those kinds of good things, and every one of those provisions are in there, so the flat tax and the current Code share much of that same risk.

Sales tax, on the other hand, is collected by the States. You would eliminate the IRS, so it is collected at the point of sale. The compliance, the studies show that the compliance with that sales tax would be greater than the current compliance we have with the income tax that we currently have, and so compliance would be better. It would be left up to the States to collect it. They would get a little slice for doing that on our behalf. The rest of the money would come into the Federal Government.

You would eliminate the entire bureaucracy that is the IRS and the good and the bad that they have done in the past, more bad lately than good because of the punishing taxpayers, going after taxpayers because their political beliefs are different from the current boss of the IRS, who is Barack Obama. That goes away, and it is just better.

I would caution, though, there are those who would argue, well, let's just do both. Let's have a little bitty income tax and a little bitty sales tax. Don't do that. The jurisdictions who have both wind up raising both. Let's pick one and stick with it, as hard as it might be to transition and all this kind of good stuff. Let's do that because of the impact it has on the opportunity for manufacturing in the United States to compete, as you just said. In addition to the tax, there is that overregulation thing that hurts them as well, but the Tax Code creates a huge competitive disadvantage that we can do something about now.

Overregulation, you know, that is in the eye of the beholder, but the income tax, the impact the income tax has on the cost of goods sold outside of the country, that is clear, and there is definitely something we could do about that.

I appreciate my colleague bringing this up.

The one thing that people ask back home who are supportive of the FairTax is: What do we do? How do we get this done? Quite frankly, it is educating taxpayers, because the uninitiated would listen to that 30-second commercial that says, you know, this politician is in favor of a percentage increase in taxes. They leave out the little nugget that we would do away with the IRS, do away with income tax, estate tax. That kind of gets left out of that 30-second commercial.

We have got to have an educated taxpayer base out there that looks at that commercial and says, no, wait a minute, as Paul Harvey said, that is not—there is more to it, there is ''the rest of the story'' associated with that tax increase that they would like to champion this to go against it—so, educating taxpayers.

I ask folks, when I bring this up at a townhall, to look at it themselves. What does it do to your business? What does it do to you personally? How does it impact you? Educate, because there is no interest like self-interest. So look what it does for you, and it is a better way to get at it.

It has got all these advantages. All this investment would stay here in the United States. I have cosponsored it for 6 years.

One quick anecdote and I will shut up. I have not had a CPA come to me and complain about sponsoring the FairTax, that you are going to put us out of business. I did have the mother of a CPA come to me, and she was a diminutive little lady who thumped me on the chest really hard and said: Don't you put my daughter out of business. I said: Ma'am, I have got that. I have got that.

Well, it just so happens I am real good friends with the CPA daughter. I ran into her a couple weeks later. She said: Hey, I understand you saw my mom. I said: Yeah, she was worried about me putting you out of business. She said: Don't worry about my mom. If the Code went away, all that tax compliance work went away, we would find really good stuff that we could do for our clients to promote their business, help them be more efficient, help them grow and do all those kinds of things that we would really rather do than comply with an ever-changing Tax Code.

I appreciate my colleague sponsoring this hour tonight and those who are about to speak and have spoken, because it is important to educate the American taxpayer so that that groundswell of support—you know, the folks who support a national sales tax, the folks who support a flat tax, basically, are telling Congress, we want something other than the current Code. The problem is we have got to have enough oomph, enough political muscle from the electorate—I am not sure how she is going to spell that—to back it so they would represent that two-thirds to overcome a policy that is this invasive, this expansive, and make that happen.

So it is about educating taxpayers, getting them on board to create that political will that then gets communicated to the 435 of us who actually have the voting cards that can make it happen.

So I appreciate my colleague for sponsoring this tonight and allowing me to prattle on for a whole lot longer than you probably wanted, but thank you for letting me be with you tonight.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, your leadership has been invaluable on this, not just because of the people you represent, but because of your background as a CPA. The American people know instinctively there is a better way to do it, and to have it from someone who spent a lifetime in that space, we really can move on. I laughed at your story about getting thumped in the chest.

We have been joined by JODY HICE from the great State of Georgia. In our district, folks thump you in the chest and say, you better put your name on the FairTax. In fact, Congressman HICE has constituents out in the hallway right now but cared enough about the FairTax to come down just for a moment. I appreciate him doing that. I am happy to yield to him.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. It is just a great honor anytime to be able to speak on the FairTax, and I just want to say thank you for your incredible leadership in keeping this ball moving forward. But, yes, you are right. In fact, one of the first things I did when I took office here was to cosponsor the FairTax.

If there is any one issue in the 10th District of Georgia that I hear more than anything else, it is support for the FairTax. I think it is because the people know, really, two key things. Number one, taxes are far too high, excessive, and burdensome, and the Tax Code is absolutely too complicated. I hear this over and over and over. Every year it gets more and more complicated and bigger and bigger and bigger. And so, you know, we are at a point that the Tax Code itself literally cries out for reform, and I don't know of any better way of dealing with this than the FairTax.

We talk about having an economic boom, the likes of which we have never seen before. It is all wrapped up in reforming the Tax Code in a manner that can be done here with the FairTax. And, you know, this is something that absolutely we need to do. It is going to strengthen individual freedom.

Just think of this. Individual freedom is wrapped up in economic freedom, and the more we confiscate through our current tax system, the less individual freedom we have. It is going to promote jobs, the likes of which we haven't seen before. It is going to eliminate the IRS. Who among us doesn't want to see that happen?

The IRS, as we watch it these days even targeting individuals, it is just insane to think of any government agency targeting citizens of this country, but particularly an agency like the IRS that literally has the power to destroy lives. It is just an incredibly important issue for us to address, and so I am a strong supporter of the FairTax, and thank you for your leadership on this.

I think, as we come to the close of this 114th Congress, we need to do all

we can to keep this on the forefront—tax reform and, in particular, the FairTax. We need to move this needle forward. To you and your predecessor, John Linder, you have carried this weight on your shoulders a long time, and I am deeply appreciative of this and for your leadership in this Special Order. Thank you for letting me participate in it. I am deeply appreciative.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman. He is a new, first-term Member here, and he is already leading on all of these issues, and I am grateful to him for that. He has got his ear to the pulse of what folks want back home, and what folks want is more freedom and more economic opportunity. I am so grateful to him.

If I can ask the chairman: Trained as a CPA as you are, what is the benefit of the Tax Code? Everybody in this Chamber, from the far left to the far right, every Republican, every Democrat, everybody wants a better job environment. They want growth in the economy. They want the American people to succeed and be prosperous. What is in it for America to keep what we have today?

Mr. CONAWAY. Well, a couple things. Obviously, there is an industry created to help comply with a really complex Code. There is a smaller but, nevertheless, powerful industry that is in place to promote new changes and additional issues to add to the Code to make it more complicated. Every one of those special programs in the Code—deductions or credits—has an advocacy group. Somebody somewhere is using that piece in their tax return.

Here is an example. I was talking back home about the advantages of eliminating—A Better Way has got another tax program. But I said, making a comment, we are going to eliminate all those deductions and credits for individuals. I said, now, that is going to take political will because every one of them has an advocate, a taxpayer, not a lobbyist or all those kinds of bad words, but a taxpayer; and in order to overcome it, we are all going to have to give up our little special niches to make that happen.

No sooner was that out of my mouth and I finished it than a guy came up to me and said, hey, I agree with doing away with all those tax credits and all those deductions, but leave in place section 1031. Well, 1031 is that like-kind exchange section where I can take income-producing property, sell it, defer the gain, invest it in another income-producing property, and just kind of daisy-chain that down the road. Well, he is a broker. He sells ranches and farms, so it was in his best interest personally to make that happen.

It is hard to make broad statements that it does good stuff, but every one of those provisions has somebody somewhere in America who is taking advantage of it.

Here is another thing that just happened, and this has really nothing much to do with this. I got two calls today, one while I was sitting here waiting for this to start from a voice that said, ''Hello,'' very stern, this is so-and-so from the IRS, Internal Revenue Service, and you have an audit problem that you have not addressed. There is a big deal going on, and if you don't call this number back right away, we will interpret that as you trying to run from us, and it will enhance the charges against you. A clear scam because the IRS doesn't call you. But nevertheless, there is a scheme out there available that someone could use as a scam artist to frighten taxpayers because, to an uninitiated person, they would call that number back. I have no idea what it would do to your phone if you called it back.

There is something going on there that hasn't happened, but here is what would never happen. You will never get a call that says you have not paid your sales taxes, and because you have not paid your sales taxes, we are coming to get you. No, sales taxes are collected at the point of sale, and there will be no collection agency. There will be no opportunity for a scam in that regard.

But back on who benefits. Obviously, there are a group of folks who do tax compliance, and much of that is offshored, quite frankly, and then the people who use those individual pieces. So part of this is to overcome that inertia to change.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad you mentioned that scam. I am going to find the camera that is focused down here and tell folks, if you get a call from the IRS, it is not legitimate. Do not deal with somebody at the end of a 1–800 number who says there is an arrest warrant out for you. If you don't have any other option, call your Congressman, and we will intervene for you in that space. It is hundreds of millions of dollars that have been scammed from American citizens, Mr. Chairman, through this scheme.

The scheme works for one reason and one reason only, and that is that the IRS really is that scary to the average American citizen, and we created it. It is our creation, and we are complicit in this scam. Please, it is happening to your parents, your grandparents. I get those calls, too. I am in constituents' homes. The calls are coming in then, and not everyone knows it is a scam. Folks are so frightened by the IRS, they are paying these folks hundreds of millions of dollars today.

I appreciate you mentioning that.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman. Again, I appreciate him sponsoring this hour. I know you have a couple other Members who want to speak. Thank you for your generosity tonight.

Mr. WOODALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We have got down here with us what I would say is a gentleman who is second to none in terms of FairTax support. He is STEVE KING, from the great State of Iowa. Even before I was elected to Congress, I could turn on C–SPAN, and when folks wanted to talk about tax reform, I would see STEVE KING down here talking about a better way to do a Tax Code. I would hear him talking about, from his own personal experience, what it was like to be targeted by an agency like this and what it would mean, as a small-business owner himself, to be free of that burden and be able to go out and hire. I have always been grateful for his friendship since he has arrived, and I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa tonight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding, but especially for his leadership here in the United States Congress, and especially on the FairTax. And that introduction, Mr. Speaker, it flashes back to me some of the things that I haven't really spoken to recently and how far we haven't come over the years that this became, obviously, the best thing that we could possibly do from a tax perspective in America—or anywhere in the world, for that matter.

I have often told the story, but I should say I used to tell this story often, and that is that I am running my little construction business that I started up in 1975, and we have completed 41 years in business. I was audited one too many years in a row by the IRS, and I had learned that—we didn't have copy machines in those days, so if they could ask for data, I would have just said: Here, I will run all these copies. You can analyze them. I will go out and start a machine up and go to work, make a little money so I can pay my taxes.

What it really did was it shut me down. It shut me down because I had to sit there in my office and serve papers out to the auditor because I was the one who knew where the papers were, and they were in my filing cabinet. And I had learned in previous audits that I didn't want to just say: Here is the filing cabinet. I am going to work. Let me know what the bill is when you are done.

It didn't work out too well for me.

□ 1715

So, I sat there for 4 days, and I served papers to the IRS. I would say: I will give you a paper. You can look at it. You can take your notes. Do what you will. When you are done with that paper, hand it back to me and I will put it in the file, and then you ask for another record and I will give it to you.

We did that for 4 days. At the end of that period of time, we had an intense negotiation. It came down to a number. I remember it clearly. It doesn't seem so big today as it did then, but it was big then, and it was wrong.

I paid the taxes that I owed and had done that with good intent as well. I complied with the law, and I had intent to comply with the law. But they seemed to have intent that they were going to justify the 4 days of being drug through—I thought I was drug through that, not them—but when it

was all done, I had to go to the bank to borrow the money to pay the IRS that I believe to this day I did not owe. If I had otherwise borrowed the money to hire a lawyer to defend myself against the IRS and the Federal Government, the odds of success were so infinitesimally small that I had to decide do I want to stand on principle or—if I stand on principle, I can sacrifice my company—or do I want to borrow the money and pay bondage to what was an unjust principle and try to keep my business alive? That is what I decided to do.

Those who know me for the time I have been here know how hard that is—for me, especially. I had to swallow as hard as I have ever had to swallow. But I went back out to work, and I fired up that old bulldozer and I climbed in the seat and the smoke went out the exhaust stack and out of my ears. This is the way that a person has to do business in this country.

My oldest son owns that business today. He told me a narrative—not telling me the message I would get out of it—that he was joining up with an engineering firm to start a new business venture in addition to our construction work. They had a 90-minute meeting.

At the end of that meeting, David King said to the engineer: Mike, did you realize that we have just talked business for 90 minutes?

Yes, I surely do.

Do you know what our topic was for 90 minutes on this business venture?

Taxes.

Ninety minutes of human resources were burned up on how to set up a tax structure to start a new business rather than figuring how to produce a good or a service that has a marketable value here or abroad. That is what is wrong. It is the waste of human resources that are consumed in compliance with the IRS, and it is the waste of human resources that could be far better used in producing that good or service that has a marketable value here or abroad.

I have come not full circle on the issue. I stand exactly where I did in that time back in 1980 when I was audited one too many years in a row. But we are in the second generation of King Construction today, and I have to go back and look.

Just yesterday, I had a 1-hour meeting with a Commissioner of the IRS, Commissioner Koskinen, who is facing a privileged motion as well as a filed motion to face impeachment for malfeasance within the IRS; and the violations, I believe, happened directly under the watch of Lois Lerner.

So, I never imagined, Mr. Speaker, that day that I climbed in the seat of that old bulldozer and the smoke came out of the exhaust stack and my ears, and I began to think, I want to be rid of the IRS. I went through the process of, if you abolish the IRS, then what to do you do to replace the revenue? I spent weeks thinking that through. There was nobody to talk to in those days.

I would go to, I called it my OshKosh B'Gosh caucus, the guys in the overalls at 6 a.m. in the morning, and I would sit down and I would tell them we need to have a national sales tax; we need to replace the IRS; we need to abolish the IRS. Give people their freedom. Let them make their choices on their taxes when they purchase, not have somebody looking over your shoulder second-guessing all the decisions you have to make while you are in business.

For weeks, we went through that, and they got a little tired of hearing me talk about going to—I didn't call it a FairTax; I didn't have a name for it except national sales tax. Finally, they said, well, if that were such a good idea, we would already have done it by now. Anybody that served much time in Congress knows that is a laugher. We have lots of good ideas that we don't do by now because there are competing interests here.

I have taken this policy to Alan Greenspan, the former chairman, shortly after he retired. I went to his Spartan office in downtown D.C., and I asked him if he would be the national spokesman for the FairTax. It was my mission to be a good salesman—and I am a good salesman; I have a good-looking wife, and that is proof positive—for the FairTax.

We went through the FairTax, and he said: Congressman, this is not an economic question. You are asking me, as an economist, to be your spokesman. It is not an economic question. You will not find serious economists that disagree the FairTax does these things that you say.

He said: It's a political question. So economists should not be selling a political question. Politicians should sell a political question. That is you. You go sell it.

I said: Well, let me try this on you. I want to go through this list of things that I say the FairTax does that is good, and I want you to interrupt me and challenge me at any point along the way of any component that I have said that can't be sustained in an economic argument, an economic forum.

So, I went through the list. I will just hit some of them, not all of them. The FairTax abolishes the tax on productivity. We are punishing productivity in America. People on that side of the aisle believe that consumption drives the economy. Well, if you don't produce, it doesn't. It is the production that drives the economy, especially when you are importing or exporting it, and we need to get that back.

It eliminates the tax on production. It eliminates corporate income tax, personal income tax, estate tax, capital gains tax. It allows for the repatriation of the U.S. capital that is stranded overseas by the trillions of dollars that would be reinvested in the U.S.

I went through this vast list of things the FairTax does that are good, and I stopped and I said: You are not interrupting me, Mr. Chairman. He said: I don't need to do that, but you left something out. You didn't mention that the FairTax provides an incentive for savings and investment, and this economy desperately needs an incentive for savings and investment.

It wasn't that I left it out on purpose. I just forgot to say it.

So he said: Add that to what you are saying, and keep saying everything else.

And so I turned it into this. Now I just tell people the FairTax does everything good that anybody's tax policy does that is good. It does them all, and it does them all better. And that is pretty close to the final word on the topic.

Now, America needs to come to her senses, and if we want to have a stimulated economy, if we want to reverse this imbalance we have in trade and bring it back to where we have an export surplus instead of an import surplus, if we want to stabilize our currency, if we want to stimulate manufacturing and production in America, if you want to have a stable currency, a stable economy, an America that is a robust economy in the world again, we go to the FairTax.

That little island of Ireland that has attracted over 700 former U.S. companies that were domiciled in the U.S., now domiciled in Ireland with their little flat tax over there—it was zero for 10 years, became 10, then 13 percent or so. The dynamics that they have seen on that little island of Ireland, with the FairTax in America, would be multiplied by a factor that I hesitate to guess at here on the floor of the United States Congress. But it would be an awesome, dynamic change to our economy, and we wouldn't need to be importing millions of people from foreign countries to do these jobs Americans would do, because the wages would go up, the benefits would go up, our competitiveness would go up, and America would be back in the preeminent place in the world again.

That is how good this FairTax is. That is why I am here on the floor to support Mr. WOODALL, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and the opportunity to say a few words.

Mr. WOODALL. For folks who aren't following those numbers as closely as you are, yes, when this Tax Code was written in 1986, the average corporate income tax rate around the globe was almost 50 percent. Today, it is less than 25 percent. The rest of the world has been moving towards that tax competitiveness, while America has been standing still.

You asked about the good things that happen around here. Generally, the good things that happen are because folks come with individual experience, as you have come with; they come with passion, as you have come with.

What folks may not realize is here you are. The family runs King Construction, and you are not asking for a

tax cut. You are not asking for a tax carveout. You are not asking for a special favor or an exemption or a deduction. You are saying do away with all the special interests in the Tax Code, and let's just give everybody a fair shot at a flat and level code. It is that kind of selflessness that is going to drive the changes that have to happen here. Yes, there are special interests that are committed to selfish preservation of provisions in the Tax Code. I think selflessness is going to win out in that debate.

We are joined on the floor by a new Member from the great State of Georgia. His name is BUDDY CARTER. He represents the single fastest growing container port on the entire planet.

What I am saying to you is, when it comes to creating jobs in America, we have got to export to a billion new consumers in India and a billion new consumers in China, and we are not competitive with our Tax Code today.

The gentleman from Georgia sees this day in and day out, going out of the great Port of Savannah. In fact, I am told—the gentleman can correct me if I am wrong—out of your automobile exporting plant, we now export more Mercedes to the rest of the globe than any other vehicle out of that American port, because we are building Mercedes-Benz better and cheaper than the rest of the globe, and the rest of the world wants to buy them.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for holding this important debate on tax reform and the FairTax Act.

Tax reform is one of the most pressing issues facing our Nation today. In fact, it is so important that my very first act in Congress was to cosponsor this bill. I had promised that to my constituents. When I got here, that is exactly what I did. Without question, one of the most pressing issues that our citizenry has right now is tax reform. That is at the top of the list. So I am very proud to be able to participate in this.

You mentioned the ports. I am very blessed and very humble to be able to represent the First Congressional District in Georgia, which includes two major seaports: the Port of Savannah, which is the number two container port on the Eastern seaboard and number four in the Nation; and the Port of Brunswick, which is the number three roll-on, roll-off port in the country, meaning that we have cars down there that are leaving that port every day and going to all corners of the world.

It is something that we are very, very proud of, and something that adds to our economy. And it is not just the economy of the First Congressional District, but of the entire Southeast United States. That is how important it is. Again, that is why the FairTax is so very important to our country and why I support it so much.

We need a tax system that treats everyone equally, that encourages American businesses and the economy to grow and prosper. First of all, people don't like paying taxes. We understand that. We all understand the need to pay taxes. But if they are going to pay a tax, they want to pay a consumption tax. They don't want to pay a property tax. They would rather pay a consumption tax.

I have learned that after years of being a mayor and after years serving in the State legislature, that has been something that has been just very clear to me. And people want a tax system that is easy to understand. They don't like our current tax system that is so complex.

When you look at the IRS manual and you see how thick it is, it just boggles the mind to think that we can't come up with something much easier than that. That is why I compliment you on the FairTax, because it is simple and it is straightforward and it is fair, and that is what people want.

But even worse, we have got an out-of-control bureaucracy at the IRS that has completely lost the trust of the American people. When I go home, when I meet with my constituents time and time again, that is what they tell me, that they don't trust the IRS, that it is too complex. They want it to where they can file their taxes on a postcard. And there is no reason why we shouldn't have that and no reason why we shouldn't continue to work toward that common goal.

The FairTax Act would fully repeal our current tax system and replace it with a national sales tax on the use and our consumption of property or services in the U.S. By eliminating the Federal income tax, everyone can keep their entire paycheck and pay taxes only on what they consume. Again, a consumption tax.

No more struggling to understand the volumes and volumes of tax codes an exemptions. It would do away with all that. Simplify, simplify, simplify. Everyone would contribute their fair share based on what they purchase.

We all have to purchase. That is what makes our economy run, and that is why this is such an ideal tax and such an ideal system for me and for us as Americans.

You know, as a former small-business owner, I am fully aware of how difficult it is to be successful and grow when the tax system is so complicated and burdensome. I fought those battles. The uncertainty alone makes it very hard to take on the challenges and risk of building capital and hiring employees. The economy cannot grow if businessowners are held back from making the changes and additions that they need to expand. We have to have that.

I believe that a simple and straightforward system like the FairTax will provide the certainty that businesses need to grow with confidence. Our Nation is still in an economic recovery mode, and businessowners and families need all the confidence that they can get.

Again, I want to thank my colleague from Georgia for introducing this legislation and compliment him on the excellent job that he is doing. I encourage all my colleagues to support the FairTax so that we can finally have the fair and simple tax system that Americans deserve.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman for making the FairTax number one out of the gate. I know he leads a passionate constituency.

I listened to you talk about what the FairTax would do, and I am thinking that is almost unbelievable that there is that much out there on the table we could seize for the American economy and American families that we haven't done.

□ 1730

I am reminded that America is the only country in the OECD, the only economically developed First World country that does not have a consumption tax today. Folks around America are accustomed to all of the downsides of our current system that you went through. There is a better way and the rest of the world has found it and we are lagging behind.

I appreciate the gentleman's leadership to help get us there.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. WOODALL. We also have on the floor the chairman of the House Budget Committee. Now, I will tell you that if there is someone who is working harder for the American economy than Dr. TOM PRICE, chairman of the Budget Committee, I don't know who it is. And he is absolutely trying to cut every penny of waste, fraud, and abuse there is in the budget, but I don't know that we can cut our way into prosperity. I think we are going to have to grow our way into prosperity, and this burdensome Tax Code seems to be standing between us and that kind of success.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman, and let me add my voice to the echo and chorus of those who are commending him for his work on the FairTax. This is incredibly important.

And the gentleman is right. I have the privilege of chairing the Budget Committee, which is sometimes a blessing, sometimes a curse. But you put your finger on the thing that I want to talk about today because the FairTax, as you well know, our current tax system is punishing all the things that we say that we want.

So we want hard work, we want success, we want entrepreneurship, we want savings, we want investment, we want all those things that people talk about that.

They say: Why are we not getting those things that allow for that growth that has to happen?

And one of the reasons, I believe—and I know you do, too—is because our current tax system punishes each and

every one them. Every one of those things that we say we want, our tax system punishes.

So people make their equation and they say: Well, should I do this? Well, no. I am taxed more if I do that. I am taxed more if I work hard. I am taxed more if I succeed. I am taxed more if I hire more people, on and on and on.

So when you look at where we are, from a growth standpoint, which is incredibly important because we can't tax our way out of the challenge that we have got. We can't even cut spending to the degree that we need to to get out of the challenge that we have from a fiscal standpoint.

We need to grow the economy. And the growth rate that we have had over the last 40 to 50 years in this Nation, average growth rate has been about 3.2 percent. Your constituents and my constituents and people all across this great country know that over the past 6 months we have seen a growth rate of 1 percent, and over the past 8 years we have seen a growth rate in the neighborhood of 2 percent. So we have had a 33 to 65 percent reduction in the level of growth in this country.

What does that mean to folks back home?

It means the jobs aren't being created. It means that there is part-time work instead of full-time work. It means that you have a son or a daughter that graduates from college and they can't find a job in the endeavor that they have chosen. All these things that make it so that the economy is tamped down, harmed by our current system.

So the FairTax does all sorts of wonderful things, but one of the things that it does that would just reinvigorate and enlighten this economy is to incentivize the things that we say that we want: incentivizing savings, incentivize investment, incentivize hard work, incentivize entrepreneurship, incentivize risk-taking. Incentivize individuals who are out there trying to build a better mouse trap and we are going to reward them for trying to build that better mouse trap.

So I am enthusiastic about H.R. 25, enthusiastic about the support that you have continued to generate for this. I want to commend John Linder, who is a dear friend of yours and mine, and the work that he did to begin this project. I know that we will ultimately get to this point of a FairTax, of a consumption tax, because it is the right thing to do and it is the only thing that we can do that actually solves many of the challenges that we have got. So let me commend you for what you are doing. God bless you. It is a wonderful, wonderful work. And if you keep at it and we keep at it, I know that the American people will ensure that they invigorate men and women in this Chamber so that they support this commonsense, logical, exciting solution to the challenges that we face from a fiscal standpoint.

Mr. WOODALL. If I could say to my friend, a lot of folks believe that this town is just about talk, talk, talk, talk, talk. Yet you, in your budget that you have prepared, moved out of the Budget Committee, put down in writing, black and white, put your name behind it for all the world to see, every cycle, that there is a better way and we can do better.

Folks are afraid to take a stand on issues. You have been unafraid to take a stand. We cannot get from here to there without that kind of leadership, and I am grateful to you for that.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Well, thank you, because this only happens when people get out there and say this is the solution. These are the kind of positive solutions that we can put forward, and if we were to adopt them, then it's ''Katy, bar the door.''

Thanks so much for your great work.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend. And I would encourage folks, if you have any—if you want the black and white on this issue, go back to the Joint Tax Committee Tax Symposium. The Joint Tax Committee invited in everyone from the far-right economists to the far-left economists and said, Take a look at America's Tax Code and take a look at a consumption tax like the FairTax and tell me what it would do for the American economy, for families, for jobs.

Every single economist—not some, not most, every single economist—said a consumption tax, a move away from our current tax system will grow the American economy. Some said a little, some said a lot.

But we can do better. There is not a single Member of this Chamber who defends the current Tax Code as being the best we can do. It is not. The FairTax just may be the best we can do.

If you are not quite ready for the FairTax—and I hope you are; it is H.R. 25—let me refer to the Better Way agenda. The chairman mentioned it earlier. It is on the Speaker's Web site, betterway.speaker.gov. It is on better.gop as well.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee laid out a fundamental change in the way we do taxes. It is the most consumption tax-based plan a Ways and Means chairman has ever produced for this institution. It is not the FairTax, but dadgummit, it is moving us in the right direction.

If you want some encouragement about what is doable, about what we are able to bring ourselves together around, about what can really, Mr. Speaker, make a difference for jobs and the economy, look at what Chairman KEVIN BRADY from Texas has done. Again, it is a part of the House's Better Way agenda, but it is laid out there in black and white.

What my challenge is, not just for Members of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, but for all voters across the country is the chairman has laid out a plan that gets rid of the exemptions, the deductions, the carve-outs, all of the lobbyist special favors. All of that is gone, but it is up to us to keep it gone. Take a look at it, believe in it, and then let's work together to make it a reality.

The only people who are disadvantaged by a change to a competitive Tax Code are our foreign competitors overseas. This isn't about Republicans. This isn't about Democrats. This is about America. This is about growth, and there absolutely is a better way.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues for their leadership and for joining me here.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PORK SHIPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are going to talk about pork ships. Now, you may be scratching your head. What is a pork ship?

Well, a pork ship was a name coined by POLITICO. Some may think, well, maybe that is a creative barbecue dish. Or military historians might say: Well, maybe it has something to do with the Bay of Pigs. Others might think it is an Oscar Mayer-sponsored cruise liner. But all those guesses would be wrong.

The term actually applies to a chronically unreliable ship, the littoral combat ship.

Well, how unreliable is this ship?

In just the last 9 months, four of the six ships that we have built as Littoral combat ships have been in trouble. They have broken down.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have been working to rein in this program for years. Unfortunately, the ship's manufacturers and some Members of Congress seem intent on throwing good money after bad.

The LCS has cost us almost $20 billion so far; $20 billion for six ships. But we have many more that we are going to build that are going to be flawed and that will break down. So the total cost of the ships over the course of the program is a mind-blowing $120 billion. That is right, $120 billion.

Now, we are scraping right now to find enough money for the defense budget. We are scraping right now to come up with $2 billion to protect Americans from the Zika virus. Meanwhile, we are spending truckloads of money on ships that don't float.

Now, maybe I am being a little hyperbolic here, but I am going to follow through by talking about the history of the ship. The ship is so poorly conceived that even the name, littoral combat ship, doesn't fit.

The term ''littoral'' means that the ship should be able to operate along the shoreline. Yet, Navy officials have admitted that they haven't studied carefully enough whether the LCS is the right ship for warfare in shallow waters.

Combat. Combat isn't accurate either since the Defense Department's Testing Office has said the LCS is not survivable in combat settings.

Littoral combat ship. It doesn't meet the term ''littoral.'' It doesn't meet the term ''combat.'' And considering that one of these ships spent 58 percent of a 10-month deployment idle in a port, we might suggest that maybe it is not even a ship.

The Navy now wants to call it something else. Since this grand scheme that was concocted back in the 1990s doesn't quite fit today, let's just rename it a frigate.

So what is a frigate?

A frigate is a heavy, slow, and survivable ship. The littoral combat ship meets the heavy because it is much heavier than it was supposed to be. It is much slower than it is supposed to be, but it is not survivable.

So the question then becomes: What are we doing? We are never going to get back the nearly $20 million we have already appropriated on that vessel, but are we going to spend extraordinary sums of money on something that didn't meet the initial expectations and has proven over and over again that it is not working?

Let's talk about the evolution of the LCS and how we got to this point. One of the primary reasons for building the LCS was to increase the size of the Navy by building smaller and presumably cheaper vessels. However, there was never a consistent agreement on the LCS' mission.

Military correspondent David Axe has called the LCS ''Frankenstein's warship'' and questioned whether the LCS should be a heavily armored combat vessel, a mine clearer, a submarine hunter, a low-cost patroller.

How about a small, fast amphibious ship?

It was apparently meant to be all those things, yet we seem to have ended up with a ship that can do none of these things.

Since the Navy didn't conduct rigorous analysis on the ship until billions of dollars were already spent, they were building it without a strategic plan. As a result, the LCS program has changed its fundamental acquisition plan—now, get this—four times since 2005.

□ 1745

We now have a ship that is less survivable and less lethal than originally planned. The real threshold question is: Do we really want to put our sailors' lives at risk on a vulnerable ship? That should be the threshold question. If this ship is so plagued with flaws and is not survivable in combat, are we not putting our sailors at risk?

On top of the fact that the LCS is struggling to perform its intended missions, it is turning out to be the proverbial lemon. As detailed by a Politico article in July, the ship's maiden voyages have been marked by cracked hulls, engine failures, unexpected rusting, software glitches, and weapons malfunctions.

So let's start with February 2011. Here we are. What happened there? In February 2011, the USS *Freedom* sprung a 6-inch crack in its hull that required several months' worth of repairs. All right, that is the USS Freedom.

Now we are in June 2011, just a few months later, and we find that the USS *Independence* has suffered severe corrosion and has been sidelined.

In December 2012, the Defense Department's director of operational test and evaluation released a report saying: ''The LCS is not expected to be survivable . . . in a hostile combat environment.'' Now, this is the office within the Department of Defense within the Department that is charged with making sure our weapons are safe, effective, and accurate; and the testing office is saying: Do you know what? It is not survivable.

In July 2013, the USS *Freedom* was, once again, immobilized during a trial run. So it has got two strikes now. Also in July of 2013, the GAO urged Congress to restrict the purchase of new LCS until the Navy completed technical and design studies and figured out how much it will cost to fix the vessel's problems. These were very good suggestions. Now, we pay these departments to make these recommendations. But guess what. We just ignored it.

We move from July 2013 to December 2014, Secretary of Defense Hagel directed the Navy to study ways to improve the program. However, the Navy doubled down on its failed strategy and prioritized costs and schedule considerations over mission requirements.

In December 2015, the USS *Milwaukee*—yet another LCS—broke down and had to be towed 40 miles after a software malfunction. In the same month, Secretary of Defense Carter directed the Navy to cut the program which would save billions of dollars. Once again, Congress resisted these efforts.

Another LCS, the USS *Fort Worth*, in January 2016 was sidelined because its operators failed to follow proper maintenance procedures.

In June of this year, GAO recommended Congress not fund any LCS for 2017. So what did Congress do? In a strained budget, did we heed the GAO? No. No, we didn't. The NDAA authorized not one, not two, but three new ships—three new ships—adding $1.5 billion to the budget. Now, this is after the GAO said: Do not authorize any more LCS this year. What did we do? We actually upped the department's request of two to three.

But there is more. In July of this year, the USS *Freedom*—oh, my God, the third time—yet again encountered more mechanical issues. How bad is it? This time its engine will need to be rebuilt or replaced. This is a $400 million ship that has been in dock, paralyzed, and towed in three times already, and now we are being told we have to replace or rebuild the engine.

Then most recently, yet another—there are only six of them, mind you, and five of them have had problems. In August of this year, the USS *Coronado* broke down because of an engineering problem.

Despite all of these problems and all of these warnings, what do we do in Congress? We continue to throw money at this ship. Lemons may float in water, but this lemon of a ship evidently does not, and it is taking taxpayer money to the bottom of the ocean with it.

Even the Republican chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, JOHN MCCAIN, has questioned the LCS program, demonstrating that this is not a partisan issue.

Members, we have a responsibility to take care of the taxpayers' dollars. It makes you wonder why certain House Members are so committed to not just sustaining, but boosting the LCS production. Aren't we supposed to be prudent with taxpayer money?

The answer may be looking at what the shipbuilders were doing in Washington from January to March of this year. During that time, these shipbuilders were spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to lobby Congress. Do you know what? I bet we are all paying for that in the bottom line of that particular contract.

I experienced firsthand what that money can buy when I attempted to introduce an amendment to the FY 2017 Defense Appropriations bill that would have reduced the total ships purchased from three to two for this fiscal year.

Now, the Rules Committee apparently decided that my amendment was not germane to the bill. I mean, truly, that is right. An amendment on defense spending was deemed not relevant to a defense spending bill. This wasn't an absurd proposal either; it was in line with the President's budget request. It certainly wasn't a poison pill. That one ship represented only about 0.06 percent of the total defense budget.

In hindsight, I should have followed GAO's recommendation to not fund any LCS next year. I thought only going with two ships was a fair compromise. We won't know because we weren't even allowed to vote on it. That is what we do here. We avoid voting on controversial issues. But that is our job, and this is more than just controversial. This is spending taxpayer money and spending it poorly.

Even LCS shipbuilder Lockheed Martin must have been surprised that my amendment never reached the House floor. They had already sent out a letter urging a ''no'' vote on it. Now, as I mentioned, it never even got considered because it was held to be nongermane in a defense spending bill. But their arguments for voting against the amendment are about effective as a littoral combat ship is at a littoral combat, which is to say not very.

Lockheed said that if we reduced the LCS program, the Navy would be ''unable to sustain fleet capability and

meet global requirements.'' However, the Secretary of Defense said that cutting the LCS would actually improve our naval forces by allowing us to invest in more pressing needs.

Lockheed's letter also said that we shouldn't reduce the LCS program because ''ship count is crucial for the Navy to meet its tactical missions.'' Ship count may be an important measurement of capability, but we should not be spending billions of dollars just to reach an arbitrary ship number, especially if those ships aren't survivable in combat or stall out on the open seas and have to be towed back to port. But that is what we are funding. We are funding flawed ship design, and we are funding flawed ships that are costing us a truckload of money.

Lockheed also maintains if we cut the program it would force the shipyards to shut down. But that is not even true. The GAO says both companies who work on the LCS variants already have enough work on the books to keep their shipyards running to the year 2021.

Fortunately, there is still an opportunity to salvage some savings from this shipbuilding program. The NDAA conference committee has been meeting to discuss provisions for the final bill. The Senate version supports Secretary Carter's directive to reduce the number of LCS. As a member of the conference committee, I have argued for the adoption of this provision. Cutting the total number of ships will save billions of dollars of taxpayer money over the long run.

As wasteful and as unnecessary as this program has been, it is just the tip of the iceberg of Congress forcing the Defense Department to spend taxpayer money on weapons it does not want and only seem to benefit certain industries.

For example, the House NDAA bill redirects $18 billion in critical funding for wartime operations towards programs the Defense Department did not request. As a result, the bill would only fund the Defense Department through next April, effectively sidestepping the Bipartisan Budget Act compromise signed onto by both Republicans and Democrats that we reached just last year and putting funding for combat operations at risk.

In any budget environment, this is not the way we should be doing business, but House Republicans think nothing of engaging in these wasteful and irresponsible budget shenanigans—and some Democrats, too.

Now, I am all for Congress revisiting budget caps and looking for waste and areas where spending and support should be increased. But I do not support cutting funding to crucial, existing programs to fund programs the military doesn't even want.

Furthermore, should we be funding programs and should we be funding weapons that have not been fully tested, as the LCS is, that has already shown that it is flawed, that has already shown that five out of the six ships that are afloat have had problems, and they are big problems?

Whom do we work for? Do we work for big business; or do we work for the American people? Throwing taxpayer money at failed programs solely for the benefit of industry is not how we should be operating.

I am going to stop here. I am joined by my colleague from Minnesota. He is one of the most outspoken people in this Congress on issues around fairness in budgeting, and I am grateful that he is here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SPEIER for yielding. I appreciate the gentlewoman being the leader on this issue, looking after the public dollar and looking after our national security making sure that we don't waste any money but that we put our energy into making sure that we protect the American people at the most proper cost because a dollar that we waste is a dollar we cannot use to do anything else. So the gentlewoman's advocacy here, I think, is absolutely important.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman for organizing this hour to highlight an area of incredible waste of funds, the littoral combat ship. The Operational Test and Evaluation office in the Pentagon said in January that the ship is not reliable.

□ 1800

The Pentagon wants to pay for only two of these ships in 2017, enough to preserve competition and to make sure that taxpayers get the best deal for their money. Yet some in Congress want to force the Pentagon to buy three ships. Key Members of the Congress have expressed their concerns about the ship.

Senators JOHN MCCAIN and JACK REED do not believe that the littoral combat ship could defeat an enemy fleet ''unless the enemy fleet consists of a small number of lightly armed boats at extremely short range.''

The GAO thinks the problems with the littoral combat ship are severe enough to merit a complete production pause. The GAO recommends that Congress not fund these ships in 2017. The last of the Navy's survivability tests will not be completed until 2018, giving us the answers we need to guide future development.

The events of this week only reinforce the GAO's recommendation. The Navy ordered all littoral combat ship crews to stand down and halt operations in order to review procedures and engineering standards. Every single sailor with an engineering role on the crew will need to be retrained. This is due to ongoing challenges. That ought to be enough for us to take notice.

Yet Congress is not listening to the facts. The House appropriated an extra $348 million for this ship in 2017. $348 million goes a long way to buying other things that can promote national security, but also things that can help domestic security—things like housing, things like food, jobs, all these kinds of things that we have urgent needs to address. We haven't taken up the Zika. We haven't dealt with Flint. Many urgent needs.

This is not a worthwhile meritorious expenditure. Somebody is getting paid, and it is not right. The American people's interest should be upheld first. That is $348 million above what the President requested for a ship that is not even working.

There are better uses for the taxpayer's money. Like I said, Zika. Let's make sure that our veterans are stably housed and support mental health programs. How about universal child care for working families? There are so many urgent needs that the American people have. Or, if we stick to military needs, let's support our troops overseas for an entire year, not just a few months.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for bringing to light this critical issue. She always is at the forefront when justice needs a champion. I want to urge Ms. SPEIER to keep up the fight. We are very proud of her and the work that she does. We will always be standing by her side.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for his comments. He hit the nail on the head. There are so many important resources, there are so many important services that we need to fund, and yet we don't find the money for that. Meanwhile, we have six ships, five of which have had problems, flaws, and yet we will not only continue to fund those ships, continue to rehabilitate those ships, but they are going to add three more.

When will we finally get the message that there is something wrong with this ship? Let's go back to the drawing board. Let's do this the right way. Let's not build more ships until we find out what is really wrong. This ship has not been fully tested yet.

Imagine if we put cars on the road that haven't been fully tested and then were breaking down and they were being towed. Would we put up with that? Absolutely not. But we are putting up with it when it comes to the funding of these ships, and I think it is a travesty.

I would say the LCS program has to go. Not just the name, because we have already proven that it is not subject to littoral shorelines. It is not eligible for combat survivability, and there is a big question as to whether or not it is a ship at all since it has the potential, or the propensity, to sink or to break down.

Let's trim the fat from this pork ship and finally sink it.

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

ZIKA VIRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity tonight to come to the floor of the House together with a bipartisan group of legislators from the State of Florida to talk about the importance of urgent action on the Zika virus.

Perhaps no story has captivated the anxiety of the American people more than Zika has recently. Neither has a topic more angered the American people, angered people throughout Florida, because of the inability of a Congress and a President and a divided government to put policy ahead of politics and actually address what is a growing public health crisis.

Many issues that we face today—and the Founders intended this—are regional issues, from flooding, to health scares, to infrastructure issues. We have regional representation here in the House. Florida, in the continental United States, is ground zero for the impact of the Zika virus.

What has emerged within the Florida delegation, I am proud to say, is consensus that continues to grow among Republicans and Democrats around urgency. Now, we all have different opinions about the packages that have been proposed. Over the past 6 months, we have seen three primary options:

The President proposed a plan of $1.9 billion over 2 years. That was his initial proposal.

The House proposal had money flowing at about that same rate by reallocating $600 million from unspent Ebola money that was to be delivered over about 6 months, so $100 million a month, depending on how you calculate the color of money.

The Senate reached a compromised plan at about $1.1 billion. Now, I am sure we all have differences of opinions about which plan is best. We have seen that. We have seen demands for votes on the President's plan. In fact, in the Appropriations Committee, we have had to take those votes many times. We have seen the Senate act on their plan. We have seen the House act on theirs.

I had great reservations about some of the elements of the President's plan, and I was honest about this. The President's plan assumed a 2-year crisis instead of just 1. I had questions about that. The President's plan allowed for construction of capital properties on leased lands with no recapture provisions. I had concerns about that in terms of stewardship of taxpayer dollars. The President's plan also expands Medicaid services of taxpayer supported health care in Puerto Rico by an additional 10 percent for any healthcare needs, not just Zika, arguably diluting money going to Zika. Those were my concerns. The system is set up for us to have that debate. It is okay that we have that debate.

Others have great concerns about the House bill and some of the provisions and riders in the House bill. They have objected to those. That is understandable as well.

In the Senate, they reached a compromise around a $1.1 billion clean bill.

We should have these debates early on. Nothing should be rubber-stamped. We wouldn't be doing our job if we didn't actually read the legislation, see what is in it, and talk about a contest of ideas. But we can never let those differences lead us to inaction. That is what is at risk in the current Zika debate. We cannot let our differences lead us to doing nothing.

I believe we have a pathway forward around a consensus, clean $1.1 billion package we have seen in the Senate today with my colleague, CURT CLAWSON, from the State of Florida and others. We have introduced the clean version with no riders of the Senate plan here in the House of Representatives to hopefully give us a platform where we can build consensus around it. I believe that is the way to do it. Drop the riders, fund Zika. Let's do it. Let's do it now.

But at the end of the day, whatever package comes through here, we are called to support it. This is a public health crisis that we must address, which is why, despite my objections initially to the President's plan, I have begun to vote for the President's plan in the Appropriations Committee because the urgency is now, and it is time that we pass a Zika package.

The American people are angry, but they are scared. It is not our job to take the nuances of legislation, the nuances of different colors of money in the Federal budget process, and try to preach at the American people why one side is right or the other. Our job is to listen to the anxiety of the American people and address a pending health concern in a divided government.

The anger is that this issue perfectly reflects the dysfunction we often see in Congress, and it is doing so in the context of a public health crisis. We have to seize upon the better angels in this Chamber and in this town. You see, it doesn't help when either side plays politics with the Zika issue when the first thing that happens after a vote is the two campaign committees rush emails out the door in Members' home districts trying to raise money or blame politics, blame each other.

As a Florida delegation, let us lead tonight in trying to form consensus around a solution on Zika.

In that light, I am happy to be joined this evening, first, by a colleague of mine from south Florida and the Keys, one of the most beautiful districts next to Pinellas County, I would say.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO), a champion and early endorser of Zika funding.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY), my distinguished colleague, for leading this very important discussion here this evening on a topic that has a lot of people worried back home.

I remind people that, in the State of Florida, this is, obviously, a public health crisis. There are a lot of women who are pregnant and are very concerned. A few weeks ago, we got a call from my wife's OB/GYN telling us that his office was full of patients asking questions—a lot of anxiety, a lot of nervous people in our State.

In Florida, this is also an economic issue. I met recently with businessowners in the Wynwood-Allapattah area near downtown Miami. They tell me that business in that area is down 60 percent. That means jobs. That means people who aren't going to be able to take income home to their families, income that they need.

For us, of course, it is a public health crisis, and that is our number one concern because we want to make sure that people can live comfortably and feel safe in our State. We actually know a few people who have left the State because they are pregnant and they don't want to risk exposing their unborn babies to the effects, the devastating effects, that we have seen Zika cause throughout the world, primarily microcephaly, babies born with brain disorders.

By the way, we are still learning a lot about the Zika virus. We don't know what the long-term effects are because, until recently, this isn't a virus that had really come under the microscope.

The bottom line is that we need these funds because we need long-term certainty in the fight against Zika. We need long-term certainty so that all the Federal agencies—the CDC, Health and Human Services, State agencies, local agencies—can all respond, develop a vaccine, and, of course, help partner nations overseas.

In Florida, we get tourists from all over the world, but especially from Latin America, from South America. We need to help nations like Brazil get this virus under control; otherwise, we will continue to be exposed.

Madam Speaker, I am so thankful to my colleague, Mr. JOLLY, for his leadership on this issue, for bringing us together here tonight—Republicans and Democrats—asking for common sense, asking to make the American people proud of this Congress, to show that we can be competent, that we can solve people's problems, that we can help people feel safe and secure in their communities, especially throughout the State of Florida.

Mr. JOLLY. Madam Speaker, my appreciation to Congressman CURBELO.

Carlos raises an interesting insight, which is part of getting to the bottom of this early on, that, as stewards of taxpayer dollars, what is the money to be used for? Those questions initially are very important. As I mentioned, I had some early objections with the President's plan that I have resigned

over that I will support if it is what it takes to get a package done. But what is the money used for? That is an important question for the American people.

One of the questions was: Is mosquito control really a Federal activity? That is a legitimate question. Should we rely on States and localities for mosquito control?

Here is the important thing you will learn when you get into why we need a Federal bill to support Zika. It is about the vaccine development. It is about the research into how do we have a cure and eradicate the Zika virus, how do we partner with States and localities who are deploying resources right now for mosquito control, mosquito abatement and education; but how does the Federal Government also step in in the midst of what is a public health crisis with national implications both to people's health, to their lives, and also to our Nation's economy and Florida's economy? What is the proper role of the Federal Government?

In this case, I believe it is to provide the funding, hopefully at the $1.1 billion level, but I would be happy to support the $1.9 billion as well, whatever it takes to get it done.

□ 1815

Representing the urgency and consensus to get this done, we are joined by a Democratic colleague of ours from Palm Beach and the Broward County area, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I thank my Republican colleagues for joining here on this vitally important issue.

I rise to call for a vote on a Zika funding bill that is free of partisan hot button issues and that is free of political gamesmanship.

I am proud to join in this call for action with my Florida colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike. We have come together—above partisan divisions—to support the administration's request for emergency Zika funding. Our ability to come together and the refusal of the rest of this Congress to do the same is telling. South Florida is actively fighting outbreaks in South Beach and Wynwood. There are cases in Broward County, and there are cases in Palm Beach County, and we have seen locally acquired cases in my home district.

My constituents and the constituents of my colleagues throughout Florida are feeling the anxiety and the fear that come when there is so much that is out of their control. It is time for Congress to do all that we can to help stop the spread of this virus. This Congress' inaction is hurting Florida's families. As Representative CURBELO pointed out, it is hurting our economy.

I have three children. My twin daughters are just settling back in to start a new year of college. Today, by the way—I share with my Florida colleagues—they are celebrating their 21st birthday. My son is finishing up high school; but it feels like just yesterday when my wife and I were anxiously expecting each of their arrivals into our lives. Like most Americans who are starting a family or who are growing a family, we experienced the full range of complex emotions as we waited for their births: the sense of not knowing exactly what is going to come, the excitement, the anxiety, the anticipation, the joy. Unfortunately, the Zika virus is threatening the joy of growing a family for thousands of Floridians, and we are just not doing all that we can to stop it.

In December of last year, after outbreaks in Brazil were connected to devastating birth defects, The New York Times reported a warning for the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The CDC warned at the time that imported cases ''will likely increase and may result in local spread of the virus in some areas of the United States.''

Now, at that time in December, 2,700 babies had been born with microcephaly in Brazil—an increase from 150 the year before. These babies were born with abnormally small heads, and now we know, from subsequent research, that the Zika virus attacks growing cells that cause incomplete brain development and smaller heads in these children. These birth defects are devastating. They are also incurable. These children will have lifelong problems with their vision and with their cognitive abilities and will have other complications.

Now we know that the CDC's warning in December has become a reality in Puerto Rico and in south Florida.

Verified cases have exploded in Puerto Rico. In the span of only a few weeks—from the end of July until today—the total cases of Zika on the island have jumped from 5,500 total and 672 in pregnant women to nearly 14,000 total and 1,000 cases in pregnant women. If these trends continue, experts expect that a quarter of the population of Puerto Rico will be infected—or 887,000 infections. That, unfortunately, would represent tens of thousands of babies being born with microcephaly.

The costs of care and the toll on families is staggering. This is an issue that affects families. It is also an issue that winds up affecting their communities. The lifetime costs of medical care for each of these children will be in the millions of dollars.

While the virus is spreading rapidly in Puerto Rico, experts like virologist Tim Tellinghuisen of Scripps Research Institute said that the situation in Puerto Rico could very much happen in Florida. Over the past 7 weeks, as Congress was in recess, Florida cases went from 311—and no local infections—to over 600 cases, including 56 local infections. The number of cases in pregnant women has doubled. Our constituents are at risk.

For us, this is not a political fight. Honestly, in my heart, I do not understand how this has become a political fight for those leaders who have blocked the Zika funding in a clean bill. I understand and my colleagues here understand that we serve in the most polarized Congress in history. There are all kinds of issues that we could debate and ways that we might get at that and ways that we could change it as we need to. We have seen the divide over and over again between Republicans in Congress and President Obama; but the funds requested in this Zika battle—the funds requested to fight Zika—are not grounded in ideology.

The President didn't wake up one day and say: Hmm, I think we should have $1.9 billion to fund Zika.

After the warnings that followed the outbreaks in Brazil, President Obama went to the scientists and to the experts at the NIH and the CDC and other agencies, and he asked: What will it take to respond?

His request to this Congress represents their answer.

As we heard last week, the funding situation is now dire. Dr. Tom Frieden, the Director of the CDC, said, basically, we are out of money.

So I join my colleagues here because it is past time to act. We have to put these political battles behind us. We have to do—and we have the opportunity to do here—something that, I think, is not only the right thing for us and, more importantly, for our constituents—for the American people—but we could do something that would actually, perhaps, set an example. We should elevate the common good. We have to protect American families, and we have to pass a clean funding bill to stop the spread of Zika.

To Mr. JOLLY, I will relay just one conversation I had on my way out of the office. I was talking to a staffer of mine about the coming months, and the conversation turned to November, when there is an election. Sometimes people from D.C. like to volunteer on campaigns on the weekend before the election. I have a young woman in my office who said she just doesn't think that she is going to be willing to go down this year out of fear of Zika.

How do we not show that we can act in a way that responds to a public health emergency, and only to that public health emergency, without bringing in all of these other issues?

We have to do this. I am really grateful to be here on the House floor, and I am really thrilled to be here with my Republican colleagues, who are as committed to doing this as I am. I am so grateful for the opportunity to share this time with you.

Mr. JOLLY. I thank my colleague, Mr. DEUTCH.

That is the urgency. My colleague, Mr. DEUTCH, mentioned his family, and birthday wishes are in order.

Congratulations.

My wife and I just got married last year, and we are hoping to have a family ourselves. We live within 5 or 10

miles of one of the non-travel-related cases. Folks do understand the anxiety that creates for people in Florida who are hoping to have a family.

Yesterday and the day before—and it created a bit of a buzz—I brought about 100 mosquitoes of the Aedes aegypti variety, which are capable of carrying Zika. Through working with the University of South Florida, we were able to get these mosquitoes here to Washington, D.C., because I wanted colleagues to understand the urgency of what happens to families in Florida when they are in the proximity of these mosquitoes.

When I gave a speech with these mosquitoes, do you know what the American people said—hundreds and thousands of people?

''Release them.'' ''Smash the jar.''

Do you want to see Congress work fast?

Expose Zika mosquitoes in this Chamber. We would shut it down. We would scrub the Chamber. People would get tested. That is the anxiety. That is the urgency.

It doesn't know partisanship. It is okay that we have had this debate initially over what the right response is—the President's proposal, the House's, or the Senate's. That is okay. That is doing our job, but it is not doing our job when we let the fighting and debating lead us to do nothing.

We are joined tonight by another leader in our delegation from the panhandle—the Tallahassee area of Florida—a good friend, a Democratic friend, Ms. GWEN GRAHAM.

Ms. GRAHAM. I thank Congressman JOLLY, and I thank Congressman DEUTCH very much for arranging this tonight. It means a lot. I feel the same anxiety just being as close to the larvae as others feel, and I might just ask that the gentleman keeps them in the jar.

Madam Speaker, let me talk about my home State of Florida. I was born and raised in south Florida. I think, right around now, the Sun is probably setting in south Florida. The weather is nice. It is 80 degrees. The sky is that beautiful pink that we get. Vacationing tourists are strolling along the beach or are enjoying dinner on a patio. Somewhere—I know this—there is a dad outside who is grilling steaks, and moms are watching soccer practice. That is our life. That is our life in the beautiful State of Florida. It is like a lot of other places around this country except, right now in Florida, families are scared.

I have thought about the gentleman and Laura, and I understand that fear.

Families are scared because, as the Sun sets, the mosquitoes are coming out. For all of our lives we have lived with mosquitoes. It is part of our life in Florida, but now they are more than a nuisance. Now they are a deadly threat. We are scared because there is a deadly virus spreading. Parents are scared that, if their children are bitten, they could get terribly sick. Seniors are scared that, if they catch the disease, they may not survive. Pregnant women are scared that they will wake up one morning with a mosquito bite and that it may cause the children inside them to be born with terrible birth defects.

My daughter would be appalled for me to say this, but she is 25. She doesn't live in Florida right now. I hope she will move back, but the risk of pregnancy right now would not be one that I would want her to take.

So this is the new normal in Florida. More than 600 people in Florida have been infected with the Zika virus. Almost 100 pregnant women in Florida have been infected.

We have been sounding the alarm for months, haven't we, Congressman JOLLY?

I have come on this floor to ask for funding to fight the disease. I led a letter with more than 120 Democrats that asked Speaker RYAN to have a vote on full funding to fight the disease. I did a workday with the local mosquito control team in Bay County, and I have asked my constituents in north Florida to do their part to fight off the spreading disease.

I ask again—particularly now, following Hermine, as we have had a lot of water in our area—to please go out and make sure that you dump any standing water.

I am really proud of all that we are doing as Floridians to try and stop the spread of Zika in Florida.

Florida State University is researching the virus and making important breakthroughs.

□ 1830

Local municipalities are spraying. Ordinary people, as I said, are dumping standing water out of their yard. We are doing our part in Florida. Now, it is time for Congress to act and do their part as well.

Madam Speaker, yesterday I joined a bipartisan letter with Florida Republicans and Democrats who are asking for one simple thing: Give us a vote on a clean bill that would fully fund the fight against Zika. Give us a vote on a clean bill that would fully fund the fight against Zika.

This is a public health emergency.

Just as important, let's give scientists the certainty they need to research and develop a vaccine for Zika, and this could take several years. Prematurely cutting off resources before the vaccine is ready could be just as dangerous as not providing enough money today.

I spoke with the scientists. As they develop vaccines, they go through different trial stages. Ethically, you can't start a vaccine study, ask people to participate, and then say: ''Never mind. Our funding has dried up. You are not going to be able to continue.'' That is not something that we could do.

Our delegation has shown that Republicans and Democrats have come together on this issue, and I believe that the entire Congress can as well.

There are Republicans and Democrats in States along the Gulf Coast—Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana—who will come together and support full funding because their constituents are at risk, too.

I am still holding out hope that Speaker RYAN will be able to support full funding to fight this deadly virus.

Time is running out. It is time to put partisanship aside and vote on full funding to fight this horrific disease, Zika. We must all come together to make sure that the resources are there for mosquito control and for vaccine production.

Mr. JOLLY. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Ms. GRAHAM. We are down to 4 or 5 minutes. We have two more speakers remaining.

I yield to the gentleman from Pinellas County, Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I agree with Representative GRAHAM that we must fund this and we must fund a clean bill. Whatever it takes, Madam Speaker, we have to get this done as soon as possible.

I have been focused on the growing problem of Zika since March, when the Energy and Commerce Committee held a hearing on Zika preparedness, and we have been working together in a bipartisan fashion to get this done.

Zika is a unique problem that will only increase. As of the end of August, there were 2,686 cases of travel-associated Zika within the United States. These cases came from international travel where the individual acquired Zika abroad and discovered it when they returned to the United States.

There have also been 35 cases of locally acquired mosquito-borne Zika. As a matter of fact, we have a nontravel-related case in our county, Pinellas County.

There are 35 individuals who got Zika because a mosquito bit them within the United States. Because of this local transmission for the first time ever, we now have a CDC travel advisory about an area within the United States in the Miami area.

If you expand the incidences of Zika to include the territories, there would be 14,059 cases of locally acquired infections of Zika. Mr. Speaker, this is a large amount. We must act now. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has nearly 14,000 cases of locally acquired Zika. That number will only grow, unfortunately.

624 women within the United States had Zika while pregnant, and 971 women from the territories. We don't know the full impact that Zika will have on their infants. Already, CDC reports that 16 infants have been born with birth defects within the United States. I don't know how many more when we include the territories.

Zika can cause microcephaly, a birth defect where a baby's head is smaller than expected when compared to other

babies. Babies with microcephaly often have smaller brains that might not have developed properly.

People are really scared, Madam Speaker. We have to get this done in a bipartisan fashion.

Not all babies who have been exposed to Zika while in utero, have been born with visible birth defects.

However, we cannot say that they were born without any effect of Zika.

It is possible that they may have delayed development.

That's why I plan on introducing tomorrow, the Pregnant Women and Infants Zika Registry.

This bill will establish a CDC registry program for pregnant women and will track infants up to age five, so that researchers can get a better understanding of the impact of Zika.

This registry will collect information on pregnancy and infant outcomes following laboratory evidence of Zika virus infection during pregnancy.

The data collected will be used to update recommendations for clinical care, to plan for services for pregnant women and families affected by the Zika virus, and to improve prevention of Zika virus infection during pregnancy.

I invite all my fellow Floridians and fellow members to cosponsor this bill.

It's a responsible tool to increase our knowledge of Zika and help increase the quality and standard of care for patients.

Mr. JOLLY. Madam Speaker, we are about out of time. We have one last speaker.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, hopefully I get an opportunity to speak and continue tomorrow.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOLLY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOLLY. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Jupiter, Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and my friend (Mr. JOLLY) for organizing this Special Order, for his leadership on this issue, and convening this important conversation on the need for immediate action to combat Zika.

It is clear to us in Florida that Zika is not a partisan issue. It is about protecting our families and our children. Yet, 7 months after the World Health Organization declared an international public health emergency over Zika and the administration submitted its request for $1.9 billion in emergency funds to combat the virus, no bipartisan agreement has been reached to pass a bill providing the resources needed for this fight.

As the number of Zika cases continues to grow across the Nation, including more than 50 local transmissions in Florida alone, this prolonged congressional inaction is unacceptable. That is why over a dozen members of Florida's congressional delegation are calling on congressional leaders to take immediate action on a clean Zika funding bill.

I was proud to lead this bipartisan letter with Congressman JOLLY, and I want to thank those Representatives who have joined us.

Our hope is that the rest of Congress will work together like our delegation and treat this matter with the seriousness that it deserves, taking action needed to protect the American people and public health. That starts with ending the political posturing and dropping divisive, unrelated policy riders and immediately passing a clean funding bill to provide the resources necessary to fight Zika.

This is an emergency, not an opportunity to be exploited to score points against Planned Parenthood or to weaken the Affordable Care Act. Congress' delay has only made the problem worse and more expensive as babies tragically born with microcephaly will require a lifetime of care.

The need for emergency funding could not be more urgent given the CDC Director's recent statements that current Zika funding is nearly exhausted, so we must find the bipartisan cooperation. We must pass a clean bill and get this done immediately. The people of Florida deserve it.

This is even after the extraordinary move of reallocating over $80 million from research on Ebola, HIV, cancer, diabetes, and other chronic conditions to prioritize Zika efforts.

Beyond the funding, we also need to make sure the scientists and researchers working on developing a Zika vaccine have the necessary tools to do just that.

For example, during a recent visit to Scripps Florida, a leading research facility in my Congressional district, I heard from their Zika research team about the need for location-specific blood samples for their ongoing work.

Additionally, we must make sure that states and local partners have the resources needed to implement and maintain world-leading mosquito control programs to prevent the spread of mosquito-borne diseases.

I am proud to have put forward the SMASH Act with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CLAWSON, who knows firsthand how important mosquito control districts are.

The SMASH Act will support our local mosquito control districts to help fight the spread of Zika.

Additionally, the bill provides grants to support the work of state and local health departments, our partners on the ground, for treating infectious diseases like Zika.

To further bolster prevention, detection, and treatment efforts, Governor Scott should expand Medicaid in Florida.

Up to one million Floridians could be newly covered if the governor would simply accept available federal dollars.

These dollars would go directly to strengthening our public health and responding to Zika.

This crisis requires collective action, with all levels of government working together on both immediate and long-term solutions to combat this virus.

There are also a few simple steps Floridians can take to protect themselves.

To prevent bites and the spread of mosquitoes, this includes wearing bug spray and draining standing water.

Furthermore, it is important to remember that Zika can be sexually transmitted and the same safe sex practices that help prevent the spread of HIV will also prevent the spread of Zika.

Zika and mosquitoes don't care if you're a Democrat or Republican.

This is a serious health crisis that impacts all Americans.

It is great to see growing bipartisan support in Congress to do the right thing, putting political posturing aside to move forward a clean funding bill to combat this virus and keep families safe.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Florida, Mr. JOLLY, and the rest of our delegation for showing the leadership needed to get this done and enlist Congress in the fight against Zika.

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

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I intend to take up the topic of the commemoration of the life of Phyllis Schlafly.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days on which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the topic of this Special Order here this evening.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, this sad news came to me this past weekend that the relatively long and extraordinarily productive and impactful life of Phyllis Schlafly had come to an end at the age of 92.

I got to know Phyllis throughout the political activism of the country among conservative politics. It goes back for me quite a ways now, too, I might add. But I didn't pay a lot of attention to what was going on in the early '70s when Phyllis Schlafly's eyes went on some of the transformative shifts that were taking place in America.

Phyllis was a pro-life activist before Roe v. Wade. She saw it coming. She knew what it meant. She became one of the strongest pro-life voices in all of America and, I would say, the most persistent, the most consistent, and the most relentless voice for the longest period of time.

Phyllis was active on the public scene from at least as far back as 1952, all the way up until the last days of her life, which ended this past weekend. I would like to go through some of those milestones of Phyllis Schlafly's life, and then perhaps have some comments about those milestones along her life.

As I review some of that material, Madam Speaker, I look back on her impact, particularly in Republican politics. She was a campaign manager for a successful Republican candidate for Congress in St. Louis in 1946. It was for Claude Bakewell.

She served as an elected delegate to eight Republican National Conventions. I don't know that there has been a more consistent or persistent voice at our Republican National Conventions over more than a half a century than we have heard from Phyllis Schlafly.

She was an elected delegate to the Republican National Conventions in 1956, 1964, 1968, 1984, 1992, 1996, 2004, and 2012. You might wonder what she was doing in those missing convention years of 1960, 1980, 2000, and 2008. Well, she was an elected alternate in those conventions. And I would suspect that her choice was similar to that of what I had made a time or two in the past as well—that I wanted to make sure that there were young people that had an opportunity to be a delegate and that young people had an opportunity to come up and be active in politics. Phyllis Schlafly had facilitated thousands of young people to come into active politics.

Phyllis attended the Republican National Convention in Cleveland this last July where it was the last time that I saw her as she came into the Republican reception, the Members reception upstairs. I had an opportunity to speak a few words with her and see that radiant smile on her face. She was dressed in just a very, very colorful and gracious dress and seated in a wheelchair. The brightness in her eyes told me there was a lot of spirit left in Phyllis Schlafly.

Phyllis has played an active role in every Republican National Convention since 1952. The earliest real impact—when people began to notice who Phyllis Schlafly was—was when she published on May 1, 1964, the book, ''A Choice Not an Echo.'' It was a small little book that gave us an understanding about how presidential candidates are selected. It was a description of some of the backroom deals that were made about the dynamics of the presidential process. She called it for 1964. She identified who the backroom supporters would be, how they would try to stop Barry Goldwater from being nominated.

The book, ''A Choice Not an Echo,'' holds up to this day. She wrote a supplement to it as well to bring it up to speed, and published that book sometime in the last year or two.

''A Choice Not an Echo'' was an impactful book, and it was one that is one of the foundational documents that identifies the basis of modern-day conservatism. Phyllis Schlafly was one of a very few original conservatives here in America. She has been one of about three voices that were still active in the public scene that go back to the era in the early '60s. For Phyllis, it goes back as far back as 1946, when she managed a congressional campaign.

Phyllis' life has been deeply engaged in this kind of activity. She was elected first vice president for the National Federation of Republican Women, 1960 to 1964. She was a candidate for Congress in 1952 and 1970, in two different districts.

Phyllis received numerous awards. She founded the Republican National Coalition for Life in 1990 with the specific mission of protecting the pro-life plank in the Republican platform, and no one has been more active and had more voice on the pro-life movement and more effective than Phyllis Schlafly throughout these years. Her voice on this public scene will sorely be missed.

She was a volunteer and a founder of Eagle Forum. The people that worked with and for Eagle Forum out across through the States came as volunteers. She also established offices in all of Illinois and here in Washington, D.C., and kept a voice and a presence here.

Phyllis Schlafly became a conscience for conservatives. As we are trying to clarify the meaning of the Constitution, understand our place in history, and stand up for those principles that matter, often the voice of Phyllis Schlafly was echoing in our ears here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

□ 1845

She would gather the young Eagles to come here at least once a year, usually twice a year to hear from them and give a number of us an opportunity to speak to the young people and take questions, but the bright lights that she identified, that she brought into activism have made, I think, a dramatic difference across America as that conscience of conservatism has multiplied across hundreds and then thousands of young Eagles that I had an opportunity to meet with and exchange ideas with and listen to.

One of my stories about Phyllis Schlafly, I will start it first with this. When I arrived here in this Congress 14 years ago, one of the first days that I was here to walk out on this floor to vote, I walked back through the back of these Chambers, and one of the Members from Missouri, Todd Akin, came over to me and introduced himself. He said: I want to talk to you about Court stripping. And I said to him: You mean Article III, section 2 of the Constitution? And he said: Yes. How do you know that?

Well, the reason I had paid attention to that was because it was Phyllis Schlafly who had written about it. In my years that I had been working in my construction office, all I ever really wanted to do was raise my family and run my construction business. I didn't really think about being involved and trying to be in the middle of public policy. I thought there were good, reliable people who would be here making those decisions.

But I would send off for what, at that time, were little articles that I would call—you had to sign up for them, and you had to send off a check, and they would send you the mailing of her Forum document. Phyllis was all over the newspapers. I can't count all the publications, but I know she has published at least 27 books.

I would read these articles that would show up in these publications. Maybe the headline caught me, but I would skip the author. I would read the story, I would read the article, and, boy, that is clarity of thought, utter clarity of thought. And then I would look up: Who wrote that? Phyllis Schlafly. Time after time after time. Before I really knew who Phyllis was, I was reading her material. She was impacting my thinking, and I am wondering: Who wrote this document? Phyllis Schlafly. Hundreds and thousands of documents, hundreds and thousands of analyses that she had done.

And not only that, she was not disciplined to stick to a particular topic. I was looking through some of these topics that Phyllis had written books on. Of the 27 books, she picked a few topics: family and feminism, her book on family and feminism, ''The Power of the Positive Woman'' and ''Feminist Fantasies,'' those things that won't come true.

Phyllis Schlafly, her comment on the judiciary, the book called, ''The Supremacists: The Tyranny of Judges and How to Stop It.'' I have it here. I have a story about that I might tell if we have time a little later.

On religion, her book, ''No Higher Power: Obama's War on Religious Freedom''; her book on nuclear strategy, ''Strike From Space'' and ''Kissinger on the Couch.'' Then her book on education, ''Child Abuse in the Classroom''; her book on child care, ''Who Will Rock the Cradle?'' and on phonics, ''First Reader'' and ''Turbo Reader.'' That is an example of the kind of work that Phyllis did.

She wasn't narrow at all in her scope. She understood her faith, her Christianity, her religion, her role as a mother of six, a grandmother, a great-grandmother. She understood her role as a wife; she understood her role as a student, as a law student with a law degree; and she understood her role here in America.

When the ERA came forward—and it was a mistake then, it would be a mistake now—Phyllis Schlafly, when they thought it was all done and the Equal Rights Amendment was going to be ratified—there were a few States left—Phyllis Schlafly started the battle to shut down the ERA; and it was almost

singlehanded for a long time, but she mobilized a nation and put an end to the Equal Rights Amendment, which would have ended up with drafting women into the military.

There is much going on today that she didn't agree with, but we have slowed down this train of liberalism. She has been a significant player in it.

I see that we have some Members who have arrived at the floor that I believe would like to add some words to this. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), if he is prepared to offer some words.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. KING. It is an honor to be able to talk about Phyllis Schlafly. Though I never personally met her, like many of the heroes of our country, all Americans benefit from the service that she rendered to our country, and in particular to the Republican Party. She is the person, perhaps more than anyone, who made sure that the Republican Party is the party of life, that really is out there to this day on the side of science showing when life begins and showing what is happening at every stage of life.

I am more optimistic than ever about what is happening to show this fact, but a voice there that just knew the truth and was unashamed in speaking for it, unashamed in helping our party coalesce around a core set of beliefs, and those core beliefs are the same ones that our Founders had. So when people look back and think that, you know, hey, the Founders were this era of giants, it is neat to have lived in an era when we have some of our own. Phyllis Schlafly was one of them.

She certainly set the stage for Ronald Reagan's speech, ''A Time for Choosing,'' because of her activities in the 1964 campaign and because of ''A Time for Choosing'' and Reagan's success in that, success as Governor, and really shaping our modern party for the era that has been a conservative movement for a long time. That set the stage for Justice Scalia.

So an eventful year, a sad year to see her pass and Justice Scalia pass in the same year, but also, you know, an era when we can look forward to future success and an era when we can see what the true meaning of womanhood is all about. She was a champion for women in a way she may never get credit for.

So I am honored for her service to our country, for her defense of her faith and my faith, and for her contributions to make this the kind of country that really inspires so many around the world to see it as the land of opportunity. So thank you.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his presentation here. I not only appreciate the kind words about the life of Phyllis Schlafly, but the voice of commitment to conservative cause that emerges as we listen to the gentleman's words from Ohio.

I would like to now, if I could, yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), who has arrived. I would note also that our great friend Michele Bachmann from Minnesota is here on the floor of the House of Representatives tonight, and that adds a tremendous amount of joy to me to what otherwise is a sad occasion, but we have to be also celebrating the glorious life of Phyllis Schlafly. It helps commemorate it here to know that one of the people who was closest to Phyllis has made the trip here to be on the floor as we discuss her life and celebrate her life.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. KING, and I, too, want to echo that, for Congresswoman Michele Bachmann being here, what a treat. What an absolute treat. We miss her, by the way. We do miss her. I want to thank Michele for being here and all that she has done.

Madam Speaker, we did not recently lose a true conservative. We didn't recently lose the ''first lady of the conservative movement.'' We didn't just lose someone who was a threat to the liberal agenda and a threat to Communists. No, no, no. Phyllis Schlafly was much more than that. You know, eagles are known, Madam Speaker, for their strength and their ability to soar high above the clouds. Eagles are known to be above the fray. Phyllis was our eagle. However, she was that eagle who, while in the fray, maintained that 30,000-foot view. And she was much more than that. She was a warrior. She was a leader. She embodied American patriotism and liberty.

In 1975, Mrs. Schlafly founded the Eagle Forum, which has been a pillar in the pro-family conservative movement for four decades and counting. There is no doubt, Madam Speaker, that the Eagle Forum will live on, and we will see her eagle soar higher and higher with time.

Mrs. Schlafly was the heart and soul of the conservative movement in the early days. Many people thought she wouldn't make a difference, but as we look back, Madam Speaker, history is telling us otherwise. You hear it over and over again that one person cannot make a difference. Well, I will tell you that Phyllis Schlafly was living proof that one person can make a difference. Phyllis soared the highest, cared the most, and fought the hardest—more than anyone else—for our conservative values.

Madam Speaker, since the day I was sworn in not quite 4 years ago, I have been saying it is time to put America first. Through all of Mrs. Schlafly's work, at the very core of her efforts, she wanted to ensure that our country was first and that Americans were our top priority and that the Federal Government and even State governments knew their place. I find great comfort, Madam Speaker, in knowing that in some small way, Lord willing, I might be allowed to take part in ensuring that the work of Phyllis Schlafly continues.

She was a passionate woman who loved this country, loved her family, and was fiercely, fiercely driven to ensure that our liberties were protected and that the unborn—the unborn—would have a fighting chance to the guarantee of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Madam Speaker, those who know Phyllis know she always put family first, politics second. I can't help but believe that she knew that at the core of politics, it really was, really is, God first, family and country second, and political activism stemmed from that. Phyllis knew that.

By the way, she cared so much for this country, she came out early on in support of Donald Trump, knowing it would raise eyebrows. But that was Phyllis. You never doubted where she stood. You never doubted her convictions. Madam Speaker, she did all that for her family because she cared about future generations of Americans.

Above all, I appreciate her commitment to our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. We can take great heart in knowing that Phyllis joins her husband of 44 years, Fred, in the kingdom of Heaven with our Lord and Savior Jesus. Our hearts and prayers go out to her family. Mr. KING, you said 6 kids, 16 grandchildren—16 grandchildren.

Phyllis was an amazing person who lived an amazing life and did so much good for our country. For that, I will be forever grateful to her and the work she did for the conservative movement.

I want to thank you, my colleague, Mr. KING, for allowing me this opportunity to memorialize one of the greatest Americans. Madam Speaker, you know I am right.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for coming down to help memorialize the life of Phyllis Schlafly.

Madam Speaker, the things that come to mind as I listened to Mr. WEBER talk about Phyllis Schlafly and I look across at Michele Bachmann, I think about a time that Phyllis took us back into a room in St. Louis to sit and talk to both of us about the future and the destiny of the country. It was three of us sitting there having a little snack and chatting away on the Constitution and the value of life and marriage and the current and the destiny of America. Phyllis always saw it, as I think somebody mentioned, from 30,000 feet.

The time I spend here in this Congress, the time I have the privilege of dealing with people at some of the highest levels in the country, the longer I am at this, the fewer people I am able to identify who can see with clarity the big picture and understand the currents of the course of history and the cultural movements that operate within this course of history that are actually driving it. Phyllis always saw it. She always saw it with a clarity, and that is what drove her to put 27 books out, and one of them was in support of Donald Trump.

She had time in the last years of her life, ''The Conservative Case for Trump'' that is published. I think of the work that she got done. If somebody said to me: ''Well, Donald Trump is going to be the nominee''—and we maybe know this about the time of the Indiana primary—''why don't you just go out and write a book and publish that?''—to pull that off and get that done, to do that when you are 92.

I recall the time when Phyllis broke her hip and she was in a hospital in St. Louis.

□ 1900

So, I thought, I need to talk to Phyllis. I just want to wish her well. I call her up and, yes, she is in a hospital bed all right, but already, first thing when she comes out from the anesthetic, she asked for her laptop. She is at the hospital bed with a laptop, no doubt writing, producing documents, printing things, moving public policy in America from the hospital bed.

On another occasion, I had the privilege to be named to present an award to Phyllis here in Washington, D.C. It was at an event at a hotel here in town. So, I am thinking: How do I make this work? Actually, my schedule wouldn't work for that. I thought: I can't let Phyllis down.

Then, I learned that Phyllis had hurt her back and she had gone in for back surgery. I said: I think I know how to do this. I will tape a video for the people that are there to commemorate Phyllis, and then I will go visit her in St. Louis on my way back to Iowa.

I flew to St. Louis and went to the nursing home where she was recovering from this back surgery. Her lap was covered with books and works and things we know. She sat there and told me how, yes, they had to put some cement in her back. I said: Just like it comes out of the truck? Well, pretty much, she said: They just go in there and fill in the gaps that I have, and now I have to take a little therapy and I will be fine.

Well, she was fine, mentally. This woman had an aura about her. There was a radiance about her. I can only name three people that I have laid eyes on in my lifetime that when they were in the room you knew it; and you knew there was something emanating from the character, the spirit, the soul, and the intellect of Phyllis Schlafly. It is extraordinary. It is an extraordinary life.

I know that one of her close friends was LOUIE GOHMERT, who is here tonight on the floor. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) to say a few words about Phyllis.

Mr. GOHMERT. What a woman. What a person.

Phyllis Schlafly led efforts to return America to being the shining light on a hill that it had been, but the light was dimming. She would see that. She could see the harm that was happening to our most vulnerable, and she led an effort more years than anybody that I have ever known personally to return America to being a citadel for freedom and for morality from which freedom can only grow. She saw us losing our way, yet she remained relentless.

Those who despised her know better than most anyone else this is someone who would never, ever give up. She was a leader, a warrior, a mentor, and a friend. Like very dear friends, like family, you have disagreements sometimes, but you know her heart. You knew she wanted what was best for you, for this country, for the world.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would interject; when I disagreed with Phyllis, I started with the assumption that I was probably wrong.

Mr. GOHMERT. That is a great assumption when it comes to Phyllis.

Well, she has fought the good fight, she has finished her course, and she has kept the faith. I will be there Saturday morning with her family, but the best memorial we can give to Phyllis Schlafly is to make sure the light of freedom and morality does not die in America.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas for a very moving presentation here. I know that it means something very deeply in his heart, as it does in ours here on this floor and across this country by the thousands.

A couple of things that I want to just quickly inject into this discussion.

She would want me to say on article 3, section 2, Court stripping, we don't need to genuflect to the supremacists. The Court has gotten out of control. The Constitution is set up to where they are to be the weakest of the three branches of government, not a superior supremacist branch of government.

Phyllis handed me the manuscript to this book, as I had a lot of long plane flights to do. The manuscript was just printed off a copy machine and kind of clipped together. I worked through all of that. I wrote my edits on it, my notes in the margins, red ink. I worked through it for hours—in fact, it was days. It got lost on the plane on the way back from Africa.

I went to her and said: Phyllis, I need a little more time to work on the edits of your book because the manuscript has been lost in the luggage. She looked at me and she said: Well, Congressman, I didn't intend for you to edit my book. I just intended for you to have an early copy. I knew exactly what I wanted to say.

The book stands out. She knew exactly what she wanted to say. That is a lot about her intellect and her personality.

With utter clarity, the clearest political thinker of our time, based in Biblical values, values of Christians, constitutional values, a clear understanding of people and humanity and faith and family, she wrote on so many topics with utter clarity on topic, after topic, after topic.

She lived a life of 92 years and was a player in the public arena since immediately post-World War II, and she is a player in our lives to this day. She is in our hearts, she is in our souls, she is in our conscience, and she affects our thinking and our actions—and she will for a long, long time to come.

This is a woman who has redirected the destiny of America. I can't think of any woman who had more impact on the course of the history in the United States of America nor weighs more heavily on our sense of duty of what we need going forward to continue to honor the glorious life of Phyllis Schlafly.

Rest in peace, Phyllis. God love you. We do.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. LYNCH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 3 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. SWALWELL of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 3:30 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of brother's wedding.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 9, 2016, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6692. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Viruses, Serums, Toxins, and Analogous Products; Packaging and Labeling [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-0008] (RIN: 0579-AD19) received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6693. A letter from the Acting Director, PDRA Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Rural Broadband Access Loans and Loan Guarantees (RIN: 0572-AC34) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6694. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting an Update to the Report on Efficient Utilization of Department of Defense Real Property, pursuant to Public Law 113-66, Sec. 2814(a); (127 Stat. 1014); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6695. A letter from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Interpretive Rule Under the Military Lending Act

Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended to Service Members and Dependents [Docket ID: DOD-2013-OS-0133] (RIN: 0790-ZA11) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6696. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2015 report entitled ''Preservation and Promotion of Minority Depository Institutions'', pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1463 note; Public Law 101-73, Sec. 308 [as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 367(4)]; (124 Stat. 1556); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6697. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Athens-Clarke County, GA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8447] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6698. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Access to Data Obtained by Security-Based Swap Data Repositories [Release No.: 34-78716; File No.: S7-15-15] (RIN: 3235-AL74) received August 31, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6699. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Programs and Activities Authorized by the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (Title II of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act) [Docket No.: 2015-ED-OCTAE-0003] (RIN: 1830-AA22) received August 23, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6700. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — State Vocational Rehabilitation Services program; State Supported Employment Services program; Limitations on Use of Subminimum Wage [ED-2015-OSERS-0001] (RIN: 1820-AB70) received August 23, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6701. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Programs and Activities Authorized by the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (Title II of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act) [Docket No.: 2015-ED-OCTAE-0003] (RIN: 1830-AA22) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6702. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Savings Arrangements Established by States for Non-Governmental Employees (RIN: 1210-AB71) received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6703. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Butanedioic acid, 2-methylene-, polymer with 1,3-butadiene, ethylbenzene and 2-hydroxyethyl-2-propenoate; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0201; FRL-9950-63] received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6704. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Citrus tristeza virus expressing spinach defensin proteins 2, 7, and 8; Temporary Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0034; FRL-9947-19] received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6705. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — 2014 Quadrennial Regulatory Review — Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 [MB Docket No.: 14-50]; 2010 Quadrennial Regulatory Review — Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 [MB Docket No.: 09-182]; Promoting Diversification of Ownership In the Broadcasting Services [MB Docket No.: 07-294]; Rules and Policies Concerning Attribution of Joint Sales Agreements in Local Television Markets [MB Docket No.: 04-256] received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6706. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 [CG Docket No.: 02-278] received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6707. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Compact Fluorescent Lamps [Docket No.: EERE-2015-BT-TP-0014] (RIN: 1904-AC74) received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6708. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report covering the period from April 11, 2016 to June 9, 2016 on the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107-243, Sec. 4(a); (116 Stat. 1501) and 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 102-1, Sec. 3 [as amended by Public Law 106-113, Sec. 1000(a)(7)]; (113 Stat. 1501A-422); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6709. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's intent to sign an Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Chile, Transmittal No. 21-16, pursuant to Sec. 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act, and Executive Order 13637; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6710. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary General License: Extension of Validity [Docket No.: 160106014-6728-04] (RIN: 0694-AG82) received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6711. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces [FAC 2005-90; FAR Case 2014-025; Docket No.: 2014-0025, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM81) received August 23, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6712. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the semiannual report of disbursements for the operations of the Architect of the Capitol for the period of January 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1868a(a); Public Law 113-76, div. I, title I, Sec. 1301(a); (128 Stat. 428) (H. Doc. No. 114—162); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

6713. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting an order cancelling debts against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 386a; July 1, 1932, ch. 369 [as amended by Public Law 97-375, Sec. 208(a)(1)]; (96 Stat. 1824); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6714. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — BLM Internet-Based Auctions [16X.LLWO310000.L13100000.PP0000] (RIN: 1004-AE48) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6715. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 150818742-6210-02] (RIN: 0648-XE707) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6716. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Environmental Considerations Regulations [Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0018] (RIN: 1660-AA87) received August 30, 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.

6717. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8838; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-020-AD; Amendment 39-18601; AD 2016-16-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 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.

6718. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8472; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-106-AD; Amendment 39-18603; AD 2016-16-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 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.

6719. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5594; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-169-AD; Amendment 39-18596; AD 2016-15-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 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.

6720. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31088; Amdt. No. 3706] received September 1, 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.

6721. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31086; Amdt. No. 3704] received September 1, 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.

6722. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5459; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-148-AD; Amendment 39-18597; AD 2016-15-06] received September 1, 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.

6723. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31085; Amdt. No. 3703] received September 1, 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.

6724. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0466; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-188-AD; Amendment 39-18604; AD 2016-16-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 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.

6725. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5460; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-188-AD; Amendment 39-18599; AD 2016-16-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 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.

6726. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8429; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-122-AD; Amendment 39-18608; AD 2016-16-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 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.

6727. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, PHMSA Office of Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: FAST Act Requirements for Flammable Liquids and Rail Tank Cars [Docket No.: PHMSA-2016-0011 (HM-251C)] (RIN: 2137-AF17) received September 1, 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.

6728. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3989; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-250-AD; Amendment 39-18600; AD 2016-16-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 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.

6729. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5465; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-041-AD; Amendment 39-18609; AD 2016-16-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 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.

6730. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Continental Motors, Inc. Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0002; Directorate Identifier 2011-NE-42-AD; Amendment 39-18610; AD 2016-16-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 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.

6731. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expansion of the Sta. Rita Hills Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2014-0007; T.D. TTB-141; Ref: Notice No. 145] (RIN: 1513-AC10) received August 31, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6732. A letter from the Attorney, Office of the Chief Counsel for Trade Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Enforcement and Compliance, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Correction to Applicability Date for Modification of Regulations Regarding Price Adjustments in Antidumping Duty Proceedings [Docket No.: 140929814-6136-02] (RIN: 0625-AB02) received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 5587. A bill to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006; with an amendment (Rept. 114–728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 5226. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of information relating to pending agency regulatory actions, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BLUM, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 5951. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit prescription drug plan sponsors and MA-PD organizations under the Medicare program from retroactively reducing payment on clean claims submitted by pharmacies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 5952. A bill to improve the retirement security of American families by strengthening Social Security; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 5953. A bill to forgive the indebtedness of the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 5954. A bill to prohibit use of body-gripping traps by personnel of the Department of the Interior and the Department of

Agriculture and on lands of such departments; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 5955. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow the charitable distribution of traditional large and premium cigars to members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 5956. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to better address substance use and substance use disorders among young people; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 5957. A bill to include disabled veteran leave in the personnel management system of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 5958. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for Zika response and preparedness; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5959. A bill to require reporting of bullying to appropriate authorities and assist with equal protection claims against entities who fail to respond appropriately to bullying, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 5960. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to make publicly available, through 2021, the amount of premium rate increases of health insurance plans in advance of such increases taking effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 5961. A bill to provide for relief of victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in Iraq and Syria, for accountability for perpetrators of these crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5962. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the automatic recertification of income for income-driven repayment plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 5963. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 5964. A bill to provide a Federal share for disaster assistance provided to the State of Louisiana in connection with flooding events occurring during 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 5965. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to disclose their concealed carry or open carry policies with respect to firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 5966. A bill a bill to convey certain locks and dams; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 5967. A bill to amend chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to improve access to motor vehicle information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself, Ms. MENG, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 5968. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount of leverage made available to small business investment companies; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. KNIGHT):

H.R. 5969. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount that certain banks and savings associations may invest in small business investment companies, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 5970. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit sentencing judges in child sex trafficking cases to order the Attorney General to publicize the name and photograph of the convicted defendants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 5971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount excludable from gross income for dependent care assistance and dependent care flexible spending arrangements and to provide for a carryover of unused dependent care benefits in dependent care flexible spending arrangements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. DOLD, Ms. HAHN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 5972. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide protection for students that report sexual assault, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 5973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the tax treatment of certain life insurance contract transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 5974. A bill to require the Secretary of State to submit an annual report to Congress regarding efforts to restore or repair Christian property in the Arab Republic of Egypt that was burned, damaged, or otherwise destroyed during the sectarian violence in August 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina):

H.R. 5975. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide mandatory minimum terms of imprisonment for certain trafficking offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 5976. A bill to provide for the issuance of a semipostal to support Department of Agriculture conservation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. JONES, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROKITA, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution expressing a commitment by Congress to never forget the service of aviation's first responders; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MARINO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Res. 849. A resolution expressing condolences to the people of Italy and support for the Government of Italy in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake that struck the Lazio and Marche regions of Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr.

KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. KATKO):

H. Res. 850. A resolution recognizing suicide as a public health problem and expressing support for designation of September as ''National Suicide Prevention Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YOHO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H. Res. 851. A resolution expressing profound concern about the ongoing political, economic, social and humanitarian crisis in Venezuela, urging the release of political prisoners, and calling for respect of constitutional and democratic processes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BEYER, Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H. Res. 852. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the challenges posed to long-term stability in Lebanon by the conflict in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 853. A resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to initiate or intervene in a civil action regarding the compliance of the executive branch with the provision of law prohibiting relinquishment of the responsibility of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration with respect to Internet domain name system functions; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 5951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 5952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, section 8, clause 18:

Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 5953.

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. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 5954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 5955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 5957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.''

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 5958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.)

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 5960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;''

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 5963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constituion, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the commond defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 5965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 5966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Terrority or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 5967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 5968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3

''To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 5969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 5970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which states that Congress has the power ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 5971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 5972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 5973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 5974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 5975.

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. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 5976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. BENISHEK and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 213: Mr. UPTON and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 407: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 546: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 605: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 662: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 756: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 793: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 846: Mrs. TORRES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MENG, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 923: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 971: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1100: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1292: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1427: Mr. STEWART and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1457: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1459: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1519: Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 1600: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1618: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1686: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1779: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2096: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2124: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2132: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2156: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2218: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2290: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2296: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2315: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2348: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2368: Ms. MENG, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KIND, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FARR, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2515: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 2566: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 2656: Mr. DOLD and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2680: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2694: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2715: Mr. LOWENTHAL,

H.R. 2737: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. STEWART, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 2739: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2793: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 2799: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2849: Mr. POCAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 2875: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2889: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2902: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 2948: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 2992: Mr. JONES and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 3099: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HIMES, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 3117: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 3216: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 3261: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 3316: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 3355: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 3381: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 3438: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 3463: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3520: Mr. KEATING and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3522: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3523: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3538: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3546: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 3666: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 3690: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3720: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3742: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 3815: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 3841: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 3957: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 3991: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 4013: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 4055: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 4080: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4184: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 4216: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 4272: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 4275: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 4365: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 4520: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 4547: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 4559: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 4625: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 4626: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4657: Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 4707: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 4715: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 4760: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 4764: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 4773: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 4818: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 4867: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 4880: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 5008: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 5015: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 5127: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 5143: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 5183: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PALAZZO, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 5221: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 5351: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MESSER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 5369: Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5373: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 5410: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 5488: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 5499: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 5542: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 5583: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 5587: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5593: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 5600: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 5610: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 5620: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. JONES, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 5650: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 5679: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 5683: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 5720: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 5735: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 5756: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5785: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 5798: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 5877: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 5883: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 5894: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 5931: Mr. POSEY, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 5935: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 5940: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 5941: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 5942: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MESSER, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KIND, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN

GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 5947: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 5949: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. BURGESS.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. BERA.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. CRAMER.

H. Res. 360: Mr. PETERS.

H. Res. 586: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H. Res. 617: Mr. POSEY.

H. Res. 625: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Res. 717: Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 729: Mr. JORDAN.

H. Res. 776: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DENT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. DELAURO.

H. Res. 845: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. LEE.

H. Res. 848: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2016 No. 135

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, by whose providence our forebears brought forth this Nation, use our lawmakers to make a better world. Empower them to remove those things that obstruct the coming of Your Kingdom on Earth. As they strive for human betterment, may they experience the constancy of Your presence.

Lord, give them the wisdom to give primacy to prayer, seeking Your guidance in all they think, say, and do. Teach them the lessons they ought to learn, enabling them to grow in grace and in a knowledge of You.

And, Lord, with the approach of September 11, we pause to thank You for Your sustaining and prevailing providence. Remind us to not put our trust in human might, but in Your grace, mercy, and power.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of the lives lost in the attacks of September 11, 2001.

(Moment of silence.)

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 3296 AND S. 3297

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3296) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption to the individual mandate to maintain health coverage for individuals residing in counties with fewer than 2 health insurance issuers offering plans on an Exchange.

A bill (S. 3297) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption to the individual mandate to maintain health coverage for certain individuals whose premium has increased by more than 10 percent, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 15 years ago this Sunday, Al Qaeda terrorists launched brutal and vicious attacks against our country. Yet this weekend America will remember not only the horror of those attacks but also the heroism of our response.

We saw firefighters, police officers, and first responders rush in to confront danger. We saw the men and women of our Armed Forces stand ready and sacrifice greatly in defense of our country. We saw Americans across the land work together in a spirit of unity. So 15 years later, it is clear that the terrorists did not succeed. We remain united against terror.

So this Sunday is a day to remember and honor the victims of September 11 and pray for their families. It is also a day to express gratitude to the many Americans who have fought to keep us safe ever since—the men and women who fight for the very thing that makes this the greatest Nation on Earth—freedom.

CONGRATULATING BRIAN DUFFY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to congratulate a fellow Kentuckian and a good friend of mine who has recently taken up the leadership reins of America's oldest and largest war veterans organization.

This summer, Brian Duffy, of Louisville, was elected commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Brian is the first Operation Desert Storm veteran to lead the VFW. His election is good news, not only for his fellow Desert Storm veterans but for veterans of every generation. That is because Brian lives to serve his fellow veterans, and he has been doing so for decades as a proud member of the VFW for 33 years.

Let me give one example of what Brian has done for the veterans of Kentucky. He is the founder of the Bluegrass chapter of an organization called Honor Flight, a group that flies World War II and Korean war veterans to Washington to visit the memorials that were built in dedication of their military service.

The program provides transportation and food for the veterans of this bygone era, those whose numbers, unfortunately, continue to shrink year after year. Without Honor Flight, many of these veterans would never be able to see the World War II Memorial or the Korean War Veterans Memorial. It is important that they know, more than

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

six decades later, that America still deeply respects and honors their service and sacrifice.

My father served in World War II. I have had the pleasure of meeting many of his contemporaries when they came to Washington to make this important trip. Hundreds of Kentucky veterans have completed this journey, thanks to Brian and subsequent leaders of Bluegrass Honor Flight.

That is just one way Brian has worked to see that America stands up for its veterans, just as they have so bravely stood up for their country. It is one reason why I know he will make an excellent commander in chief for the VFW.

Brian served in the U.S. Air Force as a jet engine mechanic on F–4 Phantom fighter aircraft before becoming a flight engineer aboard a C–141 Starlifter transport aircraft. He has deployed to Grenada and Panama as well as on Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

Brian and his wife Jean, who has also served in leadership posts for the VFW, live in Louisville and have two children, Tara and Andrew. I am sure his family is proud of Brian, along with many Kentucky veterans, particularly his fellow VFW members at Post 1170.

Let me also congratulate my good friend Carl Kaelin, whom I have also worked with for decades on behalf of Bluegrass State veterans, for his appointment to serve as chief of staff to the commander in chief. Carl and Brian will make quite a team. Kentucky and the Nation are grateful for their leadership and for their service.

Brian has previously served the VFW as its junior vice commander in chief. He also served as the senior vice commander in chief. I know Brian is a huge hockey fan. So he will know what I mean when I say that his election as commander in chief makes quite a hat trick—to the benefit of Kentucky veterans and veterans across America.

In Brian's own words, the VFW is ''an organization of doers'' and ''an organization comprised of patriots.'' Both of these descriptions aptly fit the VFW's new chief. Under Brian's leadership, I am sure the VFW will continue to pay it forward to every veteran who has raised his or her right hand and taken an oath to defend a nation dedicated to the preservation of life and liberty.

OBAMACARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, President Obama said something interesting just days before signing his namesake health takeover into law. In explaining the need for ObamaCare, here is what he said:

> [W]hat's happening to your premiums? What's happening to your co-payments? What's happening to your deductible? They're all going up. That's money straight out of your pocket.
>
> So, the bottom line is this: The status quo on health care is simply unsustainable.

''Simply unsustainable'' was the President's view on the state of our health care system before ObamaCare. Here is his view on the health care system 6 years later: ''Too many Americans still strain to pay for their physician visits and prescriptions, cover their deductibles, or pay their monthly insurance bills; struggle to navigate a complex, sometimes bewildering system; and remain uninsured.''

That is the President on the state of America's health care law 6 years after ObamaCare. The President wrote this just last month. It sounds an awful lot like what we heard from him years ago, in the pre-ObamaCare world. It throws the reality of this partisan law into stark relief. It is not only that ObamaCare is failing to live up to the many promises invoked to sell it, but it is often making things worse.

Just pick up any paper or turn on the news, and you will see that more troubling projections are rolling in when it comes to ObamaCare. In fact, each day seems to bring more forecasts of skyrocketing premiums and dwindling choices. It is a trend hitting Americans across the country.

For instance, here is the headline people in my home State recently awoke to: ''Get ready to pay more for health insurance in Kentucky.'' The story goes on to warn of ObamaCare premium rates that could skyrocket by as high as 47 percent. Nearly 160,000 people are expected to be impacted.

Here is a letter from a man from Louisville who recently contacted my office. ''How,'' he asks, ''are working class Americans, like myself, able to budget for such drastic changes?'' ''The so-called Affordable Care Act,'' he said, ''is unaffordable.''

He and other Kentuckians are hardly alone in feeling this way. Take Illinois, where premiums could soar by as much as 55 percent; or Tennessee and Montana, where some rates could skyrocket by more than 60 percent; or Minnesota, where premiums could rise by an average of more than 50 percent. Minnesota's Democratic Governor said he was ''alarmed'' by these ''drastic increases'' and called them ''reason for very serious concerns.''

Even my friend, the Democratic leader, referred to ObamaCare's premium increases yesterday as ''huge.'' He is right. He was right to mention ObamaCare's ''tax increases'' too. This partisan law raised taxes that hit the middle class after Democrats promised that it wouldn't.

So these huge premium increases aren't the only reason ObamaCare is raising costs for the middle class. Premiums aren't the only reason that Americans recently cited health costs as their No. 1 financial concern. It isn't hard to see why Americans might be hurting. Taxes are up, copays are up, and deductibles are outpacing wages. Now, with more and more insurance companies pulling out of the ObamaCare State exchanges, Americans are being left with another big problem—fewer coverage options.

The Obama administration used to promise us that the ObamaCare marketplace would ''provide more choice and control over health insurance options'' and result in ''a significant increase in competition and an array of options for consumers everywhere.'' That was the promise of ObamaCare.

But that is not the reality for many Americans today. ObamaCare has forced out so many insurers that about one in five ObamaCare customers will be forced to find a new insurance company this fall. More than half of the country could have two or fewer insurers to choose from in the exchanges next year, and about one-third of all counties in the United States, along with seven entire States, are set to have just a single insurer offering plans in their areas. That includes one county in Arizona that, until just last night, would have had no options in the exchange at all. I know this is something that Senator MCCAIN has been deeply concerned about, and he has introduced good legislation to address it.

ObamaCare co-ops continue to collapse at every turn, too, with less than one-third expected to offer plans next year. When these co-ops collapse, they can cost taxpayers millions and disrupt coverage for thousands of enrollees. They can force patients to start over on their deductibles midyear and even to find new doctors. These are the latest reverberating echoes of the President's most famous broken promise: ''If you like your health care plan, you can keep it.'' That was the President's promise.

Here is a Kentuckian from Campbellsburg, who wrote to me after losing his insurance:

> I lost my health insurance that I had for many years because of ObamaCare. Instead of something affordable, I face the possibility of struggling to purchase an Obama health plan that costs two to three times what I had been paying.

To top it off, he said, the ''process of trying to find coverage has been a nightmare.''

Here is something to keep in mind when Democrats try to spin the American people on ObamaCare. For all of this chaos and pain for middle-class families, ObamaCare still has not achieved its stated purpose of universal coverage—not even close. Tens of millions still remain uninsured—tens of millions. And those who do have insurance are now discovering that simply having health insurance isn't the same thing as having health coverage. They have insurance, but it isn't the same thing as having health coverage.

Take one New Jersey man who has suffered for years from chronic migraines and needs medication to help alleviate the pain. The moment ObamaCare placed him on Medicaid, he lost his access to each of his doctors, which meant waiting 4 months to see a new doctor and get a prescription for the medication he needs. He said:

> You have a card saying you have health insurance, but if no doctors take it, it's almost like having one of those fake IDs. Your medication is all paid for, but if you can't get the pills, it's worthless.

According to a Gallup poll released just this morning, many more Americans report that ObamaCare has hurt rather than helped their families—and many more Americans say that ObamaCare will make their family's health situation worse rather than better over the long run.

Is it any wonder? Americans were told that ObamaCare would allow them to keep the health plans they liked. They couldn't. Americans were told that ObamaCare would drive down health care premiums by $2,500 per family. It hasn't. Americans were told that ObamaCare would not raise taxes on the middle class. It did. Americans were told that ObamaCare would increase choice and competition. The very opposite is proving true.

And remember the promise that ''if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor''? It has been broken too. In fact, the Obama administration recently erased references to ''keeping your doctor'' from its Web site. These entirely predictable consequences are not just flukes or quirks of ObamaCare. They are not just small wrinkles in the system that will work themselves out with time. They represent fundamental flaws built into the law's original design.

Republicans warned about ObamaCare's consequences repeatedly from the very start. Democrats mocked us for doing so and rammed through their partisan law anyway. Every single Democrat in the Senate was needed to pass it, and they got every one of them.

I invite Democrats to now consider following the lead of one of the President's own former health care advisers who recently penned an op-ed titled ''How I was wrong about ObamaCare.'' The problems Democrats caused for the middle class aren't going away until ObamaCare does. So if Democrats are serious about helping the middle class, they will work with us to build a bridge beyond ObamaCare to better care. Anything else is just more hollow rhetoric.

Today, 6 years on, ObamaCare is failing the middle class, but the President still hasn't offered a serious solution to fix it. He is now trying to convince Americans that the solution to his bloated, unwieldy, and expensive law is to make it more bloated, more unwieldy, and more expensive. In other words, it is more of the same—more of the same, just worse. His preferred Presidential candidate says the same thing. So do congressional Democrats.

How can anyone conclude, after reading all these stories about how ObamaCare is hurting the middle class, that what we need now is more ObamaCare in the form of a government-run plan? That is their solution now—more ObamaCare in the form of a government-run plan.

Look, Democrats can continue to spin us on how great this law is. They can continue to tell Americans to ''get over'' this law and its pain for the middle class. They can continue to laugh at Americans who lose their plans. They can continue to crow about exploiting ''the stupidity of the American voter'' to push this partisan law on the middle class. Or they can work with us to move beyond the failed experiment of ObamaCare. They can prove that they are finally willing to put people before ideology.

This much is clear: ObamaCare is a direct attack on the middle class. It hurts the very people it was designed to help. It raises costs, crushes choice, and is now crashing down around us. It simply isn't working.

To quote what President Obama said 6 years ago, ''The bottom line is this: The status quo of health care is simply unsustainable.''

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it seems it was just a few minutes ago, but it wasn't; it was 15 years ago that, just a few feet from where I stand now, I went to a meeting. It was approaching 9 o'clock, and no one was in the room, S–211. Senator Breaux from Louisiana walked in, and he said: Flip on the TV. And we did. We could see the tower had been hit in New York. We thought a plane had hit it by mistake. So we shut off the TV and Senator Daschle came in and started the meeting. In just a few minutes, some people came in and ushered Senator Daschle out of the meeting. He came back in quickly and said: The building has to be evacuated; there is a plane headed toward the Capitol. As we walked out of the room and looked out the window, we could all see the smoke billowing from the place we learned was the Pentagon. I will always remember that. Of course I will. And, of course, we have learned since of the many heroes of that day—people running not away from danger but toward danger.

On that day, I was first taken home. I had to rush back to the Capitol, through police barricades. Four Members of the leadership were helicoptered out of the Capitol to a secure location outside of DC. As the sun was going down, we came back to the Capitol steps. BARBARA MIKULSKI, the Senator from Maryland, who is known for giving dynamic speeches, didn't give a speech that day. In front of this bipartisan group of Senators, she very simply said: I think what we should sing is ''God Bless America.'' We all did that. It was a beautiful rendition of all the varied voices of Senators, Republicans and Democrats, singing that song. We didn't know what that meant—what tomorrow would bring—but that gave us some inspiration to think about how great our country is.

The perpetrators sought to attack our democracy, our way of life, but they failed. The tragedy of that day reminded every American of our collective strength and resilience, led by George Bush who did such a remarkable job of rallying the Nation.

We exhibited the best of ourselves in front of the world, and we resolved to degrade and destroy the terrorists responsible. After many failed attempts and in spite of some people saying ''Let's wait,'' President Obama said ''Let's do this.'' And they killed Bin Laden. That was the right thing to do. It was a courageous move on behalf of President Obama but the right thing to do. He was ultimately brought to justice.

Today, 15 years later—I will always remember that experience a few feet from here, but we will all remember, in our own way, September 11, and in our own way honor the victims and the heroes of that day and never forget. We are always stronger together when we are united.

OBAMACARE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have trouble comprehending my friend the Republican leader—how he can, with a straight face, talk about how terrible America is today. Things are upside down; it is terrible.

Remember, Obama was elected President almost 8 years ago. That month, under the prior administration, for lots of reasons we have all talked about, our country lost 800,000 jobs in one month. That wasn't the only month. Our unemployment rate shot up in places like the Presiding Officer's and my State to more than 14 percent. Unemployment in America was raging. Major companies failed. I saw the Secretary of Treasury on his knees in the White House begging the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, for help.

We joined together with President Bush. There was nothing partisan about what we did. Even though there were some small steps, we did our best to help the country. Since then, under the last 8 years of President Obama's leadership, the country has been significantly turned in the right direction.

For my friend the Republican leader to parrot what Donald Trump is saying: ''Make America great again''—America is great right now. Unemployment is less than 5 percent. Millions of jobs have been created in this administration—millions and millions of jobs—about 16 million.

We have no ground troops, except in Afghanistan. They have been brought home, and rightfully so. To hear my friend the Republican leader talk about the awfulness of ObamaCare—you don't have to have a long memory to know what it was like before ObamaCare. Insurance companies were canceling policies, denying insurance, not writing insurance because you are a woman, because you had a prior disability. I don't know if my friend is briefed by his office, reads the newspapers, or watches

the news. Three days ago the word came out that the uninsured are at all-time lows in our country. Ninety-two percent of Americans have health insurance. Is that bad? Is the insurance perfect? Of course it is not. We have 19 States led by Republican Governors who refuse to accept Medicaid. The Republican Governor from Nevada made the right choice, and it has been good for the State of Nevada.

It is interesting that after more than 6 years, we still have never seen a plan by the Republicans and what they want to do other than vote against ObamaCare. ObamaCare has expanded coverage to millions of Americans. It has improved the quality of health insurance. A lot of people who don't like the plan don't like it because they don't think it is strong enough and they want to do more. The marketplace will continue to connect Americans to quality, affordable health insurance.

I thought Republicans believed in the free enterprise system, and that is what we have with ObamaCare. The health insurance marketplace is so much better than pre-Affordable Care Act. They should stop trying to repeal ObamaCare and work with us to improve what we have. It is not going to go away.

The Affordable Care Act has shown that it has had a positive impact on the stated goal of lowering the number of people without coverage. Millions of people have health insurance who didn't before. He and other Republicans continue to come down to the floor and complain, although not as often as they used to because they have been embarrassed too many times. The Republican leader seems to think that things were better before Americans had coverage, including the 500,000 people in Kentucky who now have insurance because of ObamaCare. I guess he seems to be saying that he liked it better when insurance companies could deny coverage for any reason that they thought was appropriate; it didn't have to be a good reason.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, September 10 is World Suicide Prevention Day. I had occasion to visit with our former colleague, Gordon Smith, a tremendously good Senator from the State of Oregon, while I was in Las Vegas a couple of weeks ago. Even now we often speak—as we did in Las Vegas that evening—about our experience with those who have committed suicide. Gordon lost a son, I lost a father, and there are a small number of people here in this room today—if we could do an oral poll, we would find that many people in this room have been affected by suicide.

Think about it. Each year, about 33,000 people commit suicide. That is a lot of people. It took me a while to accept not feeling sorry for myself and to try to do something about it, and we have done some things here as a body about suicide.

We really don't understand it very well. For example, most suicides occur in the western part of the United States. I would have thought just the opposite. The West has bright, sunshiny skies, and the weather is a lot better than places like New York, but for some reason, west of the Mississippi, we have a problem with suicide that doesn't occur in other places.

It is a national problem, and we have to do something about it. We have 33,000 people die every year, and those are the ones we know about. There are hunting accidents, car accidents, and hiking accidents that are really suicides but they are not acknowledged as such.

From 1999 through 2014, the suicide rate in the United States increased by 24 percent, both men and women of all ages. Women are now becoming more equal to men in killing themselves.

If we are going to actively address the increasing rate of suicides, we can't ignore the role firearms play. Guns are the most common device men turn to when they commit suicide. That is according to the CDC and not some left-wing group the Republicans like to harangue about. Almost 23,000 suicides were carried out with firearms in 2013—that is the last information that we have—which is 10 percent higher than 3 years earlier.

We don't really know what is happening in the military. Twenty-two people in the military will kill themselves today. It is mostly done after they have been honorably discharged from the military.

We need to invest in evidence-based prevention. Young people are killing themselves. One of my wonderful staff members, my chief of staff—she is such a dear friend—comes from a large family of 10 children. One of her brothers is a medical doctor with twins. One of them hanged himself—an 11-year-old boy, dead.

We have to have more science-based information, and we don't have it. Mr. President, 33,000 people are dying each year as a result of self-inflicted injuries.

I note with a degree of seriousness that September 10 is World Suicide Prevention Day. I hope we can all acknowledge this is something on which we need to work together. It is not a partisan issue; just ask Gordon Smith. It is not a partisan issue; just ask me. As I have indicated, many people who work in these wonderful buildings in the Capitol have been affected by suicide.

Will the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2848, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (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, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Inhofe) amendment No. 4979, in the nature of a substitute.

Inhofe amendment No. 4980 (to Amendment No. 4979), to make a technical correction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the bill we are debating, the Water Resources Development Act. I will begin by commending the chairman of the EPW Committee, Senator INHOFE, and the ranking member, Senator BOXER, for their leadership on this legislation.

Sometimes it is important to just look at what these bills are doing. The Water Resources Development Act—WRDA, we call it here—the title says:

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, and for other purposes.

One of the things I have come to the floor of the Senate to speak on a number of times is one of the most important things I think we should be doing in the Senate, and that is focusing on our economy. With all due respect to the minority leader with regard to the economy in the United States, things are not going well. Just over the past two quarters, we again had numbers that were dismal by any historical measure in the United States. Last quarter, I think we had 1.5 percent GDP growth, and the quarter before that, we had 0.8 percent GDP growth. As a matter of fact, President Obama will be the first President in U.S. history who never hit 8 percent GDP growth in 1 year—never. No President has had such a dismal regard in terms of growing the economy.

What should we be doing? First of all, we need to focus on the economy. One of the critical things we should be doing in the Congress—one of the things we need to unleash to the private sector is better infrastructure for this country. Again, I commend the chairman of the EPW Committee and the ranking member because they have been leaders on this issue. Last year, we passed the first long-term highway bill in many years with the FAST Act. That is infrastructure for the country. Right now, hopefully, the Senate will pass the WRDA bill.

These aren't perfect pieces of legislation. No piece of legislation ever is. For example, I think both of them could

have had provisions that streamlined the permitting process to build bridges, roads, and ports. Right now in this country, it often takes years to cut through the redtape to get permission from the Federal Government to build infrastructure. We need to do a better job on that. But the FAST Act and now the WRDA bill are important bills. They are important bills to help us grow our economy, and that is why I am supporting the WRDA bill we are debating here on the floor.

There are many provisions in this bill that are going to benefit different parts of the country. It will certainly benefit the State of Alaska. We are a young State. We are infrastructure poor, for sure, in terms of roads, ports, and harbors.

One provision I wish to highlight is section 7106, the Small and Disadvantaged Communities Grant Program. This is a new program that I had the opportunity to work on with my team, Senator INHOFE's team, Senator BOXER's team, and Senator WICKER. We are all focused on this issue. It stemmed from an important topic we were discussing.

I know my colleague and friend, Senator PETERS from Michigan, is going to talk about Flint, MI, and what happened there and the topic of our aging infrastructure. I certainly respect his advocacy for his constituents on this topic.

We have been talking about our aging infrastructure, but one topic we didn't talk a lot about in the Senate—and I certainly tried to raise it a lot—is not just aging infrastructure, but how about the topic of no infrastructure for communities in the United States? I know a lot of Americans don't know this, but there are a lot of communities in our great Nation that have no clean water, no sewer, and no toilets that flush—entire communities in America. Think about that. They have no running water and no toilets that flush. They have what we call in Alaska honey buckets. Sounds sweet, of course, but it is not sweet; it is literally American citizens having to haul their own waste from their house to a lagoon and dump it there. Can you believe that in America we have entire communities—in my State over 30—that have that problem? What this causes is often very high rates of disease, such as skin disease, ear infections, and sometimes at third-world disease rates. Again, this is happening in America. I think it is unacceptable, and I think most of my colleagues believe it is unacceptable. It is not right.

That is where the new provision, the Small and Disadvantaged Communities Grant Program, comes in as part of this bill. It prioritizes assistance to small communities throughout our country that don't have basic drinking water or wastewater services. This is a 5-year program that is in the bill. It authorizes $1.4 billion to address what I think the vast majority of Americans would agree is an unacceptable condition in certain communities throughout our great Nation. No American community should have to rely on honey buckets. No American community should have Third World disease rates because they don't have water and sewer.

So this WRDA bill is a serious start to address this issue. It is a significant challenge. It is not going to be addressed overnight, but I think everybody in this Senate can agree we shouldn't have communities of hundreds of people in our great Nation who don't have basic services that the vast majority of Americans take for granted and assume that every community in our great country has, but we don't.

This is a good start to do what one Governor of Alaska put out as a vision and a goal, which is to put the honey bucket in a museum, and that is what we are going to try to do beginning with this program.

I encourage my colleagues to support the WRDA bill that is being debated on the floor. I again wish to thank Chairman INHOFE and Senator BOXER for their leadership on this important piece of legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the Water Resources Development Act, known as WRDA as well, which we are now considering and we expect to vote on next week.

This bill will significantly reduce the threat of lead exposure and other drinking water contamination for our communities across the United States, and it will invest in our aging water infrastructure. I am particularly pleased that language addressing the Flint water crisis—language I worked on with my colleagues Senator STABENOW, Senator INHOFE, Senator BOXER, and many others—is included in the WRDA bill before us. Their strong leadership has been invaluable, and I thank them for their efforts.

WRDA provides resources that will improve drinking water infrastructure in Flint, MI, and other places where pipes, pumps, and treatment plants are crumbling and are woefully out of date. This bill also funds health care programs for communities that have been affected by lead contamination. Also, all of the direct spending is fully paid for.

Crafting this bill has been a constructive process with input from many Senators. There are a number of new, smart policy changes that will vastly improve water quality and tackle accessibility challenges. For example, this bill delivers funding for programs that will reduce lead in drinking water, test for lead in schools and childcare facilities, and invest in new water technologies.

WRDA also authorizes over $12 billion for 29 Corps of Engineers projects in 18 States. These projects invest in ports and inland waterways, flood control and hurricane protection, and the restoration of critical ecosystems.

This worthy bill has earned the endorsements from a long list of critical stakeholders, and I appreciate the bipartisan support that has made crafting and considering this bill such a collaborative process.

While floor time for this measure is certainly long overdue, what really matters now is that we have an agreement to move forward. This is a fantastic opportunity to help millions of people all across our great country.

We now have a pathway to success if we can move the final vote of this legislation next week. I urge my fellow Senators to show the American people we can continue to work together to address urgent needs across our country, invest in critical infrastructure, and deliver much needed—and fully paid for—support for Flint families.

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. COONS. 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. COONS. Mr. President, I rise because of three numbers—three simple but important numbers—100, 176, and 9. What do all of those have to do with the matter that I think should be before us today? Well, it has been 176 days since President Obama did his job under the Constitution and nominated Chief Judge Merrick Garland of the DC Circuit Court, a consensus candidate, to our Nation's highest Court following the untimely passing of Justice Scalia. We have, of course, 100 Senators whose challenge it is to find ways to work together across the aisle and do our job and make progress for our country. It has also been 100 years that the U.S. Senate has had a Judiciary Committee—a committee on which I have the honor of serving. In the 100 years we have had a Judiciary Committee in the U.S. Senate, we have never had this situation, where the President does his job under the Constitution and nominates an eminently qualified jurist and the Senate Judiciary Committee refuses—just refuses—to conduct a hearing, to give a vote, to bring it to the floor, and to offer a final vote.

Obviously, we have disagreements. We have disagreements in this body over principles and ideology. That is part of our job to come here representing our States and their different priorities and values. But to steadfastly refuse for 176 days to even convene a hearing, to even begin the process to allow the American people to have some insight into the quality and caliber of the man nominated by our President strikes me as an unprecedented refusal. It is the first time in a century that we have so blatantly had one group in this body refusing to proceed.

Our window for acting is closing because in just a few weeks, on October 3, the Supreme Court's new term begins. So the refusal to act and to fill the ninth vacant seat has now had a serious ongoing impact on one term of the Supreme Court and now soon on a second term of the Supreme Court. We have never had a Supreme Court vacancy go this long in modern history.

In terms of the qualifications of the candidate, let's just take a quick look at the public record so far.

A bipartisan group of former Solicitors General—the lawyers of the United States, the persons who represent the United States in court and often before the Supreme Court—including Paul Clement, Ted Olson, and Ken Starr, have endorsed Judge Garland as ''superbly qualified,'' having ''demonstrated the temperament, intellect, and experience to serve'' on the Supreme Court. This is not a sharply divisive nominee who is pursuing a particular ideological agenda. This is a well-regarded, well-respected, seasoned senior member of the Federal judiciary.

Top lawyers at 44 U.S. companies have written to the Senate calling Judge Garland ''exceptionally well-qualified'' and noting that a prolonged vacancy continues to leave important, even vital, business issues unresolved before the Court, giving them a lack of predictability and leading them to have to make decisions in the absence of clear guidance from the Court.

Just yesterday my colleagues and I joined some of Judge Garland's former law clerks in front of the Supreme Court. Sometimes when I have had the opportunity to review nominees for Federal judgeships, I like to hear from those who previously worked for them. In a letter to the Senate, a group of Judge Garland's former clerks noted that ''Chief Judge Garland deeply believes that our system of justice works best when those who see things differently are able to work together, in a collegial manner, to arrive at a just result.''

Yesterday we heard again firsthand accounts from Judge Garland's clerks of his wisdom, mentorship, decency, and commitment to justice. I wish we could follow the same approach in the Senate that Judge Garland's clerks and other former coworkers said he followed in the Department of Justice, as a career prosecutor, and as a judge on the DC Circuit—an approach that focuses on collegiality and success.

I had the honor of meeting with Judge Garland on April 7. In addition to his truly impressive intellect and compelling and long judicial experience, our conversation revealed to me a person of real character, good judgment, deep sensitivity, and thoughtfulness. I wish I had the opportunity in front of a public hearing of the Judiciary Committee to ask him similar questions that would allow my constituents, the President's constituents, and other Members of this body to ask and answer important questions before the American people, before a committee of this body, and before our colleagues so that we could do our job and move forward. Yet we haven't had this hearing—the hearing that the American people so need and deserve.

In May, my Democratic colleagues held a public meeting to try to further explore and air Judge Garland's background, where we heard from four esteemed, significant, and experienced individuals deeply familiar with Judge Garland's experience and character—a former court of appeals judge, a former U.S. attorney, a former Cabinet Secretary, and a U.S. law professor who clerked for Judge Garland. All four of them urged us to move forward and consider his nomination.

Of those four, Judge Lewis' testimony has particularly stuck with me. He was nominated by President George H.W. Bush in September of 1992, which, to the best of my recollection, was an election year. He was then confirmed by a Democratic-led Senate in October of 1992, less than a month before a hotly contested Presidential election. Judge Lewis previously came to testify in support of then-Judge Samuel Alito of the Third Circuit before his elevation to the Supreme Court. Judge Lewis warned us earlier this year in this meeting that what we are doing is not only deadlocking the Supreme Court, but it is diminishing it.

Our system of justice, our Federal courts, and our constitutional order are one of America's most precious assets. As a Member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have the honor of traveling to other countries to represent our country, most often on bipartisan delegations, where we urge them to follow our model. Sadly, in too many countries I have visited, they cannot depend upon their judiciary to be truly independent, to enforce the rule of law, to issue judgments that are in keeping with their laws, traditions, or, most importantly, their constitution. That is why I am disappointed that we are engaging in this unprecedented refusal to follow the rules, to follow the process of the Constitution and the Senate and to give this important nominee a hearing. That is why I am disappointed by Leader MCCONNELL and Chairman GRASSLEY in their refusal to consider Judge Garland's qualifications. It is my hope they will reconsider.

In Chief Judge Garland's nomination, President Obama fulfilled one of his most important constitutional responsibilities. Now all 100 Senators, on this 176th day that we are waiting to fill this 9th vacancy on the Supreme Court, must do our job and provide appropriate advice and possibly consent to the President's nominee. The Senate has a valuable opportunity to show our constituents, the American people, and the world that even in the midst of a divisive Presidential campaign, our democratic and constitutional system still works. We cannot allow yearlong Supreme Court vacancies to become routine, and I am deeply concerned about the manner in which the Senate is conducting itself and the possibility that this unprecedented inaction will set a precedent for future vacancies and send a signal to the world that our constitutional order cannot still function.

I remain hopeful that my colleagues will give serious thought to the systemic consequences of what we are doing through our refusal to even hold a hearing on Judge Garland. It is long past time to put the good of our Nation and the Constitution above the politics of the day and to get to work on this confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

NOMINATION OF MERRICK GARLAND

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to thank my colleague from Delaware for joining me yesterday on the steps of the Supreme Court. We had law clerks who had served Judge Garland over the years who spoke in glowing terms about the man's ability to serve. In fact, I have not heard any detractors or critics who have come forward to suggest that the President's nominee is not a serious candidate for this job and one who would fill it with great competence.

Here is the reality of what we face. This is the Executive Calendar, which is passed out every single day in the Senate. You will see it on the desks of many of my colleagues. In this publication are nominations pending before the Senate. There are 27 Federal judicial nominees whose nominations are pending before the Senate.

One nomination that might be of interest to those who are following this debate is a nomination that goes back to October of 2015 of Edward L. Stanton III, of Tennessee. Now, we know the way the process works is that Mr. Stanton's name would not be on the calendar to be considered by the Senate were it not for the support of both Senators from Tennessee—in this case, both Republican Senators of Tennessee. So we have a nomination to fill a vacancy on a Federal district court of Tennessee that has been approved by both Republican Senators and reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee in October of last year—almost 1 year ago.

Obviously, a question must be raised. What is wrong with Mr. Stanton? What did he do? How did he get approved by both Senators and out of committee only to be sitting on the calendar for a year? What he did was he ran into a concerted, deliberate plan by Senate Republicans to stop filling judicial vacancies under President Barack Obama. There are 26 like him who have been reported from the committee and sent to the calendar.

Listen, here is the interesting part. Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, has called a special meeting of the committee today to take place right after

the first vote, right off the floor here. To do what? To add five more names to the calendar—five more nominees to the calendar. Why? Is there going to be one magic day when all 32 are going to fly out of the Senate by a handful of votes?

Well, nobody said that is going to happen. Unfortunately, it means that for each of these nominees—starting with Mr. Stanton, 1 year ago—their lives are going to be on hold. They made a good-faith effort to step forward to serve the United States of America in the Federal judiciary. They submitted themselves to elaborate background checks by the FBI and other agencies, and then, when reported by the White House, they went through further background checks by the staff of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Each of these individuals went through a hearing where, under oath, they were asked questions. Each of them, in many instances, was asked to present additional support materials for their nomination. They did it all. They did everything that was asked of them, and they sit on the calendar. What is this all about?

Well, I would say Senator MCCONNELL and Senate Republicans are not very veiled in concealing their strategy. They don't want a Democratic President to fill a vacancy on the Federal bench, despite the fact that the people of the United States chose President Barack Obama by an overwhelming margin, despite the fact that he continues to have the powers of office. They want to thwart and stop that authority of the President to fill Federal judicial vacancies. Their hope is that their favorite candidate, their beloved nominee Donald Trump, will pick the next set of Federal judges. Can you imagine?

What really is behind this is not just to give Mr. Trump his moment to pick the nominees and make nominations to pick the future members of the judiciary but really to serve a specific political agenda. The Senate Republicans are afraid of what would happen to a Federal court system if independent jurists served. They want their friends instead. They want those who will lean in their direction when it comes to the important issues of corporate interests, Wall Street banks, and the Koch brothers. The courts mean an awful lot to companies and wealthy people, and they want to make sure the right people are sitting there making decisions when it comes to the future.

So 27 nominees sit on the Senate calendar, and the Senate Republicans refuse to call them for a vote. Senator GRASSLEY on the Senate Judiciary Committee wants to add five more to the list today. Why? Why are we doing this to these poor people, putting them through this charade of nomination when there is no intention to fill the vacancy? Incidentally, among the vacancies currently pending on the Federal judiciary—we are now up to 90 vacancies across the United States—a third of them are in emergency situations, which means that the courts cannot properly function because of the vacancies on the Federal bench. Despite this, the Senate Republicans refuse, being in control of the Senate, to call these names for consideration. They know they will pass. They are not controversial. They went through the committee, and they languish on the calendar because of this political decision.

I wish that were the worst example, but it is not. The worst example relates to the 176 days pending since the nomination of Judge Merrick Garland, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. He has had his name before the Senate in nomination and has not been called for a hearing or a vote.

Each of us, when we become a Senator, walks down this aisle and over to the side where the Vice President of the United States administers an oath of office. We don't take oaths lightly. For most of us, there are only a handful of moments in our lifetime where we raise our hand and swear that we are going to do certain things. In this case, we stand there in the well of the Senate and swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America. You might think it is a formal declaration—and it is—but it is also a meaningful declaration. This country was riven and also destroyed because of a dispute over our Constitution which led to a civil war. So we make certain, if you walk down this aisle and put up your hand over there, one hand on the Bible, one hand reaching to the heavens, taking an oath to uphold the Constitution, we are serious about it.

Yet, when it comes to filling this Supreme Court vacancy, the Constitution is explicit about our responsibility in the Senate. Article II, section 2, speaks to the President's constitutional responsibility—responsibility—to fill vacancies on the U.S. Supreme Court. Why did the Founding Fathers make it a responsibility and a mandate? Because they knew what would happen if vacancies on the Court could be used for political purposes, if leaving slots vacant on the Court advantaged one political party or the other.

So they came forward and said: It is all about a full set of Justices and the President's responsibility to nominate those who would fill the vacancies. The death of Antonin Scalia created a vacancy. The Court across the street now has eight Justices. They have already been hamstrung by the fact that one Justice is missing and they were unable to reach a decision in critical cases.

So the President met his responsibility 176 days ago and sent the nomination of Merrick Garland to be considered by the Senate. I don't use this term loosely. I have looked it up. I have researched it. I want to say explicitly, the Senate of the United States of America has never, never in its history since the Judiciary Committee has been in business, never once refused a Presidential nominee a hearing. It has never happened.

Oh, I know, some of my critics on the other side will say: Well, if the shoe were on the other foot, if it were a Democratic Congress and a Republican lameduck President, you would do the same. Wrong. In recent memory, in recent history, when President Ronald Reagan was in the last year of his term and there was a vacancy on the Supreme Court, he sent the nomination of Anthony Kennedy to a Democratic-controlled Senate, and instead of refusing to do our job, the Democratic Senate approved Justice Anthony Kennedy, the Reagan nominee, in the last year of the Reagan Presidency.

But Senator MITCH MCCONNELL and the Senate Republicans have said no. No, we are just not going to do it. We don't care if the Constitution requires it. We don't care if we have taken an oath to live up to the Constitution. We don't care if it has never been done before in the history of the Senate. We are going to stop this President from filling this Supreme Court vacancy because our friends, our special interest groups, corporate interests, Wall Street banks, and the Koch brothers, don't want to see an Obama nominee filling this vacancy.

It is a shame. Merrick Garland is an extraordinarily gifted jurist. He is a son of Illinois—maybe I come to it with some prejudice—born in Chicago, raised in Lincolnwood, valedictorian of his high school, Niles West. He recently gave a graduation speech to that school.

His father ran a small business. His mother worked as the director of volunteer services at Chicago's Council for Jewish Elderly. Judge Merrick Garland is an intelligent man. He earned his undergraduate and law degrees from Harvard, clerked for distinguished jurists Henry Friendly and William Brennan. He spent years in public service as a prosecutor at the Department of Justice. He led the investigation of the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing. He served as a judge on the DC Circuit since 1997. Incidentally, he was confirmed by the Senate with a broad bipartisan vote for that position.

Throughout his career, he has won praise from across the political spectrum for his fairness, his brilliance, his work ethic, and his judgment. The American Bar Association took a look at this nominee and said: He is unanimously ''well qualified'' to serve on the Supreme Court—unanimously. This is a man who has given decades of his life to public service, and the Senate Republicans will not even give him a hearing. They will not give him a moment under oath to answer questions.

The way the Senate Republican majority has handled this Supreme Court vacancy is shameful. Since Justice Antonin Scalia's untimely passing last February, the Supreme Court has had to operate with eight Justices. As

President Ronald Reagan said back in 1987, ''Every day that passes with the Supreme Court below full strength impairs the people's business in that crucially important body.''

During the last Supreme Court term, the Court was unable to reach a final decision on the merits seven times because the Justices were deadlocked 4 to 4. Major legal questions have been left unresolved. On September 26, the Court will hold its first conference of its new term, still with only eight Justices, though the Senate has had plenty of time to fill a vacancy, but the Senate Republicans have refused to do their job.

Unlike any other Senate in the history of the United States, in the history of this country, the Senate Republicans have refused a Presidential nominee to the Supreme Court a fair hearing—any hearing—and a vote. It is shameful. The Senate is now failing under the Constitution to do its job. The Senate Republicans, by design, are responsible.

Judge Garland, the Supreme Court, and the American people deserve better. The Senate should give Merrick Garland a hearing and a vote.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. President, when they write the history of this Republican-controlled Senate, they will surely note that we are a little over 2 weeks away from a deadline, when we were supposed to have a budget and appropriations bills, and we don't have them.

That has happened before. It is not the first time in recent memory. We have been tied up in knots before, but that is a reality. Despite promises to the contrary, we have not passed an appropriations bill. I might say in fairness, in defense, of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Republican chairman, THAD COCHRAN, as well as the ranking Democrat, BARBARA MIKULSKI, we did our job.

We held hearings on the important bills. They are ready for consideration on the floor. What has stopped their consideration is the Republican House of Representatives and Senator MCCONNELL. The Republicans in the House just cannot reach an agreement. That is why John Boehner left. That is why PAUL RYAN's hair is turning gray, trying to deal with a handful of tea party Republicans who would rather see the whole Congress grind to a halt and the government shut down.

So when it comes to passing appropriations and spending bills, there is not much to brag about on the Republican side of the aisle. When it comes to the Zika virus in February, President Obama said: Be careful. We have a public health crisis looming. This mosquito we have discovered can cause extraordinary damage to pregnant women and to the babies they carry.

So he asked us, in February of this year, 7 months ago, he asked us for $1.8 billion so they could stop the spread of this mosquito virus and start the research for a vaccine to protect everyone. He said it was an emergency. Obviously, the Senate Republicans did not care. In May, we finally reached an agreement to a reduced amount, $1.1 billion, passed it out of the Senate. I believe the vote was 89 to 8, a strong bipartisan rollcall.

Many of us breathed a sigh of relief. It was before the mosquito season really got in full force in most of the country. It looked like we were going to respond to the President's call for emergency funding. Then what happened? It went over to the House of Representatives, and instead of taking the clean, bipartisan bill that passed the Senate, no, they decided they would embellish it with political poison pill riders. Listen to one of them. They said women who were concerned about family planning and their pregnancies because of this issue could not seek family counseling and women's health care at Planned Parenthood clinics. Two million American women used those clinics last year. The Republicans are now saying: Sorry. As important and popular as they may be, we are going to prohibit any money being spent for women to turn to these clinics for family planning advice because of the Zika virus.

They went further. They took $500 million out of the Veterans' Administration that was going to be used to process claims to get rid of the backlog. No, they will take $500 million away from that and put it into the Zika virus. Then, to add insult to injury, the Republicans in the House insisted on a provision that would allow them to display the Confederate flag at U.S. military cemeteries.

What we had was a simple, straightforward, clean bill to deal with the public health crisis turned into a political grab bag. They sent it over here knowing it would fall and it did, repeatedly.

Now the question is, whether Senator MCCONNELL and Senate Republicans will follow the lead of House Republican Members who are telling them: Enough. Members from Florida—Congressman YOHO, for example—a Republican Member says: Let's clean up this bill and do something about Zika. Why is he saying that? Because the Centers for Disease Control has done something extraordinary, something I don't think has ever been done before. They have warned Americans not to travel to parts of the United States, certain sections of Florida, where the Zika mosquito is showing up.

Congressmen from Florida, including Republicans, have said: Enough of the political games. Pass the clean bill funding Zika. Senate Republicans refuse. They will not move forward on it. We are stuck, stuck with the situation that we can cure and should cure on a bipartisan basis.

My colleagues from Louisiana come to tell us about the terrible devastation that has taken place in their State because of the flooding, national disaster, loss of life, damage to property. It is not the first time we have had a situation this serious—Katrina and others come to mind—but it is a reminder, when it comes to natural disasters or public health disasters, for goodness' sake, isn't that where politics should end and people should, on a bipartisan basis, set out to solve a problem instead of create a problem?

So now it is up to Speaker RYAN and it is up to Senator MCCONNELL to show real leadership in the Senate. I know they are not going to back off on these judges. They have dug in real hard on those, but I would hope, when it comes to passing spending bills in a sensible fashion and funding our efforts to stop the spread of this Zika virus, that we will do something meaningful.

They estimate, by the end of this year, one out of four people in Puerto Rico will have been infected by this virus. By the end of next year, it will be closer to 90 percent. It is a serious public health crisis. It is one we need to do something about. Ultimately, we need a vaccine. The Centers for Disease Control announced this week that they brought to a halt their efforts. They have run out of money. Now it is up to Congress. It is up to the Senate. It is up to the Republican leadership.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor once again on the topic of the vacant seat on our Supreme Court. I would also echo Senators DURBIN's comments about the need to move immediately on the funding on Zika. We of course passed something here that had clear bipartisan support. Now we wait to get this done again and to not politicize this incredible public health threat.

Today I am focusing my remarks on the damage to our system of governance that is being done by leaving a seat open on our Nation's highest Court. For years, we have seen some fraying of our democracy, the polarization, but the citizens of America have always believed in an independent Supreme Court. We have seen some political creep, as we know, into our judicial selection process. Nonetheless, the citizens of America have respected the rule of law. They continue to do that.

When our Founding Fathers sat down to sketch out the framework of our Nation, they did not issue decrees. No, they set up a system of governance with three equal branches. The Federalist Papers outline this balance of paper in detail. Alexander Hamilton once wrote about this balance. He wrote:

> The regular distribution of power into distinct departments; the introduction of legislative balances and checks; the institution of courts composed of judges holding their offices during good behavior. . . . They are means, and powerful means, by which the excellences of republican government may be retained and its imperfections lessened or avoided.

Well, that is not going to happen if we have a Court that cannot fully function. We have, in the most recent term, less cases brought up before the Court because we don't have a full composite of Justices. We have had split decisions. Think back in time. What if we only had eight Justices and a 4-to-4 decision on Bush v. Gore or in the Miranda case or Brown v. Board of Education?

Actually, an interesting fact is, the Brown decision may not have happened if it were not for the swift filling of a Supreme Court vacancy. Chief Justice Vincent died just before the reargument of the case. By most accounts, the eight-person Court was split on the issue. Had this Senate refused to give Earl Warren a hearing and a vote, we would not have had the decision, but the Senate allowed for a vote and Chief Justice Warren was confirmed, the Brown decision was handed down, and our Nation has seen great progress toward equality as a result of that decision.

In fact, the process in the Senate for the last 100 years is that the Judiciary Committee holds hearings. In the few instances where they have not, that is because those nominees were confirmed in 11 days or less. Since 1916, every nominee has been handled in that fashion. Justice Kagan has said the current Justices on the Court are doing everything they can to build a consensus and avoid a 4-to-4 split. While I appreciate that effort, that is just not how it is supposed to work. We want laws to rise or fall because the Supreme Court has decided them, not because of a 4-to-4 split.

Look at the nominee we have. He is someone who has had broad support on both sides of the aisle. Senator HATCH once came before this body and said he challenged everyone to come to the floor to say something negative about Judge Garland. Judge Garland oversaw both the Oklahoma City bombing case and the Unabomber case at nearly the same time. He earned a 76-to-23 vote in this Chamber for his last job, and he is someone who has routinely received positive comments from judges and commentators from the other side of the aisle who basically have acknowledged he is someone who looks for that common ground.

I have no doubt he would excel in his hearing, but right now we are not going to know that.

I just ask my colleagues: What are they afraid of? Are they afraid the citizens of America will be able to see this fine judge and how smart he is or how he answers questions? As my friend Senator ANGUS KING has said, are they afraid they would like him too much?

I do not understand why we simply cannot have a hearing. I had to put myself—I think, well, what would happen if we had a Republican President and a Democratic Senate, what would I do? I have clearly thought this through, as a lawyer and as someone who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, and know I would say we have to have a hearing because the Constitution says our duty is to advise and consent. It doesn't say advise and consent after a Presidential election or whenever it is convenient. It says advise and consent.

I am hopeful my colleagues are listening to us, that they will find it within themselves to allow this great judge, this great jurist a hearing. I was there in the Rose Garden when President Obama nominated him. I saw him tear up, and I thought to myself, not only is this a monumental moment in his own life, to be nominated for the highest Court of the land, but perhaps he was tearing up because he knew the burden he was carrying, one man, on his shoulders, the burden of carrying forward the American tradition of an independent judiciary, this simple concept that politics isn't supposed to dictate our processes, that our Founding Fathers set out three co-equal branches of government. Our job in the Senate is to make sure the judiciary is funded so it can function, our job is to pass laws they then look at and apply when there are questions about those laws, and our job is to advise and consent on nominees to the Federal judiciary.

So let's get our act together and do our job.

I yield the floor.

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.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO PATTY WETTERLING

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I wish to take just a few minutes to give a brief tribute to someone I know well, Patty Wetterling, and to her family. They are longtime Minnesota residents. Patty and I know each other well. We actually ran against each other for the Senate in 2005, and out of that experience we came to be very good friends.

Patty Wetterling is a woman of unbelievable courage. Her son Jacob was kidnapped at gunpoint 27 years ago. All that time she has kept the hope alive that he would be found. She knew it was a small hope, but, as we know, there have been cases in America where missing children are found 10 years, 20 years later, and that is what she was hoping for.

This past week, those dreams were dashed, as a very evil man came forward to law enforcement—he was already in captivity—and admitted to this crime and brought law enforcement to Jacob's remains.

The story, which I will not put on the record, is a horrific one, but I think the most poignant moment in this horrible story were Jacob's last words, which were: What did I do wrong?

This little boy did nothing wrong. He was an 11-year-old riding his bicycle in his town, in a very rural part of Stearns County, MN, where things are supposed to be safe. Well, they weren't safe that day. The amazing part of this story is not only the memory of this little boy, but it is how for years Patty Wetterling and her family have turned their grief into action.

Understandably, many people try to hang tight to their family. She has done that. She has been a great mom, but she went beyond that. She served on the board of directors of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. She has been a nationally recognized educator on child abduction and the sexual exploitation of children. She and her husband cofounded the Jacob Wetterling Resource Center to educate communities about child safety issues and to prevent child exploitation and abduction. She served for more than 7 years as director of the Sexual Violence Prevention Program for the Minnesota Department of Health. She was named one of the ''100 Most Influential Minnesotans of the Century'' by one of our newspapers.

She has kept this hope alive, but what is amazing about it is, she has saved other lives. A number of bills, legislation—including the sexual predator registration—have come out of the work, better collaboration between local and Federal law enforcement. She has saved so many lives in Jacob's memory.

Senator FRANKEN and I are going to be putting a resolution on the record today on this topic, but I just wanted to take a moment personally to recognize Patty for her strength, her courage, and her grace.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). 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.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:45 p.m. today the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 685; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise to honor the first lady of the conservative movement. On Sunday, surrounded by her loving family, Phyllis Schlafly passed away. Few will ever match Phyllis's conviction and tenacity. She literally stood on the frontlines, fighting against forces that threatened to upend families and sought to undermine the Judeo-Christian values upon which our great Nation was founded.

Without question, Phyllis Schlafly loved America. Her contributions to our country went far beyond her work exposing the illogic of liberalism. Phyllis led the charge to make the Republican Party pro-life and defended the sanctity of marriage. She was a passionate defender of U.S. sovereignty and championed Reagan's policy of ''peace through strength'' during a crucial time in American history. The women and men of Eagle Forum, which she founded, are incredible patriots and grassroots activists who today, along with all of us, are mourning Phyllis's passing.

Our Nation continues to face many dangers, both foreign and domestic, and we need more individuals, more leaders such as Mrs. Schlafly, who are not afraid to stand and fight for the freedoms so richly bestowed upon us by our Creator. May she rest in peace.

THE INTERNET

Mr. President, today our country faces a threat to the Internet as we know it. In 22 short days, if Congress fails to act, the Obama administration intends to give away control of the Internet to an international body akin to the United Nations.

I rise to discuss the significant, irreparable damage this proposed Internet giveaway could wreak not only on our Nation but on free speech across the world. So today I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me, along with Senators LANKFORD and LEE, along with the Presiding Officer and his leadership, along with Congressman SEAN DUFFY to stop the Obama administration from relinquishing U.S. control of the Internet.

Many have stood with us in both Chambers, and we are very grateful for Senators THUNE, GRASSLEY, BURR, COTTON, SASSE, MORAN, SESSIONS, and RUBIO, along with a number of our colleagues in the House, including Congresswoman BLACKBURN and Congressmen DUFFY, BARTON, BRADY, BURGESS, CULBERSON, and FLORES. And I urge even more of my colleagues to come together and stand united to stop the Obama administration's Internet giveaway.

The Internet has been one of those transformational inventions that has changed how we communicate, how we do commerce, how we live our lives. For many, especially young people, it is hard to even imagine life before the Internet. Look at what the Internet has done. It has created an oasis of freedom for billions around the world.

One of the great problems with someone trying to start a business is what is known as the barrier to entry. What the Internet has done is dramatically reduce the barriers to entry for anyone who wants to be an entrepreneur. If you are a man or a woman or even a boy or a girl somewhere across the country or around the world and you have an idea, a service you want to sell or a good you want to make, you can put up a Web site, and instantly you have international marketing capacity. You have a portal to communicate with people. Anyone can go online and order whatever your good or service is. And between that and FedEx or UPS, you can ship it anywhere in the world. That is an extraordinary and transformational ability.

That freedom of the Internet—that you don't have to go and get anybody's approval; you don't have to go to a board for business authorization if you want to create a new business—is democratizing in that effect. The Internet empowers those with nothing but hope and a dream to be able to achieve those ambitions.

Right now the proposal of the Obama administration to give away control of the Internet poses a significant threat to our freedom, and it is one many Americans don't know about. It is scheduled to go into effect on September 30, 2016—22 days away, just over 3 weeks.

What does it mean to give away control of the Internet? From the very first days of the Internet, when it was developed here in America, the U.S. Government has maintained its core functions to ensure equal access to everyone, with no censorship. The government role isn't to monitor what we say or censor what we say; it is simply to ensure that it works—that when you type in a Web site, it actually goes to that Web site and not somewhere else. Yet that can change.

The Obama administration is, instead, pushing through a radical proposal to take control of Internet domain names and give it to an international organization—ICANN—which includes 162 foreign countries. If that proposal goes through, it will empower countries like Russia, like China, like Iran to be able to censor speech on the Internet—your speech. Countries like Russia and China and Iran are not our friends, and their interests are not our interests.

Imagine searching the Internet and instead of seeing your standard search results, you see a disclaimer that the information you were searching for is censored—that it is not consistent with the standards of this new international body and does not meet their approval. If you are in China, that situation could well come with the threat of arrest for daring to merely search for such a thing that didn't meet the approval of the censors. Thankfully, that doesn't happen in America. But giving control of the Internet to an international body with Russia and China and Iran having power over it could lead to precisely that threat. And it is going to take Congress, acting affirmatively, to stop this.

If we look at the influence of foreign governments within ICANN, it should give us greater and greater concern. For example, ICANN's former CEO, Fadi Chehade, left ICANN to lead a high-level working group for China's World Internet Conference. Mr. Chehade's decision to use his insider knowledge of how ICANN operates to help the Chinese Government and their conference is more than a little concerning. This is the person who was leading ICANN—the body we are being told to trust with our freedoms. Yet this man has gone to work for the China Internet conference, which has rightly been criticized for banning members of the press, such as the New York Times and the Washington Post.

Even reporters we may fundamentally disagree with have a right to report and to say what they believe. Yet the World Internet Conference banned them. They said ''We do not want these reporters here,'' presumably because they don't like what they are saying. That led Reporters Without Borders to demand an international boycott of the conference, calling China the ''enemy of the Internet.''

If China is the enemy of the Internet, do we want the enemy of the Internet having power over what we are allowed to say, what we are allowed to search for, what we are allowed to read online? Do we want China and Russia and Iran having the power to determine that if a Web site is unacceptable, it is taken down?

I would note that once this transition happens, there are serious indications that ICANN intends to seek to flee U.S. jurisdiction and to flee U.S. laws. Indeed, earlier this summer ICANN held a global conference in Finland in which jurisdiction shopping was part of their agenda—trying to figure out which jurisdiction they should base control of the Internet out of around the globe. A representative of Iran is already on record stating: ''[W]e should not take it [for] granted that jurisdiction is already agreed to be totally based on U.S. law.''

Our enemies are not hiding what they intend to do. Not only is there a concern of censorship and foreign jurisdiction stripping U.S. law from authority over the Internet, there are also real national security concerns. Congress has received no assurances from the Obama administration that the U.S. Government will continue to have exclusive ownership and control of the dot-gov and dot-mil top-level domains in perpetuity, which are vital to our national security. The Department of Defense, the Army, the Navy, the Air

Force and the Marines all use the dot-mil top-level domain. The White House, the CIA, the FBI, the Department of Homeland Security all use dot-gov.

The only assurance ICANN has provided the Federal Government regarding dot-gov and dot-mil is that ICANN will notify the government in the future if it decides to give dot-gov or dot-mil to another entity. So if someone is going to the IRS—or what you think is the IRS—and your comfort is that it is on a dot-gov Web site so you know it must be safe, you may instead find yourself victim of a foreign scam, a phishing scam or some other means of fraud, with no basic protections.

Congress should not sit by and let this happen. Congress must not sit by and let censorship happen. Some defenders of the Obama proposal say: This is not about censorship; it is about handing control to a multistakeholder unit. They would never dream of censoring content on the Internet.

Well, recently, leading technology companies in the United States—Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, and Microsoft reached an agreement with the European Union to remove ''hate speech'' from their online platforms within 24 hours. Giant U.S. corporations are signing on with the government to say: We are going to help you censor speech that is deemed unacceptable.

By the way, we have seen that the definition of ''hate speech'' can be very malleable, depending upon what norms are trying to be enforced. For example, the Human Rights Campaign, which is active within ICANN, has featured the Family Research Institute, the National Corporation for Marriage, the American Center for Law and Justice, and other conservative and religious groups in a report entitled ''The Export of Hate.''

We are facing the real possibility of an international body having the ability to censor political speech if it is contrary to the norms they intend to enforce. In their view it is hate to express a view different from whatever prevailing orthodoxy is being enforced.

It is one thing dealing with government organizations that try to stifle speech. That is profoundly inconsistent with who we are as Americans. But to hand over control of the Internet and to potentially muzzle everybody on the Internet is to ensure that what you say is only consistent with whatever is approved by the powers that be, and that ought to frighten everyone.

There is something we can do about that. Along with Congressman SEAN DUFFY in the House, I have introduced the Protecting Internet Freedom Act, which, if enacted, will stop the Internet transition and it will also ensure the U.S. Government keeps exclusive ownership and control of the dot-gov and dot-mil top-level domains. Our legislation is supported by 17 key groups around the country—advocacy groups, consumer groups—and it also has the formal endorsement of the House Freedom Caucus.

This should be an issue that brings us all together—Republicans, Democrats—all of us coming together. There are partisan issues that divide us. There always will be. We can have Republicans and Democrats argue until the cows come home about the top marginal tax rate, and that is a good and healthy debate to have. But when it comes to the Internet, when it comes to basic principles of freedom—letting people speak online without being censored—that ought to bring every one of us together.

As Members of the legislative branch, Congress should stand united to rein in this President, to protect the constitutional authority expressly given to Congress to control disposition of property of the United States. To put the matter very simply: The Obama administration does not have the authorization of Congress, and yet they are endeavoring to give away this valuable, critical property—to give it away with no authorization of law.

I would note that the government employees doing so are doing so in violation of Federal law, and they risk personal liability in going forward contrary to law. That ought to trouble all of us. Who in their right mind looks at the Internet and says: You know what we need? We need Russia to have more control over this. What is the thought process behind this, and what does it gain? What does it gain? When you look at the Internet, the Internet is working. The Internet works just fine. It lets us speak, it lets us operate, and it lets us engage in commerce. Why would this administration risk giving it up?

Mr. President, when you and I were children, Jimmy Carter gave away the Panama Canal. He gave it away, even though Americans had built it. Americans had died building the Panama Canal, but he nonetheless gave it away. For some reason President Obama seems to want to embody the spirit of Jimmy Carter, and instead of giving away the Panama Canal, he wants to give away the Internet. We shouldn't let him.

The U.S. Constitution prohibits transferring government property to anyone without the authorization of Congress. Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution explicitly requires congressional authorization.

For several years now, Congress has also prohibited the administration from using any funds to ''relinquish'' control of the Internet. Yet, in typical lawless fashion, the Department of Commerce has been racing to prepare to relinquish control by September 30—directly violating Federal law and using taxpayer funding to do so. The administration's continued contempt for the law and the Constitution, while, sadly, not surprising anymore, is particularly dangerous here, as it is contempt in service of undermining Internet freedom for billions of people across the world.

With the Federal Government maintaining supervision over ICANN and domain names, it means the First Amendment is protected. Other countries don't have First Amendment protections. Other countries don't protect free speech the way America does. And America does that for the world, protecting free speech on the Internet by preventing the government from engaging in censorship. We shouldn't muck it up.

If the Obama administration jams this through, hands control of the Internet over to this international organization, this United Nations-like unaccountable group, and they take it overseas, it is not like the next President can magically snap his or her fingers and bring it back. Unscrambling those eggs may well not be possible. I suspect that is why the Obama administration is trying to jam it through on September 30—to get it done in a way that the next President can't undo it, that the Internet is lost for generations to come.

To stop the giveaway of our Internet freedom, Congress should act by continuing and by strengthening the appropriations rider in the continuing resolution we will be considering this month and by preventing the Obama administration from giving away control of the Internet.

Next week I will be chairing a hearing on the harms to our freedom that come from the Obama administration's proposal to give away the Internet. President Ronald Reagan stated:

> Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn't pass it on to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was once like in the United States when men were free.

I don't want us to have to tell our children and our children's children what it was once like when the Internet wasn't censored, wasn't in the control of foreign governments. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together, to stand together and ensure that we protect freedom of the Internet for generations to come. It is not too late to act. And I am encouraged by the leadership of Members of both Houses of Congress who stand up and protect the freedom of the Internet going forward.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ITT TECH AND THE GI BILL

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, here in this Chamber and in this country of ours, we often talk about the dream of

a college education. A college education opens doors, leads to a higher quality of life. A college education can boost our wages and our incomes. A college education is a first-class ticket to the middle class.

We often talk about the young people in our communities who have made that dream a reality, and they may not have come from much. Their parents saved what they could. In many cases, they are the first in their family to go to college. They took out loans, they worked nights in many cases and on weekends, they hit the books. In many cases, they graduated with honors. They got good-paying jobs. They raised a family, and they planned to send their kids to college too. That is the dream we talk about, but for too many students across our country today, the dream of a college education has turned into a nightmare.

I learned this week that 45,000 college students who were enrolled at a school called ITT Tech awoke and learned that their college was closed—not for a snow day, not for a holiday; ITT Tech closed its doors for good after years of questionable business practices and financial woes. Many of these 45,000 students are living a nightmare this week. They are scrambling to transfer to another school. They are hoping their credits will count elsewhere so they don't have to start over again. They are scrambling to find out if they are eligible for debt forgiveness on their student loans.

I rise today, though, to talk about a particular group of students who have been harmed by the sudden closure of ITT Tech—our Nation's veterans and their families. Until this week, there were nearly 7,000 veterans enrolled at ITT Tech, using the post-9/11 GI bill to help finance their education. As a veteran myself of the Vietnam war, I know what it is to be eligible for the GI bill, which I and my generation were. While it was not as generous as this one today, nonetheless, it was a great lifesaver for me and a lot of other folks with whom I served. But the post-9/11 GI bill, while generous, is a finite benefit. It provides up to 36 months of tuition and housing benefits for veterans as well as members of their family. If the veteran doesn't use their benefit, their spouse can. If their spouse doesn't use the benefit, their dependent children may. It is an incredible benefit. But veteran students at ITT Tech have no recourse to get those GI tuition benefits back to put toward their studies at another college.

The housing allowance that our veterans' families have spent will come to an abrupt halt because they are no longer enrolled in classes. They have been robbed of their time and their hard-earned benefits, and, frankly, taxpayers have been robbed of their tax dollars.

When I think about the men and women who volunteer to serve our country during a time of war, it is unfathomable that this is the position in which we could leave them—at a defunct college, without a plan to help them get their benefits back, and without a way to pay their rent or their mortgage next month. I think it is shameful. I also think enough is enough. Congress must act to protect our veterans in this instance, as we do in so many others.

I don't believe that all for-profit schools are bad actors. They aren't. Some do a good job. But the poor educational employment outcomes for students across this sector are undeniable. The damage ITT Tech has inflicted upon students and taxpayers is undeniable. Let's take a moment and look at the facts.

ITT Tech is facing lawsuits by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and multiple State attorneys general for illegal loan schemes, deceiving shareholders, and for deceptive recruiting.

ITT Tech's accreditor recently found that the school ''is not in compliance, and is unlikely to become in compliance'' with accrediting standards. ITT Tech's closure leaves taxpayers on the hook for a half billion dollars in closed school loan discharges—half a billion dollars.

ITT Tech is one of the top recipients of post-9/11 GI bill dollars since 2009. ITT Tech did not use this massive taxpayer investment to provide a high-quality education to too many veterans. They used it for recruitment, they used those dollars for advertising and ultimately for profit.

ITT Tech failed veterans and taxpayers for years. When they closed their doors this week, they left taxpayers and veterans and their families in the lurch. It is shameful. Again, enough is enough.

The Department of Veterans Affairs must now work closely with the Department of Education to ensure that ITT Tech's student veterans have the resources and guidance they need to transfer and continue their studies at a high-quality institution of higher learning. We in Congress have work to do too. I believe we have a particular responsibility to hold bad actors accountable and increase protection for veterans who plan on enrolling at for-profit schools that are under investigation and heading for bankruptcy.

For-profit schools, such as ITT Tech and Corinthian Colleges, which also suddenly collapsed last year, target veterans for their generous benefits that we as taxpayers provide for them, and those schools exploit something called the 90–10 loophole that allows for-profit schools to be 100 percent reliant on Federal taxpayer dollars—100 percent.

Congress can take meaningful steps to protect veterans and their families, and chief among them would be closing this loophole. The 90–10 loophole has directly led to this ongoing nightmare for the student veterans at Corinthian, at ITT Tech, and at countless other schools failing to deliver on the promise of a higher quality education.

In conclusion, Congress must act. We must act to restore the dream of a high-quality college education for our Nation's veterans. It is well past time to address this situation. Enough is enough.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise today——

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will just yield for a moment.

Mr. HELLER. I will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Could the Senator give me some idea how long he will be?

Mr. HELLER. About 5 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Heller-Heinrich amendment No. 4981.

Mr. President, with your experience in the West, you know water is the lifeblood of our economy and culture. Without water, our communities cannot grow. Improving the rural water supply, their security, and economic development all goes hand in hand, which is why I have teamed up with my friend from New Mexico Senator HEINRICH to offer this western water amendment that will help ensure every drop of western water goes as far as it can.

Our amendment simply ensures that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers implements its western water infrastructure program as Congress intended. It will help advance projects like storm and sewer systems, water treatment plants, and delivery projects in Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

It was first established in 1999. This program has been helpful to rural counties surrounded by Federal lands. Increasing the West's water security is essential to the long-term economic competitiveness.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan western initiative.

Mr. President, I want to change topics and talk about something that is important to all of us; that is, Lake Tahoe. Mark Twain once said: ''The Lake had a bewilderingly richness about it that enchanted the eye and held it with the stronger fascination.''

Over the past year and a half, I have worked with my good friend from Oklahoma, Environment and Public Works Chairman JIM INHOFE. I thank him for helping advance a longstanding priority of mine—the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act. This is a bill I championed in the House before I came to the Senate, and I am proud to be the lead sponsor of it in the Senate during the 114th Congress.

This bipartisan legislation, which has garnered the unanimous support of Nevada's congressional delegation and my

California colleagues Senators FEINSTEIN and BOXER, is focused on reducing wildlife threats, improving water quality and clarity, improving public land management, and combating invasive species. Specifically, this bill invests $415 million into the Lake Tahoe Basin over the next 10 years. These important resources will address major issues that threaten the jewel of the Sierra's economic and ecological health. That includes: helping prevent and manage the introduction of the quagga mussel and other harmful invasive species; prioritizing the important fuel reduction projects that prevent catastrophic wildfire; and it advances storm water management and initiatives for transportation solutions that reduce congestion, minimize impact to the lake, and improve outdoor recreational activities.

Collaborative efforts between Nevada and California, like the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act, are prime examples of what can be accomplished when we set our minds toward a common goal. Here in the 114th Congress, the first where I have been the lead sponsor, we are closer to enactment than ever before. The bill has advanced through committee in both the House and Senate for the first time in the same Congress. When it passed the Environment and Public Works Committee, it garnered unanimous support among committee members for the first time. My hope is, when we finish consideration of this bill, the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act will have passed the full Senate for the first time in its legislative history.

Before I conclude, I thank the chairman for his leadership on infrastructure and for teaming up with our delegations to preserve this lake. I am appreciative that the Environment and Public Works Committee moved our bill through the process, both as a standalone bill and part of the water resources bill in the past year.

Like you, I know one of the core constitutional functions the Federal Government is creating is the infrastructure necessary to conduct commerce, trade, and allow for general transportation. Infrastructure development is one of my top priorities in Congress and has been a top priority of this Chamber's majority. It is important to note that we have successfully enacted important policies in this Congress to improve travel and infrastructure across our country but particularly here at Lake Tahoe.

In July, the FAA Extension, Safety, and Security Act was enacted into law. This important legislation implemented important reforms that make U.S. air travel safer, more efficient, critical to Nevada's tourism like Lake Tahoe.

Last year we enacted the first long-term highway bill in nearly a decade—the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act. It is better known as the FAST Act. This bill is already advancing a variety of important transportation projects across our country. In fact, I secured a variety of provisions in that bill that will facilitate the development of new and innovative transit, highway, and bridge projects specifically in the Tahoe Basin, as well as a provision aimed at improving pedestrian and cyclist safety. These transportation solutions improve mobility and outdoor recreation at the lake, while reducing the impacts transportation has on water quality and clarity.

Again, this week I stand with Chairman INHOFE to advance yet another important infrastructure bill—the Water Resources Development Act. This bill will strengthen our Nation's infrastructure and mitigates flood risks, improves the route for movement of goods, and invests in aging infrastructure for drinking water and wastewater.

Initiatives such as these are important to maintaining public health, improving water security, and keeping our Nation competitive in the global market. I urge my colleagues to help preserve Lake Tahoe and other cherished places across our Nation so future generations can enjoy these natural sceneries for generations to come. Let's add another major infrastructure win for the 114th Congress—support for the Heller-Heinrich amendment, the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act, and the Water Resources Development Act of 2016.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

NOMINATION OF MERRICK GARLAND

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, next month, on the first Monday in October, the Supreme Court will begin its new term. The question we have before us as Senators is whether there should be an empty seat on the dais when the Supreme Court convenes.

On the first Monday in October, we have always been accustomed to seeing all nine Justices there. For 7 months, the Court has been missing a Justice, and because of that vacancy, it has been repeatedly unable to serve as the final arbiter of the law. There have been eight Justices. There has been a vacancy most of this year.

The President fulfilled his constitutional duty in nominating somebody. We have failed to do our constitutional duty of advice and consent. The uncertainty in the law has been harmful to businesses, law enforcement, and to families and children across the country. It is a constitutional crisis. Worst of all, this constitutional crisis is wholly of the Senate Republicans' making, and they have the power to stop this constitutional crisis.

In February, the Republican leader claimed, because it was an election year, the Senate would somehow be justified in not doing its job in denying any consideration of the next Supreme Court nominee. Based on my conversations with Vermonters across the political spectrum and in every poll taken on this issue, the American people reject this partisan justification.

There is no election-year exception to Senators doing their jobs, there is no election-year exception to the President doing his job, and there is no election-year exception to the independent judiciary doing its job. Each branch of our government has its duty under the Constitution. The Republican leadership has said the Senate is going to reject its duty. It will damage the function of our Supreme Court. That needs to stop.

Since public confirmation hearings began in the Judiciary Committee for Supreme Court nominees a century ago, the Senate has never denied a nominee a hearing and a vote. The late Justice Scalia received a hearing 42 days after his nomination. Justice Kennedy, who was the last Justice confirmed in a Presidential election year, received a hearing in the Judiciary Committee, which was under the control of Democrats, just 14 days after President Reagan nominated him in a Presidential election year. The Democrats held a hearing in 14 days for this Republican nominee.

Contrast that to Chief Judge Garland's nomination that has been pending for 176 days. It is a totally unprecedented situation, and certainly that unprecedented delay has provided enough time for Senators and their staff to become familiar with his record in preparation for a hearing on debate.

The press may be focused on what might happen in a lameduck session, but this Vermonter is focused on his job now. The time for the Senate to act on the Supreme Court nomination is now. We should have a hearing next week. The Judiciary Committee can debate and consider the nomination the following week, and then the full Senate can debate and vote on his confirmation by the end of September. We have taken far less time in the past to confirm Supreme Court Justices, as the Senate has realized the urgency of having a Court at full strength.

Chief Judge Garland is ideally suited to serve on the Supreme Court on day one. He is currently the chief judge on the DC Circuit, which is also known as the second highest court. He has been a Federal judge for nearly two decades. He has more Federal judicial experience than any Supreme Court nominee in our Nation's history. As a former Federal prosecutor, he has been praised for his work leading the Justice Department's efforts on the ground in Oklahoma City in the days after the worst act of homegrown terrorism in our country's history. Republicans and Democrats alike have recognized Chief Judge Garland as a brilliant, impartial judge with unwavering fidelity to the rule of law. Republicans serving in this body, as well as Democrats in this body, said so when they voted for his confirmation to the DC Circuit.

Republicans should let this Chamber finally get to work on Chief Judge Garland's nomination. Bring the Supreme Court back to full strength in time for

the first oral argument of October. Of all the challenges facing our country, ensuring that our Supreme Court can serve as high as its constitutional function should not be one of them. This is a promise that Senate Republicans are making, but it is one they could easily solve this month.

Let's do our job. We took an oath to uphold the Constitution. Let's show that when we raised our hand to swear to uphold the Constitution, we really meant it. The President fulfilled his oath; it is time for us to do our job and fulfill ours.

I see my friend on the floor seeking recognition.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, we have a couple of votes coming up that are very significant, and the occupier of the chair is fully aware of it, having served on the committee that has worked on this legislation.

I have to say one thing about the stuff we crank out of our Environment and Public Works Committee, and that is that it has been pretty significant. We had the FAST Act, the first highway reauthorization bill in 17 years, which was a major one. Then we did the chemical bill, which was great, and now we are going to do the WRDA bill. One of the things that is interesting about it is the number of ports we are talking about. I often prided Tulsa as being the most inland port; however, it could conceivably be that Omaha may be giving us competition. Nonetheless, it gives you an idea of the significance of this legislation.

Yesterday I talked about what would happen if this legislation doesn't become a law this year. If that happens, 29 navigation, flood control, and environmental restoration projects will not happen. There will be no new Corps reforms to let sponsors improve infrastructure at their own expense. There will be no FEMA assistance to States to rehabilitate unsafe dams. There will be no reforms to help communities address clean and safe drinking water infrastructures, which is a serious problem in my State of Oklahoma. There will be no deal on the coal ash, which has plagued the coal utilities for years with lawsuits. Finally, we have a very difficult issue that we have dealt with to most people's satisfaction, and so we want to get this done in fast order, and today is a very important day in accomplishing that.

Here are some other reasons why the bill is so important. The bill gets us back to every 2 years. At one time when the first WRDA came out—and I was there when it happened—we were supposed to have a Water, Resources, and Development Act every 2 years, but then we started slipping. During the last 8 years, prior to our coming back as a majority, we really didn't address this issue. This puts us back into our schedule of doing it every 2 years. These reforms can't wait any longer.

Secondly, we have recently been reminded several times of the need for Corps projects. We saw the algae wash up on the beaches in Florida this summer. The project that will fix Lake Okeechobee and prevent this problem in the future is in WRDA 2016.

I generally don't like everglades projects. In fact, I can remember—it wasn't that many years ago—when I was the only one voting against the Everglades Restoration Act. However, let's keep in mind that at that time there was not a chief report on it, and now that there is, we have something very significant that does affect that.

This chart shows the algae blooms in St. Lucie, FL. This is a picture of the algae blooms, which were caused by deteriorating water conditions. Not only are these blooms environmentally hazardous, but they are also economically debilitating to the communities living along south Florida's working coastline. Communities along the coast depend on clean, fresh waterflows to draw in tourism. As these blooms spread along the coast, economic development is negatively impacted. If we don't authorize the Central Everglades Planning Project, those communities will cease to exist.

We also saw historic flooding in Baton Rouge, LA. There are two ongoing Corps projects that could have prevented much of the damage that we saw last month. WRDA 2016 directs the Corps to expedite the completion of these projects.

This chart shows the Baton Rouge, LA, flooding. We can no longer use the ''fix as it fails approach'' as America's flood protection. It is not about economic losses that communities face after a devastating flood; it is about loss of human lives. We are talking about human lives, and not acting is just not an option.

Last year there were several collisions in the Houston Ship Channel because of the design deficiency. The channel is too narrow, and the Coast Guard has declared it to be a precautionary zone. This chart shows the Houston Ship Channel collision that happened in 2015. Without this bill, the navigation safety project to correct this issue will not move forward.

The Corps of Engineers projects that these projects help generate $109 billion in annual economic development and generate $32 billion in revenue for the U.S. Treasury. Few understand the economic benefits associated with WRDA. As I noted yesterday, expansion of the Panama Canal is complete, now allowing the larger—I think they call them the post-Panamax boats—to pass through the canal. Look at the comparison of the two vessels. This is what they can use today, and that is what is happening now.

This chart shows the pre- and post-Panamax ships. By not passing this bill, many of the important deepening projects for our nations will go unfunded, making it difficult for them to accommodate new Panamax shipping vessels.

One port that I pointed out yesterday was Charleston, SC. They have a 45-foot channel. With this bill, they will now be able to get to the 50- to 51-foot channel range that is necessary for this ship to be able to come in. The alternative to that is going somewhere in the Caribbean so they can break down these loads and put them on smaller ships. That increases the costs dramatically, and we are not going to allow that to happen.

The investments in drinking water and other investments are important, but let's not forget the fact that there are ports we can't use right now because they can't accommodate the big ships. The investments in drinking water and wastewater infrastructure will benefit both public health and our economy. Earlier I mentioned that this is really significant for my State of Oklahoma. We have States that are not wealthy States and are primarily rural areas, and the unfunded mandates that come in are just unbearable. I say this from experience. I used to be mayor of a major city, Tulsa, OK, for a number of years. At that time our biggest problem was unfunded mandates, and that is what we are separating from today. We can pretty much correct that with the changes we are making in our WRDA bill.

A recent study by the Water Environment Federation shows, just as this chart shows, that for every million dollars of Federal spending on drinking water and clean water infrastructure, we get $2.95 million in economic output for the U.S. economy. Due to the ripple effect through the economy, these investments will result in new Federal tax revenues nearly equal to infrastructure investments. That is why we need to pass the WRDA bill now, and we have it in front of us today. It is a bill that will help protect America's working people and has major economic benefits.

The main reason I wanted to come to the floor—this is the second time that we have made this. It is not a mandate. It is just that the managers of this bill—that is Senator BOXER from California, the leadership, and I—all agree that in order to finally get people to bring their amendments to the floor, we need to have a deadline, which will be noon tomorrow. We ask that you get your amendments down here this afternoon. We are talking about amendments to the managers' package. We will not be able to consider those not in our package. That doesn't mean we are shutting them off because next week we will have the opportunity to present some, but if you want to have them seriously considered, they need to be in our package. This should come as no surprise, as our committee had asked for any and all amendments in July, prior to the August recess, in preparation for consideration in September. Last week, the Inhofe-Boxer substitute to S. 2848 was circulated, and our office stands ready to assist in any technical capacity in answering questions.

I have to say that Senator BOXER and I have worked very closely together. There are a lot of amendments that have come up and have been discussed. Some have been accepted, and others are being considered. Some are popular with Democrats but not Republicans, and the reverse is also true. This is our opportunity to do it.

If Members are unable to make the noon deadline tomorrow for our managers' package, we will still work to ensure that all amendments receive equal consideration as we work to clear as many amendments as possible and work to move amendments in regular order prior to the amendment-filing deadline for the underlying bill next week.

We have the opportunity to do this. We are now operating on deadlines. It has been my experience in the Senate that until you have a deadline where you have to do it, people, generally speaking, find other things to do. We are going to hold their feet to the fire this time. Let's try to get this through.

Let me just comment on Senator BOXER. We have worked on so many bills that are very meaningful to the American people. I can remember when they said on our side that we were not going to have a 5-year massive highway reauthorization bill. Yet I tried to explain to my conservative friends that that is the conservative approach because the only alternative to that is extensions. If you have extensions, that doesn't work at all.

We have worked very well together on that legislation, and of course we also were able to work on our chemical bill and do that, and now we are going to get this done next week.

I wish to yield to Senator BOXER and then retake the floor for the motions that will be necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I say to my colleague that I will speak for 30 seconds because I said a lot yesterday, and I agree with the Senator's analysis of how important this bill is. I certainly agree that we have shown this body that we can overcome our differences and bring important bills to the floor. This one is critical. My friend has gone into it in great detail. We are talking about clean drinking water, navigation, the economy, and how we need to move products in ports and so on. It just covers the gamut of issues that are so important. I think we have done it in a way that is fiscally responsible.

I am here to again associate myself with your remarks and also to call on my side if anybody has amendments. I don't think our side has any more than the few that we have already started to work on. Look, we are trying to get this done quickly and trying to accommodate everybody. I think most people agree that if Senator INHOFE and I can agree on something, then it is pretty much not controversial. I am here to lend my aye to the voice votes we are about to take, so I turn it back over to the chairman.

Mr. INHOFE. I think Senator BOXER's side has done a better job of getting their amendments in than our side. In talking to her and the leader over there, the Democratic side is down to about seven amendments that are being considered.

I encourage our Republicans to do the same thing and get this thing done so we can make it happen.

I take this opportunity to thank the Senator from California for the hard work we have done together.

AMENDMENT NOS. 4981 AND 4991 EN BLOC TO AMENDMENT NO. 4979

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up en bloc: Heller No. 4981 and Merkley No. 4991.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], for others, proposes amendments numbered 4981 and 4991 to amendment No. 4979.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4981

(Purpose: To ensure the proper implementation of the rural Western water program)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RURAL WESTERN WATER.

Section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–53; 113 Stat. 383; 128 Stat. 1316) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i);

(2) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

''(h) ELIGIBILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Assistance under this section shall be made available to all eligible States and locales described in subsection (b) consistent with program priorities determined by the Secretary in accordance with criteria developed by the Secretary to establish the program priorities, with priority given to projects in any applicable State that—

''(A) execute new or amended project cooperation agreements; and

''(B) commence promptly after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016.

''(2) RURAL PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall consider a rural project authorized under this section and environmental infrastructure projects authorized under section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–580; 106 Stat. 4835) for new starts on the same basis as any other program funded from the construction account.''; and

(3) in subsection (i) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)), by striking ''which shall—,'' and all that follows through ''remain'' and inserting ''to remain''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4991

(Purpose: To provide loan forgiveness under Clean Water State Revolving Funds to local irrigation districts)

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 7206. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR LOCAL IRRIGATION DISTRICTS.

Subsection (j)(1) of section 603 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1383) (as redesignated by section 7202(b)(1)(A)(ii)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''to a municipality or an intermunicipal, interstate, or State agency'' and inserting ''to an eligible recipient''; and

(2) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting ''in assistance to a municipality or intermunicipal, interstate, or State agency'' before ''to benefit''.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now vote on these amendment en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I know of no further debate on these amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 4981 and 4991) were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

OBAMACARE

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, over the last few weeks, my home State of Arizona has been thrust into the national spotlight. I wish I could say it is because of the success of our sports teams or the strength of our universities. Instead, it is because Arizona has become ground zero for the collapse of ObamaCare, leaving most of our citizens with limited choices and higher costs when it comes to the President's signature health care law, which is a law that I fought against for weeks on end and which the then-majority on the other side of the aisle, with 60 votes and without a single Republican vote and without a single Republican amendment, passed into law.

In 2009 the President said: ''[I]f you've got health insurance, you like your doctor, you like your plan—you can keep your doctor, you can keep your plan. Nobody is talking about taking that away from you.''

Let me repeat the words of the President of the United States after, on a strict party-line basis, he passed ObamaCare: ''[I]f you've got health insurance, you like your doctor, you like your plan—you can keep your doctor, you can keep your plan. Nobody is talking about taking that away from you.''

That is a quote from the President of the United States when ObamaCare was passed. He also said that if you like your health insurance policy, you can keep your policy, period, in his own inimitable style.

Ever since the passage of ObamaCare, Americans have been hit by broken promise after broken promise and met with higher costs, fewer choices, and poor quality of care.

Let me read just a few of the most recent headlines addressing the collapse of ObamaCare in Arizona.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that relevant articles be printed in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From politico.com, Aug. 22, 2016]

THE COUNTY OBAMACARE FORGOT

(By Rachana Pradhan)

An Arizona county is poised to become an Obamacare ghost town because no insurer wants to sell exchange plans there.

Aetna's recent announcement that it would exit most of the states where it offers Obamacare plans leaves residents of Pinal County, Arizona, without any options to get subsidized health coverage next year, unless regulators scramble to find a carrier to fill the void between now and early October.

About 9,700 people in Pinal signed up for Obamacare plans this year, according to administration data.

The predicament of Pinal County is an extreme example of the contraction of insurers in the Obamacare markets expected in 2017. The federal health care law was supposed to offer a range of affordable health care plans through competition among private insurers. But that competition has dramatically declined in some states, as a result of pullbacks by national insurers and failed co-op plans. Decline in competition means fewer choices and, often, higher prices for consumers.

Nearly 1 in 5 potential Obamacare customers may have just one insurer selling plans in their communities—up from just 2 percent of customers who had one option this year, according to the McKinsey Center for U.S. Health System Reform.

But in Pinal County, a rural community within the Phoenix metropolitan area, many may lose health care coverage altogether.

''If you have a several-hundred-dollar-a-month subsidy available and you lose that, that's going to be huge,'' said Thomas Schryer, director of the Pinal County Public Health Services District.

He predicted that many Pinal residents would be unable to afford more costly insurance plans outside the Obamacare marketplace and were likely to roll the dice and go without coverage—something that will be far more risky for those with chronic health problems or who are in the middle of treatments.

Arizona's Obamacare marketplace had previously offered plans sold by national insurers like United-Health Group and Humana, as well as by a nonprofit co-op plan seeded with Obamacare loans. But the co-op collapsed, and United and Humana, like Aetna, are leaving the exchange. Other companies, like Blue Cross Blue Shield of Arizona, are scaling back their presence.

''It's a dramatic case of a more general thing: There are weaker markets that are going to be less attractive for carriers,'' said Katherine Hempstead of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

It isn't entirely clear why insurers are fleeing this particular county, which had about an 18 percent poverty rate in 2014—higher than the roughly 15 percent for the country as a whole but not extreme. Median household income was around $50,250, according to the Census.

Yet there are higher rates of adult obesity, physical inactivity and teen births in Pinal County compared with statewide figures, according to data from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. A shortage of health providers is also acute, with only one primary care doctor for every 6,700 people.

''The reason why it's empty is because nobody wants to be there,'' one insurance industry source said of Pinal County. ''The only thing a [regulator] can do is beg.''

Although Pinal experienced a population boom in the 2000s, it doesn't have much of an economic base, so most people work and likely receive their health care in nearby Phoenix, according to Arizona State University professor Tom Rex.

''The health care infrastructure often takes many years to catch up with the population,'' said Schryer.

Begging on behalf of Obamacare can be politically problematic in a red state like Arizona, where Obamacare has been a prominent feature of at least one reelection campaign in the current cycle. Sen. John McCain has made it a centerpiece of his bid for another term.

Such was the case in Mississippi in 2013, when state Insurance Commissioner Mike Chaney had to convince an insurer to offer plans in 36 counties that had no options ahead of the first open enrollment period. Chaney said federal regulators helped the state because it was ''very unpopular'' for a Republican to help recruit someone to cover the entire state. Humana eventually agreed to sell on the exchange in those counties, and it's still there.

''What we're having to do now to keep companies in our state to cover all of the counties is to grant some pretty heavy rate increases,'' Chaney said in a recent interview.

Health policy experts say that Blue Cross Blue Shield of Arizona would be the most likely to sell plans in Pinal if regulators can coax it back. The company had offered plans in the county this year but decided to drop its offerings there, as well as in neighboring Maricopa County, where Phoenix is located, according to its 2017 rate filings.

The company has said that in light of Aetna's exit, it is re-evaluating where it will offer plans next year. But an agreement to return would likely come at a price. BCBS of Arizona had initially requested a rate increase of 65 percent on average for individual plans, when Maricopa and Pinal counties were part of its filing. When it dropped those counties, the company revised its proposed increase to 51 percent.

Aetna initially submitted an 18 percent rate increase for its individual plans on the exchange. It later jacked up its requested rate increase to 86 percent, before pulling out entirely.

Trish Riley, executive director of the National Academy for State Health Policy, said regulators have discretion in setting coverage rules but few things can be done quickly. Agreeing to look at rates again would offer an incentive to insurers to participate, she said.

''What are your options?'' she said of state regulators. ''Disenfranchised consumers are going to sue you. People aren't going to get coverage. Those aren't good options.''

In the long term, Riley said the recent spate of insurance company exits should spur a broader conversation about strategies to stabilize the exchanges.

''I think this is a wake-up call,'' she said.

But state Insurance Department spokesman Stephen Briggs offered a different perspective, saying regulators ''are not scrambling'' to find another company. He also dismissed the notion that regulators might grant higher rate increases to an insurer if it agreed to serve Pinal. He said the department is still reviewing plan rates for 2017 and final rates would be released in September.

''The decision to really offer a product is a business decision that the company still has the right to make,'' he said.

[From The Republic, Aug. 26, 2016]

ARIZONA CONSUMERS FRET AS 'OBAMACARE' INSURANCE OPTIONS DWINDLE

(By Ken Altucker)

For many who buy their own health insurance, next year is shaping up to be a challenging and financially painful year.

Six major health insurers that sell plans directly to consumers are bowing out or scaling back on the Affordable Care Act marketplace in Arizona.

Only two marketplace insurers will remain in Arizona's largest county, Maricopa County, and the exodus has left Pinal County without a single insurer willing to offer a marketplace option next year to the nearly 10,000 people now enrolled.

Federal and state officials caution that things could change between now and Nov. 1, the scheduled start of the three-month enrollment period. They cite regulatory efforts to woo at least one Pinal County insurance provider.

Arizona Department of Insurance officials do not expect to finalize the list of insurers until mid- to late September, said department spokesman Stephen Briggs.The state agency, which regulates the insurance market in Arizona, can't say for certain at this point which plans will be available during enrollment.

But six insurance companies already have announced plans or disclosed in state filings their intention to drop out or scale back marketplace coverage in 2017. Aetna, Health Choice Insurance Co., Humana and UnitedHealth Group will discontinue marketplace plans in Arizona. Health Net will offer plans only in Pima County next year, according to state Department of Insurance filings.

Blue Cross Blue Shield of Arizona, Arizona's health insurance mainstay, announced in June that steep financial losses had prompted it to stop selling marketplace plans in Maricopa and Pinal counties starting next year. The company had offered plans in every county since the Affordable Care Act marketplace launched in 2014.

However, Blue Cross Blue Shield has since said it is reconsidering in the wake of Aetna's exit.

The trickle of insurers exiting—and rate-hike requests of as much as 122 percent for remaining insurers—is making consumers nervous. Some are taking step to prepare for what they fear could be delayed care and long trips to doctors' offices and hospitals.

'YOU'LL NEVER SEE A DOCTOR'

Claburn Niven Jones, who owns a home in Scottsdale and a condo in the San Francisco Bay area, said the insurance shakeout has prompted him to take steps to relocate to California. The reason? The 63–year-old cancer patient doesn't think that there will be enough insurance and health-provider options for Maricopa County residents next year.

Diagnosed with prostate and thyroid cancers, Jones envisions long waits for specialists with crowded appointment calendars.

He doesn't want to take that chance.

Enrollment figures show that more than 126,000 Maricopa County residents selected marketplace health plans offered by eight insurance companies as of Feb. 1. Those marketplace customers who seek to continue coverage will have only two options left by Jan. 1, 2017—Phoenix Health Plans Inc. and Cigna.

''If you add them all up and throw them into a network, you'll never see a doctor,'' said Jones, a retired certified public accountant. ''It's going to be a health care disaster for the people of Phoenix.''

Neither Phoenix Health Plans nor Cigna are willing to discuss proposed provider networks until state and federal insurance regulators sign off on their plans for next year.

Briggs said the state insurance department uses formulas to make sure there are enough doctors, labs and hospitals to handle the projected number of customers.

He acknowledged that the remaining insurers could face heavier customer loads after so many other insurers have dropped out or scaled back.

''They do have to demonstrate their ability to—or lack thereof—to handle the (customers) in their network,'' Briggs said.

Jones has an insurance plan through a unit of UnitedHealth Group that will expire Dec. 31. UnitedHealth won't offer an individual plan next year in Maricopa County.

Jones said he began investigating other marketplace options even though he does not qualify for subsidized ACA coverage.

He believes both Cigna and Phoenix Health Plans will be inundated with marketplace customers, and he said he can't wait until Nov. 1 to find detailed information on the insurers' networks of doctors and hospitals.

He will undergo proton radiation treatment this fall for his prostate cancer. He also needs regular appointments with an endocrinologist to monitor his thyroid cancer, which requires periodic scans following an earlier surgery.

Jones said he is preparing to establish full-time residency in California, where he owns a condominium in San Mateo.

We moved to Arizona for a quality of life and (lower) expense,'' said Niven. ''I can't get insurance, so I will have to leave.''

Other Arizonans, too, are worried that Maricopa County's narrowing options could pose challenges.

North Scottsdale resident Jane Vesely, 62, has a Blue Cross Blue Shield plan that will expire at the end of this year. She wants a marketplace plan, but she worries that neither Cigna nor Phoenix Health Plans will provide an in-network hospital near her house.

Cigna's current marketplace plans this year use its Connect network, which includes Banner Health hospitals and some specialty hospitals. The network does not include HonorHealth's Scottsdale hospitals closest to Vesely's home.

The other marketplace plan, Phoenix Health Plans, is owned by the for-profit hospital chain Tenet Healthcare, It also does not contract with Scottsdale-based HonorHealth.

It's unclear if the Department of Insurance will ask the two plans to expand their existing networks.

Vesely long had access to hospitals, doctors and specialists near her home through her husband's employer-provided health plan. Her husband retired in 2014 and is on Medicare. She has to wait more than two years before she's eligible for the federal health program for those 65 and older.

''The exchange was healthy (in 2014) and we made the decision that I don't really have to go back to work,'' said Vesely. Now she may need to get a job that offers health insurance due to the fraying marketplace.

''I have a feeling there are a lot of people like me who may be in a similar position,'' she said.

FEDS SAY MARKETPLACE PLANS REMAIN AFFORDABLE FOR MOST

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services released a report Wednesday highlighting the affordability of marketplace plans for most people. Even if insurers raised rates by an average of 50 percent, 72 percent of Arizonans could buy health coverage next year for $100 or less each month, after tax credit subsidies are calculated, the report said.

Tax credits are an Affordable Care Act tool used to offset the cost of monthly premiums for individuals who earn between 138 percent to 400 percent of the federal poverty level. More than 124,000 Arizonans who were enrolled in a plan as of March 31 had received a tax credit. But another 55,000-plus residents paid the full amount for marketplace plans, and they could face significant rate hikes next year.

Phoenix Health Plans will seek to raise rates on marketplace plans by an average of 122 percent, while Cigna has requested a 19 percent increase. Blue Cross Blue Shield, expected to be the only marketplace option in most rural Arizona counties, is seeking an average rate increase of 51 percent.

The Department of Insurance is reviewing the proposed rate increases. However, it does not have the authority under state law to reject a rate increase. The state's review can only determine whether an insurer's rate change is reasonable or unreasonable.

In the past, insurers have agreed to modify rate requests that state regulators determined were unreasonable. There's no guarantee that insurers will do that this year, particularly with a majority of Arizona counties expected to have only one marketplace insurer.

''Even if we go back to a provider to say, 'You haven't demonstrated or justified the increase,' they can say, 'Well, we appreciate that. This is what we think we have to charge in order to not go bankrupt,''' Briggs said.

While the HHS report emphasized the affordability of plans for those who qualify for health subsidies, it did not did not address the narrowing of health-care options in Arizona and other states.

Ben Wakana, HHS' deputy assistant secretary for public affairs, said it's important to look at how the federal health law has transformed the insurance market.

''Four years ago, companies in the individual market relied on a business model of largely denying coverage to people with pre-existing conditions,'' Wakana said.

He noted that the federal health-care law now forbids marketplace insurers from denying coverage to the sick, and most people can buy coverage at subsidized rates, he said.

''It has helped to get this country to the lowest uninsured rate on record,'' he said.

[From Cronkite News, Aug. 10, 2016]

OBAMACARE CONSUMERS FACE HIGHER COSTS IN FALL

(By Keshia Butts)

WASHINGTON.—When it comes to Obamacare in Arizona, not much is certain, but this much is: Coverage will still be available, but it will cost more.

Five insurance companies that had offered coverage in the Affordable Care Act marketplace have told state regulators that they will opt out or scale back coverage when the next open season for Affordable Care Act coverage begins Nov. 1.

There will still be coverage, but with fewer providers experts say costs will likely go up ''much higher in 2017 than they had in the past couple of years.''

A national estimate by the Kaiser Family Foundation predicts that premiums for one of the lower-costs plans could rise as much as 9 percent next year, compared to 2 percent this year. In Arizona, those higher premiums could hit more than 100,000 people.

''The general trend is, as premiums are going up they are going up faster then certainly consumers would like and even supporters of the law expected or hoped,'' said Michael Cannon, the director of health policy studies at the Cato Institute.

Insurance companies had until Tuesday to let state regulators, and their customers, know whether they will still be offering coverage at all or scaling back plans when the next open enrollment period under the Affordable Care Act begins on Nov. 1.

As of last week, five companies in Arizona had announced plans to pull out or pull back: Health Choice, United Healthcare, Humana, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Arizona and Health Net.

For the insurers, it's a business decision: They are losing money on the policies they have offered in previous rounds of the Affordable Care Act, better known as Obamacare.

Jeff Stelnik, senior vice president of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Arizona, said the company lost $185 million on ACA plans in two years and expects to continue to see losses.

''Our focus will be on our customers and finding the best way for them,'' Stelnik said.

Health Choice opted out of the Arizona marketplace for similar reasons, said Laura Waugh, the director of marketing and communications there.

''The business and regulatory uncertainties that exist at this time with respect to the federal health insurance marketplace significantly impacted our decision to discontinue our marketplace product offerings,'' Waugh said in an emailed statement.

The shifting marketplace was not unexpected, as it is still a relatively new market, said Allen Gjersvig, director of navigator and enrollment services at the Arizona Alliance for Community Health Centers. But he said he also expects ''as we go forward for some companies to expand coverage.''

In the meantime, people looking for coverage in the next round of Obamacare, which runs from Nov. 1 to Jan. 31, should still have plenty of plans to choose from, analysts said.

''In the key population areas of Arizona there is still going to be significant competition so that people can choose among a variety of plans, and that's going to be very helpful to them,'' said Ron Pollack, executive director of Families USA.

But they should brace for higher costs.

''What we are seeing so far is that premiums are going up much higher in 2017 than they had in the past couple of years,'' said Cynthia Cox, associate director of health reform and private insurance at Kaiser Family Foundation.

Cato's Cannon said there are several reasons why premium prices are rising.

''It requires people to buy more coverage than they did otherwise and it prevents insurance companies from saying no to people who have pre-existing conditions,'' Cannon said of Obamacare. ''And then it encourages those with expensive illnesses to sign up for the most comprehensive plans.''

But Pollack said that while premium prices will increase, so will the federal subsidies many consumers get to help them pay for their coverage.

''Even if somebody's premiums are somewhat higher than they were before, their subsidies will be somewhat higher than they were before and the ultimate thing that a consumer cares about is how much do I have to pay out of pocket,'' Pollack said.

Mr. McCAIN. Phoenix Business Journal, September 2, 2016: ''Phoenix Health Plan dumps Obamacare Exchange, leaves Cigna as sole carrier in Maricopa County.''

The Arizona Republic, August 17, 2016: ''Pinal County left with no ACA options as Aetna exits Arizona.''

Politico, August 22, 2016: ''The county Obama forgot.''

USA TODAY, August 30, 2016: ''Health Care Choices Choked Further.''

Havasu News, August 10, 2016: ''Obamacare consumers face higher costs in fall.''

TIME, August 25, 2016: ''Aetna Has Revealed Obamacare's Many Broken Promises.''

The Arizona Republic, August 26, 2016: ''Arizona consumers fret as 'Obamacare' insurance options dwindle.''

The Arizona Republic, June 14, 2016: ''Insurers seek rate hikes for ACA plans.''

Come November 1, this will be the reality for hundreds of thousands of hard-working Arizonans currently enrolled in ObamaCare. Already, UnitedHealth, Humana, Health Choice Insurance Co., Aetna, and now Phoenix Health Plan have all announced they are exiting Arizona's marketplace.

Up until late last night, Arizona had the dubious distinction of being home to the only county in America without a single health insurance provider offering plans in 2017. While I am pleased that Blue Cross Blue Shield of Arizona decided to step in to save Pinal County from having no choices in the Federal marketplace, there is no reason to believe this is an economically viable or sustainable end result. The fact remains that this is a far cry from what President Obama promised before and after signing his signature health care reform bill into law.

The mass exodus of health insurers from the ObamaCare marketplace should come as no surprise to anyone. Over the last few years, these providers have reported massive financial losses as a result of their participation in the Federal exchanges. UnitedHealth, for example, recently projected to lose well over $1 billion as a result of the poorly constructed ObamaCare marketplace. For the insurers who continue to participate in the exchanges, their only option is to raise premium rates astronomically high in order to cover their losses. In fact, one of the insurers in Arizona, in Maricopa County, said they are going to ask for a 65-percent rate increase. Copays are going up into the thousands of dollars.

What is clear is that ObamaCare is crumbling and Arizonans are being left to pick up the pieces.

Let me direct the attention of my colleagues to this map. As we can see, as it stands today, 14 of Arizona's 15 counties will have a single—that is one—a single health insurer to shop for coverage when open enrollment begins on November 1. That includes Maricopa County, Arizona's most populous county, impacting more than 120,000 of my fellow citizens. This is down from the eight health insurance options Maricopa County residents had in 2016. Let me repeat that. In 2016, they had eight health insurers to choose from. Guess what they are going to have in 2017. One, along with every other county in Arizona, with one exception that will have two. As we can see, none have three. Up until yesterday, Pinal County was in the red. Worse still, of those 14 counties, 13 Arizona counties will see their premiums increase on average by 51 percent. Thirteen of these counties will see their premiums increase on average by 51 percent. For some families, this could mean thousands of dollars per month out of their paychecks. I doubt that their standard of living and their pay has increased sufficiently to cover a 51-percent increase in their premiums.

That is why Cynthia Cox, associate director of health reform and private insurance at the Kaiser Family Foundation, recently stated:

> In most other parts of the country, large cities like Phoenix have multiple insurers participating in them. Arizona is by far the most affected state when it comes to these exits.

For a law that President Obama said would bring ''[more] choice, more competition [and] real health care security,'' ObamaCare has delivered nothing more than empty promises.

Today, thousands of my fellow citizens are asking ''What happens if the only plan being offered in my county doesn't cover my current doctor or the coverage is insufficient for my family's needs?'' or ''Should I purchase health insurance at all, given all the upheaval in the market?''

Well, when crafting this law, President Obama and congressional Democrats thought it would be a good idea to penalize those people who don't enroll by forcing them to pay a fine—to pay a fine if they didn't enroll. Put simply, if you don't enroll, you pay a fine. If there is a monopoly in a given county with no competition, you are penalized.

Being forced to choose between a much more expensive plan and paying a fine is unconscionable. In other words, they have two choices: not accepting the one plan or paying a fine. That is unconscionable. That is why yesterday I joined Senators COTTON, SASSE, FLAKE, JOHNSON, and BARRASSO in introducing legislation that would protect individuals living in a county with no competition in the Federal marketplace from having to pay a penalty. These Americans should not be forced to bear the burdens of a health care system that was fatally flawed from conception.

The collapse of ObamaCare in Arizona and across the country confirms what Republicans have warned about all along: Government-mandated health care is unsustainable. Now that the law is unraveling, it is no surprise that Democrats are clamoring for a so-called ''public option'' that is nothing more than government-run health care. If anything is clear about this failed law, it is that more government intervention is the wrong solution to fixing our health care system.

This failed law will only continue to place undue burdens on Arizona families unless we repeal and replace ObamaCare with real reform that encourages competition and empowers patients to make their own health care decisions.

I will continue to push for this bill with Senator PERDUE that would do just that—replace ObamaCare with commonsense solutions that empower patients and doctors, not the government, to take back control of their health care. Until then, hard-working Americans will continue to bear the consequences of a failed ObamaCare.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I see my friend Dr. BARRASSO. I would ask Dr. BARRASSO, what happens to average citizens when, as is the case in my State, all but one county only have one option, one health care provider? What happens then?

Mr. BARRASSO. Well, it is so interesting that the Senator would bring this up because the entire State of Wyoming has found itself in exactly the same situation where there is only one choice. Remember, the President promised a marketplace. What the American people have gotten is a monopoly. In one-third of all the counties in the country, they are down to a single—and it is not really a choice; it is a take-it-or-leave-it situation. I call all of these places falling into what is called the ''ObamaCare wasteland.'' It is unfortunate to see it happening in county after county.

I know you have been talking about the headlines: 31 percent, one in three counties, one choice. That is not what the President promised. One broken promise after another.

I don't know if you saw the most recent polling today out from Gallup. It said a couple of things: The number of people who disapprove of the health care has gone up and the number who approve has dropped. The headlines are telling the true story about how bad this is. People are finally seeing the truth, in spite of all the things the Obama administration and the Democrats who passed these things have been saying for a number of years.

Mr. MCCAIN. If I could ask another question, and that is, we see—and it is well publicized—the increases in premiums. For example, in Maricopa County, the health care provider remaining is asking for 65 percent increases in premiums, but what about the copays? In other words, isn't it hard for Americans to understand why they would literally pay thousands of dollars before they would be eligible to receive the care?

Mr. BARRASSO. Well, that is it. The deductibles and the copays are one of the reasons that people are saying they are disapproving of the health care law. The premiums have continued to go up, but on top of that, even if you get a subsidy that President Obama says is helpful, it doesn't touch it that first time or the second or the 5,000th because people, before they actually get to use the so-called insurance, have to come up with, for families, sometimes up to $10,000 out of their own pocket before that. So the insurance is not really useful.

It is interesting when we listen to the President say they have coverage—but not if they can't get care. It is useless coverage. It is empty coverage. It is not what people want, which is affordable care.

Mr. MCCAIN. So if you are an average citizen and you see your deductible at a couple thousand dollars, it seems

to me that your only other option really is to go to the emergency room, the most expensive form of health care.

Mr. BARRASSO. That is very often the case, and we are seeing more and more of that across the country. Emergency room doctors are saying they are swamped.

The President says that when they get ObamaCare, they will find family doctors. That is not what is happening. What is happening is the emergency rooms are being more and more included and involved, and that is where patients are turning today, which is why the Gallup poll today says 29 percent of Americans say they have personally been hurt by the health care law, and this may also be true in Arizona, or worse. So to help people who didn't have insurance, the President and the Democrats and those who voted for this bill should never have had to hurt so many Americans, and today about one in three Americans says they have been personally hurt by this law. Those are the numbers that are out today.

Mr. MCCAIN. So at the next townhall meeting you or I have, somebody is going to stand up and say: OK, ObamaCare has failed, Senator BARRASSO, or Senator MCCAIN. What is the answer?

Mr. BARRASSO. Senator GRAHAM from South Carolina and I introduced a bill called the Health Care Choice Act to let the States have much more of a say in this. The State Health Care Choice Act provides freedom, flexibility, choice. So much of the reason prices have gone up so high is, the President has decided what kind of insurance people need to buy instead of letting the people themselves decide what they need, what is best for them and their families. I have gotten letters, and I know you have as well, where families had insurance that worked for them, but it wasn't good enough for President Obama because he feels he knows better than the people know about themselves and their families.

We want to provide the freedom and the flexibility of choice to let States decide whether they want to comply with the mandates of ObamaCare. States have much more involvement than Washington's one-size-fits-all that I know sure doesn't work for Wyoming and I suspect doesn't work in Arizona either.

Mr. MCCAIN. In a townhall meeting, someone will stand up in Cody or Tucson and say: Senator MCCAIN, the cost of my prescription drugs has gone up 100 percent, 200 percent or whatever. How do we answer people who literally can no longer afford, in some cases, lifesaving prescription drugs?

Mr. BARRASSO. ObamaCare has actually made that worse because if you take a look at the numbers in the deductibles and copays, people who get insurance through ObamaCare have found out in the last several years that they have paid twice as much out of pocket for prescription drugs as people who got insurance through work because at work the copays are lower, the deductibles are lower, and there is coverage for medications which are expensive because of medical breakthroughs.

The life expectancy of human beings continues to go up because of the advances in medicine and technology. All of these advances have been very helpful for us as citizens of this country and as people living on this planet, but the costs are there, and with ObamaCare we are finding that those people who have to get prescriptions filled through ObamaCare are paying over twice as much as what people are paying who get insurance through work, which is why we need to get away from ObamaCare and repeal it and replace it with patient-centered care, which we are not getting under the ObamaCare law.

Mr. MCCAIN. It seems to me that as we debated for weeks on the floor of the Senate, the fundamental premise of ObamaCare was to take money from healthy young Americans in order to pay for the health care needs of older, not so well Americans. We are seeing a lot of young Americans who are saying: I would rather pay the fine. I would rather pay the fine. So the estimates of those who would be enrolled is roughly half of what the Congressional Budget Office predicted would be enrolled. Obviously, this has a huge effect on the whole ability of health care, ObamaCare, to care for these people.

Mr. BARRASSO. That was the front page story in the Washington Post on Sunday, August 28, ''Health Exchange Sign-Ups Fall Short.''

The Congressional Budget Office expected 24 million people to sign up, and less than 11 million have signed up. So less than half of the people they predicted would sign up have done so, and the reason is, so many people looked at it and didn't sign up. Why don't people sign up? Because they believe it is a bad deal for them personally. They looked at the high copays, the high deductibles, as the Senator from Arizona made reference to, and the high premiums. They decided it was cheaper to pay a fine than to buy the insurance. They find they cannot use it anyway because the deductibles and copays are so high.

Mr. MCCAIN. If you are a young person and you have paid the fine and then you get in an automobile accident on the way to the hospital, wouldn't you want to sign up for ObamaCare?

Mr. BARRASSO. Interestingly enough, President Obama has made it pretty easy to do that. What we found in watching some of these testimonies from around the country, in one State, you had over 250 people who signed up, got treatment, over $100,000 worth of treatment, and then dropped the insurance. They are gaming the system left and right because that is the way President Obama has it set up.

Look, it was written behind closed doors in the office of the then-majority leader, HARRY REID, but because it has become such a disaster, the Democrats have lost the majority and are now in the minority because so many people are bothered by the way the President and the believers in his process have said: It is all right. We have the votes. We are going to do it. We are not going to listen to Republicans. We are not going to listen to doctors who have practiced medicine their whole lives. We know what is better for the American people. That is exactly what we have happening. That is why so many people are saying: It is not a good deal for me. I don't want any part of it. Now we see this Gallup poll where 49 percent of Americans believe this health care law has hurt them personally. Today we are seeing that a greater number of Americans believe this law is going to hurt health care for them and their families into the future. So that is not a good projection about what we need as Americans in a time when we have more people who are living longer and older and want to lead healthier lives.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would like to say to Dr. BARRASSO that I have appreciated your leadership on this issue, and your knowledge and background, frankly, ever since ObamaCare was passed. The Senator has been very helpful to people such as I as we have gone through this odyssey, where the President had said there would be more choice, more competition, and real health care security. He also said, by the way—I think you might recall it, in his own inimitable style, saying: If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan, period. Remember the ''period'' he added to the comment?

So I thank the Senator, and I want to assure the citizens of Arizona that I will do everything in my power to repeal and replace ObamaCare, which is causing so much harm to the people of my State. It is unconscionable, unnecessary, and I would have it as one of my highest priorities.

I thank Dr. BARRASSO and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. RUBIO pertaining to the introduction of S. 3301 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

SENIOR TAX HIKE PREVENTION ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I rise to talk about a tax increase in the President's Affordable Care Act. I want to start, though, by commending my colleague from Florida for his remarks regarding the Zika virus and the impact it is having, not just on his State but on so many others in our country. I thank him for his diligence in trying to get to a solution.

We are so close. We did pass something in the Senate. The House passed something a little different. It is time for us to figure out how to resolve these relatively small differences and provide the help that is needed. This is an emergency. It is a medical emergency. I was on the floor yesterday speaking about another emergency, which is the opioid issue and the heroin and prescription drug addiction and now fentanyl addiction issue that is facing Ohio and so many other States in this country. So these are both issues that I hope Congress will act on as part of the process of being sure the government is funded at the year's end. Again, I commend my colleague from Florida, Senator RUBIO, for his good work on this.

Again, Madam President, what I want to talk about is a tax increase that is actually in the Affordable Care Act. This is a tax increase that many people don't know about, but sadly it goes into effect at year's end, and it is going to affect a lot of middle-income seniors in Ohio and around the country. There are millions of seniors who are potentially vulnerable to this tax increase. Some of them don't even know about it.

By the way, it comes at a time when middle-class families all around this country are feeling squeezed. It is those very middle-class families who are going to be hit hardest by this tax increase. Let's face it. Wages are flat, even declining, on average, when you take inflation into account; whereas, the cost of living has gone up, hasn't it. There are a number of factors to that. Electricity costs have gone up in my home State of Ohio by about 25 percent in the last several years, for instance.

But with regard to health care costs, there is no question that everybody is experiencing an increase—families, small businesses, seniors. The President's health care law, the Affordable Care Act, of course, was advertised as helping on that. The notion was, as was explained at the time, that there would be about a $2,500-per-family decrease in the cost of health care premiums. That has not happened.

In fact, costs have skyrocketed to the point that for many people it is their biggest cost increase and they simply cannot afford health care coverage. It was supposed to bend the cost curve and bring health care costs down, but it simply hasn't. The Ohio Department of Insurance just did an analysis. They say the average cost of health care insurance premiums for the individual market in Ohio has increased over the past 7 years by 90 percent—90 percent—almost a doubling.

When you look at the Affordable Care Act exchanges themselves, it was just reported that we are expecting a 12-percent, on average, increase—12-percent, on average, increase—for people in the exchanges. Who can afford that? This is a double-digit increase. The result, again, is people are feeling the squeeze. Wages are flat, expenses up. There is a survey that was done by the Federal Reserve recently that said about half of all Americans say they have to borrow money or sell something to cover a $400 emergency expense—$400.

If you have ever had a health emergency, you know that can catch you by surprise. It can happen to anyone. Trust me, it usually costs more than $400. Seniors are especially vulnerable to these expenses, particularly seniors who are on fixed incomes. One economist testified to the Senate Finance Committee at a hearing we had that, in part, because of those unexpected health care cost increases, more than 85 percent of Americans are at risk of having insufficient income in retirement—more than 85 percent.

We think this middle-class squeeze is going to get worse, not better, in Ohio because so many companies are pulling out of the health care exchanges. So, in Ohio, 6 of the 17 companies that offer health care on the Ohio exchanges have now decided to pull out because they are losing money. Aetna is the most recent one. This means, of course, less choice. When you have less choice, what happens? Less competition. Less competition, what happens? You tend to have higher costs and lower quality.

So this is going to make things even worse. The Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan group in Congress, and the Joint Committee on Taxation projects that health insurance premiums over the next decade will continue to grow at about 5 percent per year, on average. So that steady increase is just impossible for people to be able to afford.

For seniors, the Medicare trustees project Medicare's monthly Part B premium and deductible will increase even faster than that, by about 5.5 percent per year. Again, for a lot of people in that situation, they are on a fixed income. Their income is not going up 5.5 percent per year. One way seniors have found relief from the squeeze, of course, is take advantage of what is called the medical expense tax deduction. It is very simple. It says that if your medical expenses exceed 7.5 percent of your income, then you can deduct all of those medical expenses.

A lot of seniors take advantage of that. Again, what a lot of seniors may not know is that as of the end of this year, under the Affordable Care Act, it increases—that threshold increases from 7.5 percent up to 10 percent. What does that mean? It means a lot of middle-income seniors are not going to be able to deduct their medical expenses because they exceed 7.5 percent, but they don't exceed 10 percent of their income.

By the way, there are about 10 million Americans who use this deduction every year. Most of them are seniors. A lot of them make less than the national average household income. In fact, most make less than that. Of course, a lot are on a fixed income. I have met with some of these people back home who are directly affected by this. One would be Susan Culbertson. She is from Zanesville, OH. I was with her in Columbus last week.

Susan said she started working when she was 14 years old. She contributed to Social Security. She thought she had a decent plan for health care with Medicare and being able to take this deduction. Now, as a senior citizen, she has a chronic illness. She is losing sleep over how she is going to pay for all of her medical bills if this threshold goes up to 10 percent.

Her husband Michael McVicker worked as a substance abuse counselor in a school. He is now living off of Social Security and, boy, that is hard to do, as seniors will tell you. When he had a heart attack a few years ago, the medical expense deduction helped him and his wife Susan be able to stay afloat financially. The difference between the 7.5 percent and the 10 percent may not seem like much to some people, but it matters a lot to Susan, to her husband Michael, and to many other seniors in Ohio.

I met with Lanny Hawkins. He is from Ontario, OH. He volunteers to help seniors do their taxes. God bless him. That is a hard job because the Tax Code has gotten so doggone complicated that people need help from these advisers. He tries to help them walk through the Tax Code. He told me that in his experience, the medical expense deduction is especially helpful to seniors who have just lost their spouse. He says then only one income is there, and often they still have to pay their spouse's medical bills after they are deceased.

So in his practice, he has found people who fall between that 7.5 and that 10 percent number who are in that situation.

By the way, I was supposed to meet with somebody named Regina George—Regina is from Hamilton, OH—to talk about this very tax increase. I was looking forward to it, but she couldn't make it. Do you know why she couldn't make it? Because of the very health care problems we are talking about here. Regina just had triple bypass surgery and she has a broken hip. She has some out-of-pocket expenses. She has to depend on her son who lives with her. Her out-of-pocket health costs each month are increasing. She is very worried it is going to exceed 7.5 percent but not exceed 10 percent, and she is going to find herself in a situation where she cannot deduct these health care expenses.

The Ohio AARP has done a good job of providing specific information on this to me and to other members of the Ohio delegation. That is really helpful because this is just not about numbers; this is about people. When you talk to these people and see what they are going through, I think it is something Republicans and Democrats alike should be able to come together on to solve before we leave during this session of Congress.

By the way, the data from the Internal Revenue Service shows that seniors who use this deduction end to be the oldest, the least healthy, and, by the way, disproportionately women. Think about it. To have medical expenses above the threshold means you either have to have low income, high out-of-pocket medical expenses, or both. These are not folks we should be raising taxes on, especially not now when they are feeling squeezed.

Even with Medicare, as I said earlier, seniors still spend a large percentage of their income on health care. The average Medicare beneficiary spent more than $6,000 a year in out-of-pocket health care expenses in the last year we have information for.

The result is that some 8.3 million seniors rely on Medicaid in addition to Medicare. While this billion-dollar tax increase we are talking about today is intended to pay for part of the President's health care law, it could actually, in the long run, cause more strain on an already struggling Medicaid system. I think that is sort of the definition of pennywise and pound foolish, another reason for us to pass this legislation.

Again, it is not about numbers. It is about people, some of the most vulnerable in our communities. That is why Senator BROWN and I have introduced this legislation—it is called the Senior Tax Hike Prevention Act—to block this tax increase from going into effect at the end of the year and to extend the current 7.5-percent threshold so many seniors are counting on.

The bill is bipartisan. It is common sense. It is a chance for this body to show it does work for the most vulnerable in our society, that we stand with middle-class families who are feeling squeezed right now, and that we stand with our seniors.

I thank Senator BROWN for being an indispensable partner with me in this effort. I also thank the many supporters of our legislation, like the AARP, the American Senior Housing Alliance, and the Ohio Alliance of Area Agencies on Aging.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator BROWN, join others, join all these organizations that represent millions of seniors, and join me in blocking this billion-dollar tax increase by supporting this commonsense legislation for the sake of those seniors who are caught in the squeeze, those seniors whom we represent.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Madam 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. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2952

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, shortly I will ask unanimous consent that the Senate pass S. 2952, the Stopping Mass Hacking Act.

Colleagues, the bill is just one sentence long. What it does is simple, but in my view it is extraordinarily important. If the Senate does nothing, if the Senate fails to act, what is ahead for Americans is a massive expansion of government hacking and surveillance powers, and it will take place automatically on December 1 of this year. The legislation that I seek to pass, which has been bipartisan in the Senate, would stop this automatic expansion of government hacking and surveillance powers.

I have said it before and I want to say it again this afternoon: There is no question that it is a dangerous world out there, and I take a backseat to none when it comes to making sure our law enforcement and intelligence officers have the tools they need to keep America safe. In fact, I was actually able to add the specific provision expanding emergency powers for our government to act when there is a threat so that the government could move to protect the American people and come back and get the warrant later. But that is not what we are talking about here. What we are talking about here is a staggering expansion of government hacking and surveillance authority. These are major changes to Federal policy that are going to come about through amendments to rule 41 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

This is the kind of major issue that traditionally comes before the Judiciary Committee. I see that two of my colleagues with whom I enjoy working very much are here. Chairman GRASSLEY is here and also Senator CORNYN, a member of the Judiciary Committee and a distinguished member of the Finance Committee. We have big policy issues that come before the Finance Committee and that come before the Judiciary Committee. We work on them. We work on them in a bipartisan fashion. Chairman HATCH and I meet every Wednesday afternoon to work on these kinds of matters. That is not what is going to happen with this massive expansion of government hacking and surveillance authority.

Colleagues, these rules are going into effect on December 1 if Congress doss nothing. If Congress just says, ''Oh, gee, we have other things to do,'' these rules will go into effect. I guarantee you there are going to be many Americans who are going to be very unhappy, and they are going to ask their Members of Congress what they did to stop this ill-advised approach.

By the way, in the other body, some of the most senior Republicans—Congressman SENSENBRENNER, the distinguished Congressman from Wisconsin, is very concerned about this issue.

The American people want security and liberty, but these amendments don't give them much of either. This major policy change is going to make it easier for the government to hack into the personal devices of Americans and collect more information about them. They are going to do it by using computer programs called malware. The ''mal,'' in my view, is like ''malevolent.'' It is going to make us less safe, not more.

Allowing the government to use secret, untested malware could end up damaging not only our personal devices but the power grid or hospitals and nearly any other system connected to the Internet. Get your arms around that—hospitals in Iowa, Texas, and Oregon being damaged not because the Congress made a policy decision but because something was done automatically as a result of a change in the rules of criminal procedure. I just want to say to my colleagues that I think there will be a lot of unhappy Americans if that is the case.

The rule change says that the government can potentially search millions of computers with one single warrant issued by one single judge. There is no difference, in terms of law enforcement access, between the victims of a hack and the perpetrator himself. These changes will make people the victims twice over—once by a hacker and once again by their government. You wouldn't punish the victims of a tax scam or a Ponzi scheme with a painful audit. It just doesn't add up.

I understand that passing legislation by unanimous consent is a difficult task. These days, you can hardly get unanimous consent to drink a soda at lunchtime. But this isn't an issue where the Senate can do some kind of ostrich act and ignore the problem. By sitting here and doing nothing, the Senate will be giving consent to a substantial expansion of government hacking and surveillance authority. By not acting, the Senate would give a stamp of approval on a major policy change that has received no hearing, no oversight, and no discussion in spite of the fact that some of the most important companies in America are speaking in opposition to this.

In my view, the limits of search and seizure are unquestionably an issue for this Congress to debate. The Justice Department should not have the power to change the practical meaning of the Fourth Amendment without the people's elected leaders weighing in. Instead, the Senate ought to be doubly concerned by the fact that the administration wants to conduct proactive cyber security policy through some kind of obscure bureaucratic process like rule 41.

There aren't folks in Oregon, Texas, Iowa, or anywhere else who are following the details of something called rule 41, but I am telling everybody that they are going to be very concerned about the expansion of the government's hacking authority. So I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this bipartisan, bicameral legislation. If this bill does not pass today

by unanimous consent, I look forward to having a hearing on this issue. I know there has been bipartisan interest in the Judiciary Committee. Leaders of the Judiciary Committee have talked about it, and I hope that hearing will take place shortly so that Americans can have a chance to understand exactly how devastating this proposal would be for them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2952; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me start by saying to my friend from Oregon that I admire his passion and I admire his creativity at branding legislation. But for reasons I will explain, this is a commonsense procedure that doesn't relate to the Fourth Amendment—the constitutional right to be protected from unreasonable searches and seizures. This is a venue provision. This has to do with what court to go to in order to get a court order and to get permission of a court, after establishing probable cause, to conduct that search.

Senator WYDEN is seeking consent to block proposed changes in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that have already been the product of thoughtful and lengthy consideration, including public hearing and deliberation. These rules, as all rules that are plied in the courts are, have been approved by the rules advisory committee. This is a group of judges, law professors, and practicing attorneys. Then they were approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States. Then, most significantly perhaps, they were endorsed by the U.S. Supreme Court. So if there were constitutional or other legal issues and concerns about this, one would think the highest Court in the land would have flagged those and declined to endorse them, but they didn't.

These changes have been approved because they are commonsense measures, as I said a moment ago, that relate solely to the appropriate venue for a search warrant. They simply make clear which Federal district court the government should go to in order to apply to a judge for a search warrant in cases involving sophisticated cyber criminals and people like child pornographers and even terrorists. Ultimately, that makes our government more efficient—by making it clear which courts can consider these requests for search warrants—and better equipped to stop these heinous crimes.

As I said earlier, these aren't substantive changes. This doesn't change the balance between privacy and security in the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution. Rather, the government must still go before a judge and make the requisite showing in order to get a search warrant.

I can't understand who but the most radical of privacy advocates would say that—even after meeting the requirements of the Fourth Amendment before a judge establishing probable cause to get a search warrant, would say: No, we don't want that to happen. I can't imagine circumstances where we would say the Fourth Amendment is trumped by concerns about privacy, especially when the targets that must be proven up in court are cyber criminals, child pornographers, and even terrorists. We can't let that happen, and that is why these rule changes are so important.

Our colleague claims the rule changes will allow for mass hacking and forum shopping. That is the creative branding I told him I admired in the beginning. But these are the same claims that have been considered and rejected through a thoughtful, thorough process that I have already described. These changes are modernizing our laws and updating the tools government has to investigate so they can better protect us from the very real and increasing threat of cyber criminals and terrorists. The truth is, there are more things we need to do in addition to this to update and modernize our laws.

I would close by saying that I know public concerns have been raised. Indeed, I believe there have been some briefings—even today—by Federal law enforcement agencies and the intelligence community with regard to Russian activities in cyber space, even focused on our very system of electing our officials in the November 8 election. This is not a time to retreat and to allow cyber space to be run amuck by cyber criminals or people who would steal intellectual property or child pornographers or terrorists. This is a very sensible tool of venue. It just says where the search warrant can be sought, not the substantive requirements for what needs to be proven. That is preserved under the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution that protects all of us, as it should, against unreasonable searches and seizures.

So for all those reasons, Mr. President, I object to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am going to yield in just a moment to Senator DAINES, but just so we are clear in terms of my response to the distinguished Senator from Texas, he has—as some have tried to do—sought to characterize this as kind of a routine kind of matter; that this was a rule of criminal procedure of no great import and without any far-reaching consideration. I can tell you that cyber security experts around the country have spoken out virtually unanimously about the consequences of the government accidentally breaking their computers without telling them.

I don't know of anything that is routine about this at all. Under this change, the government can search potentially millions of computers with one single warrant issued by one single judge. And, tragically, there is no difference, in terms of law enforcement access, between the victims of a hack and the perpetrators themselves. So we are talking about clobbering victims twice. First they get clobbered by a hacker and then they could get hurt by the government.

The distinguished Senator from Texas seeks to portray this as some kind of far-out kind of matter. Virtually all of the major technology companies in this country have written in opposition to this. Scores of cyber security experts have written in opposition. One of the key points they make is that you don't punish victims twice in America. You wouldn't punish the victims of a tax scam or a Ponzi scheme with a painful audit. That is what can happen here.

The idea that a change of this magnitude would be made without any debate, consideration—there has been no hearing on this matter. I know of no meetings. I would like to hear any Member of the Senate tell me about some meeting they went to. I know of no sessions where the public voice could be heard.

I am very hopeful, and I intend to come back to this floor again in an effort to make sure the public is at least brought into this. I can tell you that Senator DAINES and I represent a lot of rural hospitals, for example. Well, certainly if you heard some of what we have been told could happen in terms of what it could mean to computer systems at hospitals and other kinds of facilities, they are going to ask their Senators: What did you do about that? Why did you just let that rule go through that would damage those systems that are a lifeline for Americans?

So we are going to be back. As I mentioned before, my colleague in the other body was starting to make a fair amount of progress. JIM SENSENBRENNER, who is a very influential Member of the other body, has taken a great interest in this, as have a number of colleagues on both sides. So we will be back.

I am going to yield now. I know my colleague from Montana has been a wonderful partner in this effort, and he has some comments to make that will highlight once again the bipartisan concern about the magnitude of this change that would take place without any involvement, none, here in the Senate—no hearings, no debates, no discussions. This is a big change, and I hope we will discuss it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Oregon commented about how technology companies are concerned about what is going on. I spent over a decade in the private sector—in fact, 12 years with a cloud computing company. We had 17 offices around the world and a product in 33 different languages. I saw firsthand what it means to be engaged in the high-tech business and the challenges related to hacking. I also know firsthand the challenge our country does face when it comes to cyber criminals. We were attacked routinely in our company and had to defend those attacks off and build rock-solid, hardened firewalls to protect our customers.

Technology has made it easier for bad actors to steal our identities, to distribute malware, and to commit a whole host of other crimes, all from behind a computer screen anywhere in the world. Our law enforcement faces tremendous challenges in tracking and stopping these criminals. The fact is, our law enforcement policies need to be updated to reflect the 21st-century realities, but these policy changes need to be made through a process that is transparent and that is effective and, importantly, protects our civil liberties.

The changes to rule 41 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure would allow the government to hack an unlimited number of Americans' computers, including innocent victims, with a single warrant. This rule change was approved behind the closed doors of a little-known judicial conference.

Fundamental changes to the way we allow law enforcement to execute searches need to be made, there is no doubt about that. We are in agreement that changes need to be made; however, it must be through a process that is fully transparent to the American people. We cannot give the Federal Government a blank check to infringe upon our civil liberties.

If Congress does not act, this rule change will automatically go into effect on December 1. S. 2952, the Stopping Mass Hacking Act, stops the rule change and will allow Congress to consider new law enforcement tools through—and this is very important—the full, open, transparent process they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to support this not only bipartisan but also bicameral piece of legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about the work of the Judiciary Committee and to make a short speech on the issue of the Affordable Care Act.

Earlier this week, the minority leader came to the floor to speak about the Supreme Court vacancy. He made personal insults and threats, as he tends to do. But political stunts and childish tantrums aside, the minority leader knows the American people deserve to have their voices heard on the future of the Supreme Court. We have made the decision that the next President will select the next Justice of the Supreme Court. We have done that because the next Justice will have a profound impact on issues that matter to all of us for decades to come, and we think the people should have a voice in that matter.

I spent the past several weeks meeting with Iowans across my State and discussing issues that concern them and what is on their minds looking forward to the election this fall. The vacancy on the Supreme Court created by the death of Justice Scalia came up time and again. At meeting after meeting during this summer, Iowans told me they appreciate the Senate's decision that the next President should nominate Justice Scalia's replacement. They understood that this nomination will affect the Court for years to come. For that reason, they want to have a voice in the matter, and we will give them that voice. That is the position the Judiciary Committee took after Justice Scalia's death. We wrote to Leader MCCONNELL on February 23 to advise him that the next President should select the next Justice. We explained it this way:

> The Presidential election is well underway. . . . The American people are presented with an exceedingly rare opportunity to decide, in a very real and concrete way, the direction the Court will take over the next generation. We believe The People should have this opportunity.

Our explanation is all the more true as we find ourselves just 2 months away from the Presidential election this fall. I remain convinced that we owe the people a chance to speak their minds on the Supreme Court during this election.

I have not been surprised to hear from my fellow Iowans that they want their voices heard on the issue, and the Senate's decision to give the people this opportunity is no surprise either. We are acting in the Senate's long tradition as a check on the President's power to nominate.

I would like to take as one example, because I have given several examples in other speeches—but go back to 1968. On June 26 of that Presidential election year, President Johnson announced his nomination of Justice Abe Fortas to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court when Chief Justice Warren declared his intentions to retire. Abe Fortas, of course, was already an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court and had been unanimously confirmed by the Senate just a few years earlier. But that confirmation didn't take place in an election year like 1968.

Within 24 hours of Justice Fortas's nomination to be Chief Justice, 19 Republican Senators issued the following statement: ''[T]he next Chief Justice should be selected . . . after the people have expressed themselves in the November elections.''

At the time, Democrats held the Senate, so these 19 Republican Members did not control the Judiciary Committee's proceedings on the floor. But those 19 Senators promised that if the issue was forced to a vote, they would ''vote against confirming any Supreme Court nominees by the incumbent President.''

These 19 Senators made this commitment immediately following the President's announcement of his intended nomination for the same reasons the Judiciary Committee has elected not to move forward the President's nomination of a successor to Justice Scalia.

Here is what Senator Howard Baker said, as one among those 19 Senators:

> I have no questions concerning the legal capability of Justice Fortas . . . [but] there are, in my opinion, more important considerations at this time.

Then, to continue to quote Senator Baker:

> The appointment of the Chief Justice really ought to be the prerogative of the new administration. . . . In my opinion, the judicial branch is not an isolated branch of Government. . . . It is and must be responsive to the sentiment of the people of the Nation.

Those are my thoughts exactly, and they are not just shared by Republicans. Recall of course that then-Chairman BIDEN said in 1992 that processing a Supreme Court nomination in an election year harms the nominee, the country, and the Senate. And he only spoke of coming together on a nominee in the next Congress with a new President.

I would finally like to address one more argument I have heard recently from those who support the President's nomination this election year. As we have drawn closer and closer to this Presidential election, they have tried to use the length of this vacancy as reason to move forward with this President's nomination. I have even heard some say that this is the longest Supreme Court vacancy ever. That is just plain false. I will list just a few examples.

Two vacancies to fill the seats of Justices Baldwin and Daniel lasted longer than 2 years in the 1800s. Six Supreme Court vacancies have lasted longer than a year, and two more have lasted nearly that long.

As this election draws closer by the day, the Judiciary Committee's position remains consistent. The next President will choose Justice Scalia's replacement.

Senators have made this choice before—like the 19 who declared during the 1968 election year that the next President should choose Justice Warren's replacement. They did so, just as then-Chairman BIDEN said, because that course was best for the country during a politically charged election year. The same thing is true this election year. The next President will select the next Supreme Court Justice.

OBAMACARE

Mr. President, I would like to say just a few words on the Affordable Care

Act. I would like to give a direct quote from President Obama about ObamaCare: ''Too many Americans still strain to pay for their physician visits and prescriptions, cover their deductibles or pay their monthly insurance bill.''

I am glad that the President has finally heard that message. When I was having meetings in some of the 99 counties in Iowa this year, I heard plenty from families who felt duped by the promises of ObamaCare. Two families told me that their ObamaCare insurance premium was more than their house payment. Many said they did not know how they would continue to pay the premiums.

But President Obama says, in effect, ''Pay no attention to rising premiums,'' and then promises to give people subsidies. But 97 percent of Americans do not receive ObamaCare subsidies.

ObamaCare seems to be collapsing. Insurers are leaving the exchanges. There has been a lot of news on that lately. Premiums are increasing by double digits. In Iowa, some of those premiums increased as much as 28 percent, and I have heard a lot of States are much higher. Americans have fewer health care choices every day, despite the many promises that ObamaCare would improve just about every aspect of our health care system. Twenty percent of ObamaCare customers will be forced to find a new insurance company this fall. So much for the promise that was made in 2008 that ''if you like your [insurance], you can keep it.''

And it is official: You can no longer keep your doctor. So much for the promise of 2008 that ''if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor.'' The Obama administration has now even erased all references on its Web site to the words ''keeping your doctor.'' The link to the web page that used to say ''how to keep your doctor'' now says ''how to pick a health plan.''

So ObamaCare seems to be collapsing. This comes as no surprise. ObamaCare has worked as well as piling 2 tons of fertilizer on a 1-ton truck, and of course any farmer can tell you, that just doesn't work very well for a long haul.

We could enact alternative reforms aimed at solving America's biggest health care problems. Good places to start would be cracking down on frivolous lawsuits, letting people purchase insurance across State lines, improving transparency in the health care pricing, giving States more freedom to improve Medicaid, using consumer choice to drive competition, which in turn drives down costs, and changing the Tax Code so that small businesses can provide affordable health insurance to their employees. That financial help is something that ObamaCare took away, and this is exactly what my legislation, S. 1697, the Small Business Healthcare Relief Act, will do to give those employers an opportunity to provide that help to their employees.

I have given only a partial list of policy changes so the American people can know that the failing ObamaCare program is not the only answer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. KING. Mr. President, last March this body passed CARA, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. Unfortunately, at the same time, we didn't fund it. We didn't provide any additional funds to support the treatment and recovery of people throughout the country. Since we passed that bill and failed to fund it, 15,000 people—78 a day, 3 an hour—have died because we haven't acted on funding.

A group of us got together on March 2 and brought forth an amendment to provide $600 million of emergency funding to give some substance to this bill, which had so much promise, and to provide support for recovery and treatment. That amendment was defeated.

Passing that bill without funding is like sending the fire department to a five-alarm fire with no water. We don't have the means to do what has to be done to defeat this scourge, which has taken the life of a constituent or more in every State in the Union. Every one of us has lost lives in our State because of this.

Treatment works. Recovery is possible. It is hard, but the greatest tragedy—the greatest tragedy—is when someone struggles with this awful disease, is ready to seek help, seeks help, and is told: Sorry, there is a 3-month waiting list. That is unconscionable.

This is something that is taking lives right now. This isn't an abstract, ''maybe this will happen in the future.'' This is right now, today, in Maine, in Florida, in California, in Arizona, in Washington, in Nebraska, in Texas—all across this country. It is the greatest public health crisis of my lifetime. Seventy-eight people a day are dying, and it is preventable.

There are three legs to the stool of dealing with this: One is law enforcement, one is prevention, and one is treatment. And without all three of those legs, the stool collapses and people die. These are real people.

I have had roundtables in Maine. I sat next to a deputy sheriff who lost his daughter and one woman who said she hoped her son would be arrested so maybe then he could get into treatment. These are regular, ordinary Americans that are being affected by this, not only young people. These are older people, middle class, middle-aged people. This is a major crisis. There are lots of aspects to it, and I can talk about the fact that opioid prescription drugs lead to heroin and other drugs, but the real subject today is funding.

I was told back in the spring: Don't worry, we are going to take up CARA in appropriations. We are going to have appropriations bills, and it will all be dealt with. Well, now we are talking about a continuing resolution that would not have any additional funding unless we find a way to do it, and that is my plea today.

I have written to the President; I have written to the chair of the Appropriations Committee saying: Let's find a way to at least fund the $181 million that is authorized in CARA. At least do that, even if we are doing a continuing resolution.

By the way, I don't understand why we are doing continuing resolutions when the agreement has been reached on the amount of the budget, the amount of the appropriations. The Appropriations Committee has done their work. Why aren't we doing appropriations? That is another subject.

But however we do the funding this fall, let's deal with this terrible problem that is taking lives, tearing families apart, and deeply wounding the heart of America.

I ask the consideration of this whole body for this urgent problem and that we take real steps to deliver help to those people who are asking for it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF PETER MICHAEL McKINLEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Peter Michael McKinley, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federative Republic of Brazil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the McKinley nomination?

Mr. COATS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), and

the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) would vote ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 137 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Baldwin	Franken	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Bennet	Gillibrand	Reed
Blumenthal	Graham	Reid
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Booker	Hatch	Roberts
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Brown	Heitkamp	Rubio
Burr	Heller	Sanders
Cantwell	Hirono	Sasse
Capito	Hoeven	Schatz
Cardin	Inhofe	Schumer
Carper	Isakson	Scott
Casey	King	Sessions
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Coats	Lankford	Shelby
Cochran	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Lee	Sullivan
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Corker	Markey	Thune
Cornyn	McCain	Tillis
Cotton	McCaskill	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Udall
Cruz	Menendez	Vitter
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Donnelly	Mikulski	Warren
Enzi	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murphy	Wicker
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Fischer	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—8

Alexander	Johnson	Moran
Boxer	Kaine	Peters
Durbin	Kirk	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume legislative session.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2016—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the Inhofe-Boxer amendment No. 4979.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 4979.

Mitch McConnell, James M. Inhofe, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, Shelley Moore Capito, Thom Tillis, Dan Sullivan, Mike Rounds, Marco Rubio, Cory Gardner, Dean Heller, Pat Roberts, David Vitter, Roy Blunt, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the underlying bill, S. 2848.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 523, S. 2848, a bill 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, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, James M. Inhofe, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, Shelley Moore Capito, Thom Tillis, Dan Sullivan, Mike Rounds, Marco Rubio, Cory Gardner, Dean Heller, Pat Roberts, David Vitter, Roy Blunt, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls with respect to the cloture motions be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments for the cloture motions filed today be at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, September 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

OBAMACARE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to share some flashbacks for throwback Thursdays, if we want to call it that, with regard to ObamaCare.

There have been a lot of speeches made about ObamaCare recently. Specifically, I want to look at the facts about ObamaCare, as we all know them now, more than 6 years after it was signed into law—6 long years—and remind the country what the President and my colleagues across the aisle promised all of us when they pushed this bill through the Congress. I say ''push'' because it passed without one single Republican vote and certainly not mine.

First, the reality. All summer long, we have read the headlines about drastic premium increases being requested, insurers pulling out from different States, and patients being caught in the middle.

My State of Kansas has not been immune. Last year, UnitedHealthcare announced it would leave our State. Aetna was going to start offering coverage next year and then announced a massive exit from exchange markets across the country, including Kansas. We were at risk of having just one insurer in many parts of the State, with no competition with regard to pricing.

In June, the State insurance department announced a proposed rate increase for next year. The good news: A new insurer, Medica, was proposing to offer coverage in Kansas. However, there is bad news. The bad news is that premiums could be increased by nearly 50 percent next year for some individuals in our State and I know in many other States. Last year, the highest approved increase was 24.5 percent. Next year's rates are still being finalized, but they could be double that.

Now let's throw it back. In 2013, President Obama said about the law that ''the result is more choice, more competition, real health care security.'' Today, however, we see less choice, less competition. And with insurers coming and going and rising premiums, I think Kansas families would agree they are not secure in their health care coverage. I don't know any State that is.

These are not just headlines in the paper or on the Internet; real folks back home are hurting. A nurse in Miltonvale, KS, wrote to me about what she calls the devastating effect ObamaCare is having on her patients and her loved ones. She says: ''I am very concerned that continuing along these lines will further limit care and accelerate a decline in health care in our state, as well as our nation.''

But, again, let's throw back to what we were initially promised. Way back on the campaign trail in 2008, then-Candidate Obama promised that he would enact health care reform which would lower a typical family's premium by $2,500 a year. I don't foresee any way those savings could be realized if a Kansan's premium is going to be up to over 40 percent, on top of about 25 percent last year.

Looking back to 2013, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI said the implementation of this law was ''fabulous.'' Fabulous, indeed. This was, of course, before open enrollment started and the failed launch of the healthcare.gov Web site, which crashed.

More issues of concern to me have come from recent regulations that have been used to implement this law. This law has massive regulations. The law has 2,000 pages. We are now at over 10,000 pages of regulations.

The administration has proposed changing how they verify individuals as being eligible to receive taxpayer assistance for their premiums under the

law. Discrepancies between what a person claims their income is and what is received from trusted data sources must now be off by 25 percent. Previously, it was 10 percent in order for the administration to investigate a possible fraud. So I guess you can be fraudulent up to 24.9 percent now. The administration should not be lowering the standard by which it verifies eligibility for folks to receive our scarce taxpayer dollars. It is unacceptable for implementation of this law to further burden taxpayers by failing to protect against fraud and abuse.

Another recent regulation gets at one of my biggest fears from the law's passage: the ability of the government to ration care. There were four provisions of this law that I believed would decrease individual choice and open the door to rationing, one of which was the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation, CMMI. In March, this outfit passed a proposal to test, as the agency calls it, how we pay for prescription drugs for our seniors under Medicare Part B. Patient groups, doctors, and many of us in Congress are gravely concerned about how this test could affect the patient's quality of and access to care. As the Kansas Medical Society explained to me, this so-called demonstration ''will force Kansas Medicare beneficiaries with serious, sometimes life-threatening conditions to participate, disrupt their treatment processes, and impede their access to needed medications with no evidence of improved health outcomes or financial gains for the Medicare system.'' Such a so-called test is now allowable because of the rationing provisions of ObamaCare.

The law is simply not working for the large majority of Americans. Insurers are pulling out, citing large losses in covering the population of people who are seeking coverage on the exchanges. So Americans are left with fewer options in selecting their health care coverage, and, most concerning, they are paying more for it—a lot more.

Looking back to December of 2015 when this body sent legislation to the President's desk to repeal ObamaCare, the President's Statement of Administration Policy stated simply, ''The Affordable Care Act is Working.'' Yet, last month the President wrote in the Journal of the American Medical Association that ''too many Americans still strain to pay for their physician visits and prescriptions, cover their deductibles, or pay their monthly insurance bills.'' That is a true statement. I thank the President for waking up to this nightmare.

Despite his new revelation that the Affordable Care Act is, in fact, the unaffordable care act for most, the President and his party's candidate to succeed him say the answer is greater government control—a public option. Folks, that is government health care. That is what we are talking about. The failings of ObamaCare cannot be corrected with more government intervention, more restrictions, and more regulations.

We must triage the pain this law is inflicting on hard-working Americans. We must repeal and we must replace this law. I know that many colleagues will join me in continuing to work to provide freedom from its mandates and increased taxes to all and enact reforms to our health care system that will actually lower the cost of coverage and increase access to care for individuals.

Simply put, this law is failing. It is our job to correct it, and we will continue fighting to do so.

I was talking about this matter in the cloakroom just moments ago. Several of our Members have been very active in this whole endeavor to try to not only repeal but to replace this law, and they pause a little bit and say: You know, maybe this law was designed to fail. Maybe this law is so bad in terms of falling apart that people could not help but know that and then come in and say that the only thing we can now move to is national health care, government-run health insurance. If that is true, that is a 6-year effort with a lot of pain and suffering and in terms of political deceit, probably ranks right at the top.

We have to repeal this law. We have to replace it. We have to get to work. And we have to prevent further steps toward national health insurance.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

WRDA

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise to speak about legislation that is currently on the floor, the Water Resources Development Act.

I start by thanking a great legislative team of opposites who come together—and when they do they get things done—that is, Senator INHOFE, the chair of the committee, and the ranking member, Senator BOXER. I thank both of them for tireless effort, including their staffs for bringing forward something that is very important to my home State but important to communities all across the country. I also want to thank our two leaders for coming together and finding a way to have a path forward that allows us to come to the bill without a vote on a motion to proceed, and that involves all of our colleagues wanting to work together and that is evident on this bill and I very much appreciate everybody's efforts.

This comes after the Environment and Public Works Committee approved the Water Resources Development Act by 19 to 1 in the committee. Clearly, there is very strong bipartisan support, and it comes because the water infrastructure needs of the country are so great for every community, every State. I know the distinguished Presiding Officer would be able to tell the same story in North Dakota.

I particularly want to focus on one part—and then I will speak more broadly about the bill—but the part that deals with lead exposure and lead in water, which is very important to me, as colleagues know, and very important to a community called Flint, MI, where 100,000 people, through no fault of their own, were exposed to excessive levels of lead. There are efforts going on now to try to fix that, and we will focus on the long-term health and nutrition needs of the children and families, but the water is still not fixed.

People have said to me: Gosh, that was really bad what happened before in Flint. I say: No, no, it is not what happened in Flint, it is still happening. There are still bottles of water being delivered to homes, and people have been waiting. So we are grateful to be at this point, and there certainly is a sense of urgency coming from families in Flint and all around Michigan as well.

More than one-half million preschool students in the United States are exposed to elevated lead levels. So this is an issue not only in Flint but in schools and other parts of Michigan, where the drinking fountains in the school—you know, when you are walking down the hall and see the drinking fountain in the school is shut down because of high lead exposure, that has happened in schools across the country.

We have a particular concern because there are 9,000 children under the age of 6, not counting all the children in school, who have elevated lead levels. It is quite frightening because some of the homes in Flint actually have registered levels higher than a toxic waste dump. It is pretty scary and incredibly important that we support their efforts to get the pipes replaced as quickly as possible.

The cost of lead exposure goes far beyond the $50 billion a year Americans have to pay in health care and in bottled water and all of the other health issues. Having unsafe water costs us our well-being, the health of the communities, economic development. It costs us a sense of dignity. As Americans, we think one of the basic rights that we don't think about—we just take it for granted that you are going to turn on the faucet and clean water is going to come out and you can drink it. That sense of basic confidence in infrastructure has been shaken in Flint but also in other communities across the country. That is something we are addressing in this bill that is so very important.

I am very pleased we have a bill in front of us that will comprehensively not only address a community that we have been fighting for and care deeply about but other communities around Michigan and around the country. We need the funding in this bill—the authorization in this bill because of a number of reasons. Let me again—speaking about lead, there are 5,300

American cities that have been found to be in violation of Federal lead rules. So there are 5,300 cities right now that we know don't meet the standards for safety. In USA TODAY they reported that excessive lead has been detected in nearly 2,000 public water systems across all 50 States. This is an important bill, and it addresses something that not only I have been focused on and my colleague Senator PETERS has been focused on but I know other colleagues are focusing on in communities in their States.

Frankly, there is no safe level of lead exposure and even a small amount can harm people over their lifetime. One study from Rhode Island found a correlation between even the lowest levels of lead exposure and declines in reading scores. There are certainly many other studies.

When we look at what is happening in this bill, the first thing I am very pleased to say is that we have a provision that helps our communities that have literally been shut down, not only families with bottled water, but can you imagine being a downtown restaurant and we have economic development going on downtown and all of a sudden people don't want to come because they are worried the restaurant is using contaminated water. In fact, it is totally safe to come to downtown Flint, and they are making great efforts on economic development and revitalization. I was pleased to host the SBA Administrator a number of months ago, talking with small business entrepreneurs who are excited about being in Flint.

When we look at the broad ripple effect when a water system isn't safe, it is most importantly about families and children, but it also affects small businesses and it affects the entire economy. So in this bill, we are very pleased we have a provision fully paid for by phasing out another program that will help address this.

We also address lead contamination in communities across the country. There is a very important loan program that was put in place by the chairman and ranking member in the last WRDA bill but not activated, not funded, that we fund that will activate loans—$800 million, possibly more, in loans available for communities all across the country. The structure was set up in the last WRDA bill and now in this one we are actually funding it. So communities can activate very important loans to upgrade their water infrastructure.

We also know that when we are looking at issues around lead contamination, we see across the country drinking water issues in 22 percent of the homes in Jackson, MS, were found to exceed the Federal action lead levels. I remember the Mayor of Jackson saying to pregnant moms and children: Don't drink the water.

It is not just water. There are 37 million housing units in the United States that contain lead-based paint. Even though we have come a long way, we have addressed lead-based paint, but we still have problems there in older homes that are still affecting children.

Soil is another issue, and certainly those of us who work with our farmers understand that as a critical resource in growing our food in East Chicago, IN, some show lead levels up to 227 times above the Federal lead limits and 135 times above the arsenic limit. It is pretty tough to be growing things when you have that kind of contamination in the soil.

The top 6 inches of soil had up to 30 times more lead than the level considered safe for children. Atlantic City, Philadelphia, Allentown, Pennsylvania, where over 500,000 children have enough lead in their blood to merit a visit to the doctor.

In this bill, we provide resources as well to address issues related to public health and lead in children. We know that for the 286 million Americans who get their tapwater from community water systems, this bill is an incredibly important investment in many different ways. It is necessary for public health and safety, it is necessary for economic development, and communities across America will benefit from this.

I also thank the committee for once again focusing on something else we in Michigan care about—the Great Lakes. We are surrounded. We have the peninsula surrounded by water and great beauty. Another wonderful summer we just had, where boating, fishing, and tourism is a very important part of our economy as well as a way of life. In this bill, for the first time, we established the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, formally in law, and it will authorize $300 million for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative over the next 5 years. This is important for all of us in the Great Lakes State. It is also important because 27 percent of the world's freshwater comes from the Great Lakes. So it is a very important economic resource for all of us.

This bill also authorizes new programs to help with drought by promoting innovative water technology and research, for desalinization and water reuse and recycling.

It authorizes very important Army Corps projects. There are 25 critical Army Corps projects in 17 different States that are authorized in this legislation. These are authorizations for infrastructure projects that protect and address concerns in communities in South Carolina, Florida, New Jersey, and Louisiana, where we know about the hurricane and storm damage, and flood control projects in Texas, Missouri, Kansas, and California. There are environmental restoration projects in Oregon and in Washington State.

There are additional dam improvement programs, new programs that allow FEMA to help rehabilitate high-hazard potential dams. America's 84,000 dams are rapidly aging, and 14,000 of them are considered high risk, high hazard. We have about 88 of those dams in Michigan that are considered high hazard.

So this is a bill that touches every single State. I know Members across the aisle have worked on this together. Clearly, it is something that is very important to Michigan, very important to families in Michigan. The piece that allows us to support the 100,000 people in Michigan is incredibly important for us, but we also understand that in the process of legislating, we have been able to support efforts and needs around the country and come together to do something that is important for communities in all of our States.

I think that is what legislating is all about, as the Presiding Officer knows. You and I have worked together on many different projects that try to address concerns across the country.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member for doing an outstanding job, for supporting our efforts but also supporting efforts of other Members. Hopefully, as we work our way through this process, we can come together on commonsense amendments that relate to this bill so we can have a very big vote on final passage and send it to the House, and hopefully our colleagues in the House will recognize how important this is to their districts and their States as well, and we will be able to get this to the President as soon as possible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

HONORING CORPORAL MONTRELL JACKSON, DEPUTY BRAD GARAFOLA, AND OFFICER MATTHEW GERALD

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor three brave men: Corporal Montrell Jackson, Deputy Brad Garafola, and Officer Matthew Gerald.

It has been a tough summer in Louisiana. Not only did we have the floods of which I spoke yesterday, but we had the Alton Sterling shooting, the civil unrest afterwards, and then these three officers killed and several others shot. I will speak today to these officers.

On July 17, the three men I just mentioned gave their lives while protecting our community when ambushed while reporting to a 9–1-1 call. Deputy Nick Tullier, Deputy Bruce Simmons, and Officer Chad Montgomery were injured during this attack. Thankfully, Deputy Simmons and Officer Montgomery have returned home to their families, but Deputy Tullier remains in the hospital. Please keep him in your thoughts and prayers.

Speaking of those who died, Corporal Jackson was a 10-year veteran of the Baton Rouge Police Department, a loving husband to his wife Trenisha, and a father to his 4-month-old child, Mason. Following the shooting of Mr. Alton Sterling, Montrell wrote on his Facebook page:

> I personally want to send prayers out to everyone affected by this tragedy. These are

trying times. Please don't let hate infect your heart. This city must and will get better.

Deputy Garafola served the East Baton Rouge Sheriff's Office for over 24 years. He was a beloved son, husband to his wife Tonja, and father to their four children: Garrett, Braley, Brad, and Samantha. He was remembered for always selflessly trying to help others. At the time of his death, he again acted selflessly, giving his life when he saw another officer down, running to that officer who was injured during the attack and by doing so exposing himself to fatal gunfire.

Officer Matthew Gerald joined the Baton Rouge Police Department just last year. Before this, he had bravely served our country in both the Army and Marine Corps. Between 2002 and 2009, Matt completed three tours of duty in Iraq as a crew chief on a helicopter crew and received numerous awards and medals. Prior to his service in the Army, he had enlisted in the Marine Corps in New Orleans and served 4 years from 1994 to 1998. Matt was a loving son, husband to his wife Dechia, and father to Dawelyn and Fynleigh. His wife recently announced she is pregnant with their third child.

Each of those men shared common core values that guided them: service, stewardship, and sacrifice. They put the needs and well-being of others before their own. Scripture says, ''Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.'' In protecting their community, these men paid the ultimate sacrifice. I honor their lives and thank their families for their selfless service to the city of Baton Rouge, to the State of Louisiana, and to the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

WRDA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as the Presiding Officer knows, we are working on a bill we call WRDA, W-R-D-A, which is the Water Resources Development Act. This is important to the entire country because what it focuses on is obviously clean drinking water but also the kinds of infrastructure that protect public safety and make commerce and transportation possible.

I commend the leadership of Chairman INHOFE, the Senator from Oklahoma, and Ranking Member BOXER, the Senator from California, for the work they have done getting us this far.

In particular, I wanted to mention the application of this legislation to my home State of Texas. Texas understands that water is a precious resource and one that needs to be managed effectively. There is an old saying in Texas that whiskey is for drinking and water is for fighting. It kind of makes you chuckle, but it demonstrates the point that water is essential to life. It is essential to our agricultural community to be able to grow our crops and water our livestock. It is indispensable, but it is easy to overlook all the work it takes to craft good legislation that looks out for the whole country's water supply and also protects our ports, our waterways, and helps guard against flooding. These are just a few of the projects included in this bill.

In April, this legislation overwhelmingly passed out of committee. I am pleased this bill serves as just another example of what we can accomplish when we put politics aside and work together in the best interests of the American people.

I wish to mention that I am also grateful this legislation includes part of a bill that I introduced last spring called the COAST Act. Texas has hundreds of miles of coastline, and the State's location in the Gulf of Mexico makes it particularly vulnerable to hurricanes, storms, and other weather impacts such as flooding, storm surges, and high winds. I don't need to tell the Presiding Officer about that, as Louisiana recently suffered terrible flooding.

In 2008, Texans saw firsthand when Hurricane Ike made landfall. It became the second most costly U.S. hurricane on record.

Of course, because the area is so densely populated and includes one of our Nation's busiest ports and energy hubs, major damage along the Texas coast would likely be felt well beyond our State in much of the rest of the country as well, particularly the economic impacts. Safeguarding the gulf coast from the next major hurricane should be a priority not just to Texas but a national priority, as I say, both to those who live there and those who would suffer the potential economic consequences. That is why this particular provision, the coastal Texas protection provision in the Water Resources Development Act legislation, is so important.

This is very straightforward. All it would do is require the Army Corps of Engineers to take advantage of preexisting studies and not have to duplicate those studies as a prerequisite to addressing this issue. The Corps wouldn't have to duplicate efforts but could instead build on the good work of leaders in the State that had already been done, so the Texas coast can get the protection it needs sooner rather than later.

Fortunately, the Water Resources Development Act also includes projects that will benefit communities across my State, such as infrastructure improvements to help reduce flooding, provisions that make our ship channels more efficient and strengthen our ports by making them safer and better equipped to handle growing amounts of trade. I know there is a lot of discussion about trade, particularly in the Presidential election season, but I will tell you that trade is viewed as an unmitigated good in my State. We are the No. 1 exporting State in the Nation, and that is just one reason why our economy is growing faster than the national economy.

We have learned a very simple lesson; that is, when you grow things—when you make things—and you have more people and more markets to sell to around the world, it is good for jobs, and it is good for the economy. I hope that some of our leaders and those who aspire to become the next President of the United States learn from some of the lessons that we have learned from in Texas—that trade is good.

That is not to say that with globalization there aren't some people disadvantaged, and we can address some of those concerns with funds dedicated to retraining efforts. But the fact of the matter is that more technology and more globalization are changing our economy and our labor markets in ways that we will never be able to reverse. So we shouldn't throw the baby out with the bath water and just turn our backs on the benefits of trade, which means we need to have efficient ports that are equipped to handle growing amounts of trade globally.

In conclusion, on the Water Resources Development Act, let me say again that I express my gratitude to Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member BOXER for this solid, bipartisan legislation. I hope it passes the Senate soon. I trust it will be out of the Senate by the middle of next week.

JUSTICE AGAINST SPONSORS OF TERRORISM ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this weekend is the 15th anniversary of the terrible attacks on our country on September 11, 2001. It is impossible to forget the horrible events of that day and the pain, grief, and mourning that our country felt. I think it is one of those seminal events in my life—and I am sure I am not alone—that I will always remember what I was doing and where I was when those planes hit the World Trade Center. It reminds me of when President John F. Kennedy was assassinated when I was much younger. I remember where I was and what I was doing.

I know communities across the country will spend time on this anniversary of 9/11 honoring the lives of the victims, their families, and the friends that they left behind, as well as the first responders and volunteers who put others before themselves in the wake of so much destruction.

One way that Congress can honor the victims of that day and lend support to their families is by sending the Justice

Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act to President Obama's desk for his signature. This bill would enable Americans and their family members to pursue justice against those who sponsor acts of terrorism on the U.S. homeland, such as that which occurred on September 11, 2001.

A few months ago this legislation passed unanimously in the Senate. Again, there is not much legislation that passes this body unanimously, but this did.

I believe unanimous passage of this bill sends an unmistakable message that we will combat terrorism with every tool we have. Just as importantly, we will make sure that simple justice is available to the victims of terrorist attacks on our soil by not erecting any unnecessary roadblocks to the pursuit of justice in the courts of law.

I understand that the House of Representatives will vote on this legislation, perhaps as soon as today or tomorrow, and I hope they send a similar message to the victims and their families on this 15th anniversary of 9/11.

Finally, I hope the President will rethink his previous statements expressing an intent to perhaps veto this legislation. It makes absolutely no sense to prevent the families who suffered losses as a result of terrorist attacks on our soils from having their day in court against whoever is responsible. This legislation does not purport to decide who is responsible but merely removes the impediments under the sovereign immunity act that prevent them from even presenting their case in court.

It is time we help victims of terrorism in our country to seek justice, and it is time that the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act becomes the law of the land.

With that, I yield the floor.

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. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, today I return to the floor for talk No. 49—49 weeks of coming to the floor to talk about what we have described as ''waste of the week.'' We originally started this about 50 weeks ago in this cycle, with some skipping of weeks when we were not in session, trying to look at ways to make government more efficient and effective and to save taxpayer dollars. We set a goal of reaching $100 billion.

Whether it was the Congressional Budget Office, whether it was the inspectors general overseeing expenditures in the various agencies, we kept receiving these reports about taxpayer money that is wasted through waste, fraud, and abuse. We have talked about everything from the ridiculous to the really serious in terms of mismanagement, fraud, and waste that has occurred in this Federal Government.

At a time when we cannot begin to balance our budget, when expenditures keep significantly exceeding revenues that are coming in no matter how much tax we collect, we find ourselves in a situation where we are continuing to borrow and borrow and borrow and borrow into the trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars—a truly unsustainable rate which will cause great harm to the American people at some point, if it hasn't already. Clearly, it is holding down our ability to grow. Clearly, it is putting us in a situation where expenditures on just paying interest on the money we have to borrow continues to increase, depriving us of the opportunity to address some essential needs, such as infrastructure and basic science. NIH research, the CDC, and others are being squeezed because we simply don't have the funds available without continuing to go into debt.

So this is No. 49. It is one of the more minor ones. Keep tuning in because next week we have a big one coming. We could come down here almost every day and talk about something, with the backlog of waste, fraud, and abuse documented by agencies that are nonpartisan. They are not Republican. They are not Democratic. These are agencies that just deal with numbers, they just deal with facts, and they report to us, as Members of the Senate and the Congress, to make this available to the public and to demonstrate that we could run a much better shop here and save the taxpayers a lot of money.

Today I want to highlight abuse of a fund that exists within the Department of Health and Human Services. It is called the Nonrecurring Expenses Fund, otherwise known as NEF. ''Nonrecurring expense fund'' is another fancy description the Federal Government has put out so that nobody can understand what it is, but we looked into this and found that the Nonrecurring Expenses Fund is a fund that was created to place money which wasn't used. There was money appropriated by Congress for specific purposes, but they didn't use all of it. Instead of turning it back to the Treasury or the taxpayer, they said: Let's create this fund that we can put this excess money in that hasn't been used for the purpose it was designated. We will put it in a fund, and it will be there for use for some other purposes.

Well, you know how government works: Never return a penny of the money that has been allocated to you by the Congress because the next time it comes up on an annual basis for your allocation, Congress may say: Well, they didn't need all that money, so let's give them less money next year.

Oh, no, we don't want to be in that position, so let's make sure we find a way to spend it.

Anyway, the money is sitting here in this slush fund called the Nonrecurring Expenses Fund, and it is supposed to be used for one-time expenses that come up on construction or IT projects and they can go to the fund and take some money out and use it for specified purposes. Well, all that was fine, I guess. I think it should have gone back to the Treasury. They did put a 5-year limit on it, and if it is still there after 5 years, it is supposed to go back to the Treasury but instead goes to this fund.

Well, along came ObamaCare and all of its promises: Don't worry, it is not going to cost you a penny more than what is already being paid. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Your premiums won't go up.

All that was promised to us by the President. After every declarative thing he said, he added: Period. Not one penny increase, period. Keep your doctor, period. Done deal, folks. Trust us.

Well, of course none of that happened. ObamaCare seems to be collapsing under the weight of its own regulations and rules and operations. We read every day, almost every week of an exchange closing, of premiums skyrocketing. We are in for a very big surprise this fall. Some of this has been documented about the numbers coming in and the increases in premiums in the various States that are staggering. People are dropping out, people can't afford to get in, and on and on it goes.

In any event, under ObamaCare, as we all remember, when they set it up, the Web site didn't work and people couldn't make the phone calls, so the expenditures have been significantly higher than what we were told and what was projected, and we are talking about big money here. So the administration thought, well, let's sort of look around, dig around, and maybe we will find a fund somewhere where there is some excess money we can use to prop up ObamaCare rather than having to go back to the Congress.

Now, this is money appropriated for a specific purpose and not to be used or tapped into to pay for some other failing program over here, but, of course, that didn't stop the White House from doing that. It seems nothing does stop them, including laws passed by the Congress.

In any event, they determined that, wow, here is a slush fund. Over the course of 4 years, it had about $1.3 billion in it. So why don't we just take it? It breaches the rules, maybe even the constitutionality of the fact that Congress appropriates money for specific purposes and puts it in specific places, and the administration doesn't have the right to simply go over there and say: Oh, there is a pot of money over there. It has been sitting there. Even though the law says it should expire after 5 years and it has to go back to the Treasury, we will ignore that and

take that money, and we will apply it to pay for some of the bills on ObamaCare.

And that is exactly what they did. So $1.3 billion was taken from a fund without a congressional vote—an abuse of power undermining Congress's constitutional authority over appropriations. So here we are adding to our total the $1.3 billion that could have been saved, that was appropriated but not used. It could have been used for many things. We are talking about trying to find ways to pay for Zika funding. This is a serious matter. Zika is having an impact. We have known that. The opposition here—the Democrats—have voted three times to prohibit us from going forward on that. But one of the issues here is the pay-for that we are under. If we are going to start a new program or appropriate more money to a program, we want to find something else to pay for it. Well, here is the perfect way to do it, and the amount of money is more than actually requested. Mr. President, $1.3 billion could be easily used as a pay-for for the Zika problem. That would get the CDC and get the States out there to deal with this very significant and difficult problem. But no, nope; it had to go to ObamaCare. It had to sort of once again fill the gap from expenditures that have gone all over the place.

So what we have done is shown that this is money that we could have saved the taxpayer or that could have used for a better purpose, and under the waste of the week total here, we are now adding this $1.3 billion, which brings our total to $240 billion—$240,785,726,817. It just keeps going up. Here we are sitting on a total of nearly $241 billion of waste, fraud and abuse.

As I said, fasten your seatbelts, folks; the next one coming in next week is a staggering number of documented waste, fraud and abuse.

Mr. President, with that, 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. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, we are in a race against time. The number of confirmed locally acquired Zika infections in Florida now total 56. In Puerto Rico, it is estimated that 50 pregnant women are infected with Zika each day. There are now 67 countries and territories around the world reporting Zika cases. The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has announced that the agency has exhausted its current funds to combat the Zika virus, but thus far the Republicans have refused to work with the Democrats to actually provide the new funding in the race to find a vaccine. This is simply unacceptable.

Last month, I visited Cabo Verde off the coast of Africa. I saw firsthand the devastating impacts of the Zika virus. Through a Catholic Relief Services program, I met with mothers and their infants suffering from microcephaly, the birth defect which causes smaller brains and other developmental defects in newborns. I was able to meet with two loving mothers: Dunia, the mother of Dara; and Suely, who is the mother of Senilson. Both babies were born on June 5, 2016. The first case of microcephaly associated with the Zika virus on Cabo Verde was detected in March, just 6 months after the disease was declared an epidemic in the country. Now there are more than 7,500 reported cases of Zika on Cabo Verde, and the number continues to grow.

Zika is a terrifying virus. It is the only known mosquito-borne virus that can cause birth defects and also be sexually transmitted. In addition to microcephaly, Zika also has been connected to neurological effects in individuals of any age, including a link to the onset of Guillain-Barre syndrome, which can cause paralysis for months. One bite from an infected mosquito could damage the course of a life forever.

We need only look back a few chapters in our own history books to understand how important it is for humanity to find a vaccine for a virus like Zika.

In 1953, there were 35,000 annual cases of polio in the United States. Mothers and fathers all across America were frightened that their children would be next to contract the debilitating disease. Two U.S. researchers, Dr. Albert Sabin and Dr. Jonas Salk, were locked in a historic race to develop a safe and effective polio vaccine. Fortunately, they were both successful. Today, those vaccines have virtually eliminated polio around the world.

Now, in 2016, millions of parents and dozens of countries around the world are once again praying that the medical community can be catalyzed to develop a solution for today's global disease threat—the Zika virus.

We are fortunate that in today's new race for a cure, there are at least three leading Zika vaccine candidates. Last month, I toured the laboratories at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center in Boston, which is collaborating with Walter Reed Army Institute of Research. Their vaccine candidate has been found to offer universal protection against the Zika virus in laboratory tests. The results were so promising that the vaccine will be tested in a small group of individuals—human beings—this fall.

There are two other vaccine candidates also showing positive results. One is made by the National Institutes of Health and the other by Inovio Pharmaceuticals. Both are far enough along that they are already utilizing human subjects, but if the current trials involving just the small groups are successful, we will need to provide much more funding to cover the costs of expanding this research to thousands of participants. That next step in the Zika clinical trials, if both of these candidates that I just mentioned are successful, could cost upward of $100 million to $200 million, beginning as soon as this January, if these clinical trials are successful with small numbers of human beings. That is a small amount of money when one considers that the cost of caring for one infant born with Zika-caused microcephaly will cost potentially up to $10 million through the life of that baby.

Six months ago, knowing the impeding and impending threat of Zika once we entered the warm, mosquito-loving, hot summer months, fueled further by climate change, President Obama requested $1.9 billion in emergency funds from Congress to combat Zika, but instead of approving emergency funding at the start of the summer, Republicans, unfortunately, did not finish the business that we should have finished before they recessed Congress for 7 weeks. Families cancelled their summer vacations out of fear, while Republicans made Congress go on a vacation. Meanwhile, cases of Zika on our own soil, in Puerto Rico, and around the world ticked higher and higher.

Whether it is Zika, Ebola, SARS, or the next global pandemic, we simply cannot treat every global health threat like a game of Whac-A-Mole. We need a sustainable and comprehensive emergency medical system that is put in place so we can respond to all emerging infectious disease threats.

First, we need a Federal fund that is readily available for use when a global disease represents itself. Second, we need a single person at the White House responsible for organizing domestic efforts as well as liaising with our international partners in the face of an infectious disease pandemic. We did this on Ebola. We should do it for every global health threat.

The truth is, though, that if on Ebola we had already had a pandemic response team in place, we probably could have cut the amount of death and harm that was done by that disease by a dramatic amount, but the most important thing we need right now is we need the congressional Republicans to stop playing politics and work with Democrats to pass a real and serious response to the Zika crisis, including emergency funding. The fastest way to do this is for the House to bring a bipartisan, Senate-passed $1.1 billion compromise bill to address the Zika epidemic and bring it up for a vote. We have already passed that through the Senate. House Republicans should just take it up, vote on it, and we will get it done. It is only a matter of time before the fear of local transmission in Florida becomes the reality for nearly every State in this Nation. That is why immediate funding is a critical component of the U.S. and global fight

against the Zika virus. We have the intellectual capacity to develop faster diagnostic tests, efficient vaccines, and advanced therapeutics with Zika, but what we need now is the financial certainty to support this kind of work in an accelerated way. The next pandemic that awaits the global community is just one frequent flier account away. This crisis demands that Congress pass a Zika funding package as soon as possible. The continuation of vaccine development depends on it, our ability to stop the spread of the virus depends on it, and the lives of millions of people around the world depend on it.

We won the race against polio in the 1950s. With accelerated funding, we have the opportunity today with these three vaccine candidates and others on the way to find a safe and effective solution to combat Zika by 2018. It is time to recognize the threat to humankind and the impact such a harmful disease will have on an entire generation of children by ensuring our 21st century scientists—our Sabins and Salks—have the funding they need to banish this virus to the history books.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

HONORING NEBRASKA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN COMBAT

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to continue my tribute to Nebraska's heroes and the current generation of men and women who have given their lives defending our freedom in Iraq and Afghanistan. Each of these Nebraskans has a powerful story.

CAPTAIN ROBERT J. YLLESCAS

Today I will reflect upon the life of Army CPT Robert Yllescas of Osceola, NE.

Rob's life began in Guatemala, where he was born and raised. His mother Barbara would often bring young Rob to Nebraska during visits to her family in Osceola. When in Nebraska, Rob made plenty of friends, and he fell in love with the good life.

He also met a young girl named Dena, who would one day become his wife. After graduating high school in Guatemala in 1996, Rob moved to Nebraska permanently, and he enrolled at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. He also enlisted in the Nebraska Army National Guard. Rob had always wanted to serve in the military. He hoped to become a general one day. With this in mind, Rob enrolled in Army ROTC at UNL.

Fate had something else in store for Rob during his college years too. He reconnected with Dena. They fell in love, were engaged a year later, and were married on July 29, 2000. Rob continued his studies and training, later graduating from UNL in May, 2001, receiving his commission as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army.

That August, Rob and Dena welcomed the birth of their first daughter, Julia. A short time later, Lieutenant Rob Yllescas began his first Active-Duty assignment on September 10, 2001. The very next day, everything changed for Rob, his family, and our Nation. America's military priorities transformed dramatically, focusing on a new mission to combat terrorism.

From the beginning of his military service, Rob's commanding officers took note of his character and his leadership. One commander said, ''Yllescas was an extraordinary person to be around. He brought that 'lead from the front' mentality into his work.''

Another soldier who served with him said Rob ''was strong as an ox with a smile as big as Nebraska.''

Over the next several years, life became fast-paced for the Yllescas family. Rob deployed to Iraq in 2003 for a year, and then he returned for a second deployment in 2005, when the fighting grew more intense. Returning home to Nebraska in 2006, Rob continued to excel in the military, later graduating from Army Ranger School. Rob achieved the rank of captain and was assigned to the 6th Squadron of the 4th Cavalry Regiment. He took command of Bravo Troop, known as the Blackfoots.

After nearly 2 years of training and earning the respect of his troops, Rob learned he would deploy to Afghanistan. Shortly before his deployment, Rob and Dena welcomed their second daughter, Eva, on February 1, 2008. Upon arriving in Afghanistan, Captain Yllescas and Bravo Troop were stationed at Camp Keating. This outpost, located in the eastern province of Nuristan, was known to many as the most dangerous territory in Afghanistan. Camp Keating had been under constant attack since becoming operational in 2006. Two prior camp commanders had been killed before the Blackfoots arrived.

Once again, Captain Yllescas made an immediate impact. His lead-from-the-front approach earned the respect of his men and improved the relations with the local Afghan leaders. Rob carried himself with a grace that would calm the nerves of these community leaders, and he often met with them unarmed and without that full battle rattle, but his charismatic style and the improved relations quickly became a threat to the enemy forces in the region.

Camp Keating, located in the Kamdesh District, was known to American troops as the ''Tip of the Spear.'' Al Qaeda and militants moved freely through this area from safe havens in Pakistan. They filtered weapons and ammunition through this region to engage with coalition forces throughout Afghanistan.

One soldier described his tour at Camp Keating, saying: ''I was either extremely bored or extremely terrified.'' For months, Captain Yllescas and his Blackfoots continued their focus on improving relations with the local Afghan community, and things seemed to be moving in the right direction.

As Captain Yllescas made progress, he also drew the attention of the enemy militants. By the fall of 2008, they were coordinating plans to remove this threat to their supply chain. On October 28, 2008, a remotely controlled IED was detonated and seriously wounded Captain Yllescas as part of a planned assassination attempt. Rob was quickly evacuated out of Afghanistan. He was stabilized and moved to the Bethesda Naval Medical Center outside of Washington, DC.

Throughout this time at the medical center, Dena remained at his side. During Rob's second week at Bethesda Medical Naval Center, President George W. Bush visited him on November 10 and personally awarded him the Purple Heart. Rob's best day occurred when his daughter Julia entered his hospital room. Just seeing Julia seemed to ease his mind.

Ultimately, Rob's severe leg and head wounds were too much to overcome. CPT Robert Yllescas died on December 1, 2008. A week later, the auditorium in Osceola, NE, was filled to capacity with people honoring their hometown hero. In the time since, Dena and Rob's mother Barbara have become very active in the Gold Star family activities throughout Nebraska. His daughters Julia, who is now 15, and Eva, now 8, are also active in this cause. The two of them are well known for their beautiful voices and singing of patriotic songs at veterans events.

For his service to our Nation, CPT Rob Yllescas earned many military decorations. Among the many important badges and decorations he earned, Captain Yllescas was awarded the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Iraq Campaign Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, and the Ranger Tab. CPT Robert Yllescas embodied the pride of his State, served his country, and loved his family. I am honored to tell his story.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to voice my concern as an American and my outrage as a grandfather-to-be about the lack of action to fund our response to the Zika epidemic. Zika has come to Miami, FL, and Congress needs to step up and provide the necessary funds to fight this terrible virus.

Zika is like any other national emergency, and we are a nation that always—always—responds to emergencies. While I am encouraged with the news that Republicans are seeing fit to do their job and drop some of the conditions in their Zika bill, which this body has voted down three times already, there is no excuse for any further delay—no excuse for doing nothing while Americans face a risk that we have the power to mitigate.

The alarms have been ringing for months. We knew Zika wasn't coming, but instead of being proactive and prepared for what was about to hit our shores, Republicans in Congress chose to poison our response with rightwing ideological policy riders that prevented us from appropriately addressing this issue. To make matters worse, rather than removing these unacceptable provisions from the bill, they simply chose to ignore it entirely and send Congress on vacation without acting.

Since that time, we have had at least 43 instances of locally acquired Zika in the Miami area and nearly 16,000 locally acquired cases in Puerto Rico. In the 50 United States, we now have 3,000 total cases, including those that were acquired outside of the country. Most frightening for families throughout our Nation is that we know of at least 1,751 cases of pregnant women infected with Zika—a truly devastating diagnosis for everyone involved.

Today we have heard from the head of the National Institutes of Health's Infectious Disease Institute that without immediate funding, the current ongoing clinical trials into a Zika vaccine will be forced to shut down—putting a halt to any real chance we have of developing a preventive vaccine in the near term.

We, as Democrats, have fought the opposition to pass the President's request for $1.9 billion to battle Zika. In May, the Senate, in a bipartisan compromise, agreed by a vote of 89 to 8 to fund $1.1 billion in response funding, but that bipartisan agreement was derailed in the House of Representatives, where Republicans insisted on adding a poison pill provision that had nothing to do with Zika and everything to do with seizing the opportunity to pursue an anti-family political social agenda that would prohibit family planning clinics from getting Zika funds—directly impacting the health of women in the most high-risk areas at a time that we know Zika can be contracted not only by a bite of a mosquito but by sexual intercourse.

Every major health organization, from the Centers for Disease Control to the World Health Organization, to the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, has recommended that the best course of action is to increase access to contraception and family planning services to decrease transmission of the virus.

Today I call, once again, on the majority leader and the Speaker of the House to address this crisis now. Let's do our jobs and help keep the American people safe, healthy, and secure by addressing this crisis with everything we have and all we can provide to women and families who face an emergency situation no less important and no less threatening than tornadoes, hurricanes, wildfires, or superstorms such as Sandy.

We need to quickly and decisively respond. We are already behind. We have lost critical time and sacrificed the progress we should have already made to political obstructionism that has prevented us from providing what we need to ensure maximum protection. We need to act now, not tomorrow, not the next day, not next week—now. But here we are 7 months after the President's original call for an emergency response to Zika and 5 months—long before Miami had become ground zero for the virus in the continental United States—5 months before the first confirmed cases of locally acquired transmission occurred and began to spread.

My Republican colleagues talk a lot about national security, about defending this Nation and its people and I agree with them, but there are many ways to defend America from the many threats we face, and Zika is one of them. If we believe what we say about keeping America and Americans safe, then quickly passing the necessary funding to defeat Zika is in the personal security interest of the United States.

We are dealing with a virus that has tremendous costs. We do not yet know all the potential birth defects that Zika can cause, and we do not know all the potential effects of microcephaly to a newborn or the life expectancy of a Zika baby, but the health care costs for the 31-year-old mother in Hackensack, NJ, who gave birth to the first Zika baby born in the United States, will, no doubt, be staggering—in the millions of dollars.

At the end of the day, protecting our people from an insidious virus that ultimately can affect the next generation that is being born is in fact protecting the public. In my mind, it is not acceptable to play politics with a national emergency. We can have all the debates in the world about family planning and access to women's health care, but we are delaying the possibilities of a vaccine being prepared, of mosquito abatement to limit the population of infected insects. We are denying care to those women who could be or are infected. We need to act now and pass the necessary funding just as we do in any national emergency, against any threat or any enemy, and Zika is a real and direct threat.

I can talk from personal experience. It has affected my family and me. My daughter lives in Miami. She is now 6 months pregnant with her first child, and I am deeply concerned about her health, her well-being and the well-being of my first grandchild. While this moment is a moment of great joy, every young mother already has concerns about the normal course of events: Will my child be healthy? Will my child be safe and free from illness? These are normal concerns, but Zika adds a new dimension to those normal worries, and we could have done something to stop it if it were not for Republican obstructionism in the House. Shame on us that we have not done all we could to mitigate the fear that young mothers are feeling, and that fear is palpable. It cannot be ignored, not by me, not by any father, not by any grandfather, and it should not be ignored by Republicans in Congress. This isn't for me or my daughter. It is too late for her to take advantage of a vaccine or cure, but it is not too late for other mothers and their children across this country. How can we, in good conscience, not do all we can to attack this problem as best as we can?

My daughter has taken precautions and is doing everything possible to protect herself, but this issue goes beyond the personal aspect of what is happening in my family, and while having a child is a moment of great joy, any woman who is pregnant in Miami—actually, in reality, this knows no limitations geographically. It will continue to spread across the country. It is an added risk that is very real and should be of deep concern to all of us.

We want to protect our children. We talked about that in many different dimensions in different debates, whether it is about education or health care, and now we are doing something that every person who is a father or may be a grandfather understands very clearly. Every woman who serves in the Senate and has had a child understands very well the whole emotional process that goes on, like worrying about that child, taking care of themselves, having the right nutrition, and doing all the prenatal care they have to do so they can have a child who is born healthy.

Women throughout the country are doing their best to protect themselves to the extent that they can, but not all of them have the ability to do something about it like those of us in this Chamber. It is our responsibility, obligation, and duty to act in the interest of every family who cannot do what we can by simply passing this legislation and doing it now.

The alarms have been ringing for months. We knew Zika was coming, but instead of being proactive and prepared for what was about to hit our shores, Republican leaders in Congress chose to ignore the warning signs and adjourn Congress without acting. Now we are back and our Nation faces an emergency. We are here. There are no excuses. There is no political justification for inaction. At the end of the day, lives are at stake and we swore to protect every American. I call on my colleagues in both Chambers to put this nonsense aside, stop the pointless political posturing, and do your job.

We are living in a political season that has devolved into a race to the bottom. Let's not participate in that race by letting the rigid, fundamentalist social agenda with the most extreme elements in our politics overrule common sense and shared values in the face of a crisis and danger to America.

We know what is right. We know what we have to do, and now is the time to do it. It is with that hope that we break the shackles of this absurd political obstructionist chain that is holding us back from doing what is right and necessary.

I look forward to next week—since it seems we will be out of session now—ultimately addressing the concerns that women and families have across this country. We hear a lot about the protection of the unborn. Well, this is the very essence of being able to protect the unborn from an insidious disease that can affect their lives forever.

I hope the conscience of the Senate will ultimately move itself to its better judgment.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WRDA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time on the floor to first express my appreciation to the leadership for bringing forward the Water Resources Development Act. I know we are going to have a chance to vote on cloture on Monday, and I just want to thank the leadership for making the bill available for floor time.

I also congratulate Senator INHOFE, the chairman of our committee, and Senator BOXER, the ranking Democrat, because I am a proud member of the Environment and Public Works Committee that has recommended the Water Resources Development Act to the full Senate.

The process that was used by Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member BOXER is the way the legislative process should work in the U.S. Senate. We had a very open process, where many Members—all of the members of our committee and many other Members of the Senate—participated in one of the most important bills that we consider during the congressional session. It deals with the conservation and development of our water resources and authorizes the construction projects for the improvement of rivers and harbors. In other words, this bill very much affects every State in the Nation because it affects our economy, our environment, clean water, and public health. It is an extremely important piece of legislation.

When we look at the content of this bill, we see that the leaders of our committee were able to work out the right types of compromises so that we don't have a contentious bill before the U.S. Senate. We have a bill that is focused on the purposes of WRDA, to conserve and develop our water resources and to authorize the construction projects for our rivers and harbors.

For Maryland this bill is particularly important. When we look at the WRDA bill, so many projects and so many opportunities in my State are involved. In Maryland we have the Port of Baltimore, which is the economic hub. I was there last week visiting the Port of Baltimore. I am there frequently. There are tens of thousands of jobs there. It is one of the most active ports in our country. It depends on the WRDA bill for the authorizations of the projects to keep the Port of Baltimore competitive and able to do the important economic work of our region. So for the economic impact that our ports have on America, and certainly the Port of Baltimore and Maryland, this bill is particularly important.

I make a point of being in Ocean City, MD, during the Association of County Conferences and had a chance to see firsthand the impact of these renourishing programs that are impacted by the WRDA bill. The protection of the Chesapeake Bay in my State, the largest estuary in our hemisphere, is very much impacted by this bill. The public health of the people of Maryland and indeed our Nation are very much impacted by the Water Resources Development Act.

So let me talk specifically about what is included in this bill that will help the people of Maryland and the people of our country. First, to the economic impact—as I said earlier, the passage of this bill will provide for job growth and economic growth in our country. It also will protect our public health. The dredging and maintenance of our rivers and harbors are paramount to this. As a result of the previous WRDA bills and continuing to this WRDA bill, we in our region are able to maintain our channels. We also have been able to find locations where we can put the dredge material.

For example, in Maryland we had a national model for what we did at Poplar Island. Poplar Island was a disappearing island in the Chesapeake Bay that was basically all submerged. It was an environmental negative. It was a liability. Through the use of deposits of dredge material, Poplar Island has been converted not just to a dredge site but an environmental restoration site and has helped very much in dealing with the diversity of species that we find in the Chesapeake Bay region. Through WRDA authorizations and appropriations, we have been able to convert a negative on our environment to a positive and at the same time find a way to use dredge materials to keep our harbors open. That is a win-win-win situation, and it is those types of projects that are included in the Water Resources Development Act.

But there are many other communities. In Maryland we have the Port of Baltimore—I talked about that—but we have a lot of smaller ports and harbors in Maryland. During the break I visited Salisbury, MD. They have a port. They want to expand their port so they can not only import products as they do, but use it as an export location. In Salisbury, they have Chesapeake Shipbuilding, which is one of the premier shipbuilding facilities we have, and they benefit from what is done in Salisbury Harbor. By way of example, I want to point out to the people I represent in Maryland the important economic projects that are very much impacted by the passage of the Water Resources Development Act.

The economic impact goes beyond just what we do in our harbors; it also involves our shoreline protection. While I was in Ocean City, I visited with Mayor Meehan, the mayor of Ocean City, who pointed out to me what happened during the last storm. We get storms along the East Coast; we always get storms. But he pointed out to me the impact that the beach renourishment programs have had in minimizing damage to property and to the shoreline. We invest in beach renourishment as basically an insurance policy against damage that could be much greater. We could have our money back and much more through the investments we make in beach renourishment in the Water Resources Development Act. I can state that people who have their homes and businesses in Ocean City, MD, very much appreciate the fact that this Congress is paying attention to this issue.

Then I can go to Smith Island. Smith Island is the last habitable island in Maryland on the Chesapeake Bay. It is eroding, and it has serious issues about its sustainability. For the people who live on Smith Island, it is not only their homes but part of the history of our State and Nation that they are preserving. We have provided in the WRDA bill a way that we can do living shorelines so a community like Smith Island continues to be safe from the devastation we are seeing with erosion. I am proud of all those provisions that are in this WRDA bill that will help us deal with those issues.

As I pointed out earlier, the WRDA bill is important for our Chesapeake Bay. The Chesapeake Bay is the largest estuary in our hemisphere. I talk about it frequently on the floor of the U.S. Senate. It has been declared by many presidents as a national treasure. It is a national treasure. We have a comprehensive program in partnership with the Federal Government and with the State governments of five States and the District of Columbia. We have a partnership with local governments, with the private sector, and we are making progress.

In this bill, to give one example, we increased the authorization for oyster recovery programs. I was proud to offer this amendment from $60 million to $100 million, almost doubling the dollars that are going to be available for oyster recovery programs. Why is that important? I think most Members understand that oysters are cash crops. It is nice to be able to harvest oysters and be able to serve them and to use them as watermen do. So we are increasing dramatically the number of oysters that can be harvested, using new methods, including ways in which we can seed oysters off the bottom, as

well as on the bottom of the river, and it is taking. We are seeing our oyster crops increase dramatically, which is helping the economy of the watermen of Maryland in our region.

Oysters are also a filtering agent for the Chesapeake Bay. They cleanse the water. They give us a better quality water in the Chesapeake Bay, which helps all species and the future of the Chesapeake Bay. We were down to a small percentage of the historic crop of oysters when we started the recovery program. Now that we have been in the recovery program, we are recovering a significant number of oysters. We are not there yet; we have got a lot more to do. But this extra Federal help in oyster recovery will certainly help in that regard.

Oysters also, by the way, build the infrastructure for the different species within the Bay. They actually become what the living organisms can live on and produce the type of food chain necessary for a healthy diversity within the Chesapeake Bay. So I was particularly pleased that the committee recommended my amendment to increase our programs for oyster recovery.

This bill also deals with clean water. In the 111th Congress, when I was chair of the Water Subcommittee of the Environment and Public Works Committee, I filed S. 1005, which deals with our State revolving funds. Let me explain for my colleagues—I think most know—that the State revolving funds are the major Federal partnership to help local governments deal with safe drinking water and clean water.

Wastewater treatment is done through State revolving funds. We have taken some actions in order to modernize this program. In this WRDA bill, we incorporate many of the elements of the legislation that I filed that will update and improve the revolving loan programs. It makes it much more predictable and flexible for our States, so they can plan their projects accordingly, which is critically important for safe drinking water and economic growth. We expand the eligibility to include preconstruction, to deal with replacement and rehab, and for the first time allow these funds to be used for source water protection plans so that we actually can make sure we are getting safe water into our water supply.

We also allow for the prioritization of sustainability, and we provide incentives for water efficiency that is cost saving and uses better technology, so that the way we handle our water can be done with less leakage, less waste, less energy, and more efficiency, which saves money.

There is $900 million authorized for the Water Resources Research Act, and I was pleased to offer that to the committee, and I was pleased it was included in the final bill that is before the committee.

Let me talk for a moment about public health. The WRDA bill also deals with public health, which is very important. I know every Member is aware of what happened in Flint, MI, on lead poisoning. We know how tragic that was. We know how many families and children were directly impacted by decisions that were made there. This bill does much to deal with the tragedies in Flint, but Flint is not unique in the risk factors to our children on the exposures to lead.

I can give Baltimore City as an example. The schools in Baltimore City have turned off their water fountains because it would not be safe for the children in schools to use the water fountains that are there. The pipes that lead into the schools are contaminated by lead. The city doesn't have the resources to replace those pipes that come in and therefore have closed the water fountains and use bottled water instead.

So we have problems in our water infrastructure in America as it relates to the vulnerability of exposure to excessive lead. I think the Presiding Officer is aware that there is no acceptable level of lead in a child's blood. We know that lead in the blood of children has an impact on their capacity to grow. I will give one example. Freddie Gray, who was tragically killed over a year ago in a police incident that caused a disturbance in Baltimore, had high levels of lead from his youth in his blood.

These are matters we could take steps to correct, and this WRDA bill does exactly that. First, it takes many of the provisions of the bill that I filed working with many of my colleagues. It called for true leadership. We put together many of our ideas on what we can do to combat lead poisoning. I put that bill together with my colleagues and filed that bill with Senator INHOFE and Senator BOXER's leadership. We were able to incorporate many of those provisions—most of those provisions into this WRDA bill that is now before the U.S. Senate so that we will be able to give public notice and transparency when public officials discover an unacceptably high level of lead in the water system. The public will know, and they can avoid the risks.

We are providing money for testing of schools, testing of childcare centers, and individual children. In Maryland every child between 1 and 2 years of age will be tested to see whether they have excessive lead levels in their blood. There is truly an all-out effort.

There is one provision I want to underscore. There is $300 million in this bill so we can secure the last line of pipe coming from the main sources into homes. There are a lot of individuals, families, and low-income families who live in homes where the water system itself is safe but the pipes that lead into their home produce lead and subject their families to lead poisoning. They don't have the resources to correct it, and this bill provides a program where low-income families can get help in correcting the pipes that feed into their house to make sure they are lead-free so their children aren't susceptible to lead poisoning.

These are all good-news issues. I appreciate the time and attention given to this, but I wanted to emphasize that this bill is a very important bill. It contains issues, as I said, from protecting our environment to our public health, to our economy. It is a bill that deserves the strong support of the Members of the Senate. I hope my colleagues in the House will also approve this bill.

It reflects the hard work and leadership of Senator INHOFE and Senator BOXER and the Environment and Public Works Committee and many Members of the Senate. I am very proud to support this legislation.

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. BOOZMAN. 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. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask to speak in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

HONORING CORPORAL BILL COOPER

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to honor the service and sacrifice of Corporal Bill Cooper of the Sebastian County Sheriff's Office. Corporal Cooper gave his life in the line of duty on August 10, 2016. As a veteran of the U.S. Marine Corps who spent 15 years in the Sebastian County Sheriff's Office and 6 years with the Ft. Smith Police Department, Bill Cooper was a true public servant.

Corporal Cooper was remembered by his colleagues as a model law enforcement officer who did things the right way. He loved the men and women he worked with, and he exemplified what many in law enforcement aspire to, which was being an officer who never failed to show how much he cared about his community.

As such, he continued to serve long after he was eligible to retire. Cooper was also a devoted husband, father, and grandfather who loved his family very, very much. Last month, Corporal Cooper responded to a domestic call involving an armed suspect near Hackett, AR. The suspect opened fire on Cooper and Hackett police chief Darrell Spells.

Corporal Cooper was fatally wounded. Chief Spells and Greenwood K–9 officer Kina were injured. The suspect later surrendered and was taken into police custody. In a true testament to the impact that Corporal Cooper had on so many who served with him or knew him, he was laid to rest at a funeral service attended by several thousand people, including law enforcement officers from across the State and around the country. His colleagues and friends

remembered him to have always treated citizens with respect and dignity, while also being a loyal partner and friend.

While our hearts break for those who knew him, we also respect and admire Corporal Cooper for his lifetime of service. He truly was someone who ran toward danger in order to protect others. Corporal Cooper was a hero, and today we honor his sacrifice. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Ruth, his son Scott, along with many other family members, friends, and colleagues in the law enforcement community.

I humbly and sincerely offer my condolences and my gratitude to them as they grieve for Bill. Bill was a classmate of mine at the Northside High School in Fort Smith. We as a class are very, very proud of him for his sacrifice, for our safety, but also, and certainly as important, the way he lived his life. May we always remember Corporal Cooper's life and legacy of service.

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. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today the U.S. International Trade Commission, or the USITC, is celebrating its 100th anniversary. That makes today an appropriate day for us to acknowledge the distinguished service that this independent and nonpartisan Federal agency has provided, and continues to provide, in the field of international trade.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I concur with Senator HATCH and also congratulate the USITC on its centennial and commend the agency for its service over the last century.

Established by the Congress as the U.S. Tariff Commission on September 8, 1916, the agency was reconfigured and redesignated as the USITC by the Trade Act of 1974. As mandated by Congress, the USITC performs three principal functions: No. 1, fairly and objectively administer U.S. trade remedy laws within its mandate; No. 2, provide the Congress, the President, and the United States Trade Representative with independent analysis, information, and support concerning matters related to international trade, tariffs, and U.S. competitiveness; and No. 3 maintain the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

By successfully executing these functions, the USITC performs a valuable service to the U.S. Government and the American people. Those of us in Congress particularly appreciate the highly technical data and analyses that the USITC provides to help inform our formulation of U.S. trade policy.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, of course, the core of the USITC's success derives from the agency's people. For decades now, the impressive and skilled commissioners and staff at the USITC have driven the agency's success. We congratulate the USITC for reaching this centennial milestone and for accomplishing a well-deserved tenure of valuable and professional service.

RECOGNIZING THE JEFFERSONTOWN POLICE DEPARTMENT ANGEL PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have spoken many times on this floor about the threat that opioid abuse represents to our country. Rates of substance abuse have been on the rise in recent years, and Kentucky has been hit particularly hard by this epidemic. A recent State report from the Kentucky Office of Drug Control Policy said that, last year, over 1,200 deaths in the Commonwealth were caused by drug abuse.

Well, I am glad to share with my colleagues some good news in the fight against opioid abuse in Kentucky. This August, I visited with and saw up close a program that is changing how law enforcement deals with drug addiction, a program that is saving lives. It is the Jeffersontown Angel Program, an initiative spearheaded by the Jeffersontown, KY, Police Department.

At the Jeffersontown Police Department, a priority has been placed on getting treatment for folks who request help for their addiction to opiates by connecting them with local treatment facilities. In many cases, those with substance-abuse disorders can be taken immediately to a treatment facility to start their recovery. People who abuse drugs can also turn over their drugs or drug equipment without being charged with a crime.

The new Jeffersontown Police Department Angel Program is the first of its kind in Kentucky. It is modeled after a successful program launched in Gloucester, MA, in 2015, which has so far referred more than 450 people to treatment and produced a 33 percent reduction in property crime rates.

That evidence was enough to convince Jeffersontown Police Chief Ken Hatmaker. ''When you can have a 33 percent drop in property crime,'' he says, ''I'm going to listen.''

While the Jeffersontown Police Department remains strenuously committed to investigating, pursuing, and arresting drug traffickers to the fullest extent of the law, the Angel Program helps reduce those traffickers' clientele by working to remove the stigma of addiction and making it easier to access recovery programs.

Fighting drug abuse is a cause I have embraced here in the Senate as well, and it has been a focus of mine for many years. I have traveled throughout the Commonwealth speaking with people, learning about the scope of substance abuse in my State, and working with Kentuckians to combat it.

A few years ago, I convened a listening session in northern Kentucky, a region particularly hard hit by this epidemic, to hear from informed Kentuckians in the medical, public health, and law-enforcement fields. I testified before the Senate's Drug Caucus to share my findings with my colleagues.

I have also met with the Nation's Director of National Drug Control Policy—better known as the drug czar—and successfully persuaded him to visit Kentucky to see firsthand the damage done by drugs. His visit and greater Federal funding for law enforcement in Kentucky have both been a part of a multilayered strategy to stop drug trafficking.

I also made it a priority to pass the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA, a bill I was proud to see recently signed into law. CARA is a comprehensive approach to tackling the opioid drug epidemic that bolsters treatment, prevention and recovery efforts, and gives law enforcement tools to help those already suffering with addiction and help prevent more senseless loss of life.

CARA authorizes new grants for vital, lifesaving programs to help treat those suffering from drug addiction. It also includes several important policy reforms. It will expand treatment by giving prescribing authority to nurse practitioners and physician assistants to administer medication-assisted treatments for opioid addiction. It will increase the availability of naloxone, which can instantly reverse a drug overdose, to law enforcement agencies and other first responders. And it will strengthen and enhance prescription drug monitoring programs to crack down on ''doctor shopping.''

Substance abuse destroys lives. It increases crime, rips apart families, and leaves too many bodies in its wake. I want to commend the Jeffersontown Police Department for launching the Angel Program and leading the way in Kentucky in efforts to battle substance abuse. With the good work done by the Jeffersontown Police Department, along with the continued efforts we are doing here in Congress, I believe we can fight back against this scourge of addiction, and reduce its devastating effects.

The Louisville Courier-Journal recently published an article describing the Jeffersontown Police Department's Angel Program. I ask unanimous consent that said article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Louisville Courier Journal, Aug. 25, 2016]

J-TOWN'S NEW STRATEGY TO COMBAT ADDICTION

(By Amanda Beam)

Sgt. Brittney Garrett wants to save lives through changing attitudes.

Her influence can be seen in the waiting area inside the Jeffersontown Police Department, the law-enforcement agency for which she works. Pamphlets about overcoming substance abuse and local addiction support groups can be found on most every table there.

This lobby welcomes with acceptance, not doubt, supporting the revolutionary initiative Garrett has embraced.

It's called The Angel Program, and it's redefining the way law enforcement views drug addiction.

Through cooperation with community partners, the initiative gives resources to people searching for sobriety.

During their intake hours of 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday, the J-Town PD serves as a conduit to connect those who seek therapy for their addiction with providers who can access and provide treatment for their needs. Folks, in most cases, will be immediately taken to a treatment facility to begin their recovery.

People who use can also turn over drugs for disposal to the police without fear of reprisal.

''The hard part isn't coming in,'' Garrett said of those who enter the station to obtain assistance. ''The hard part is getting through your treatment.''

Certain exclusions do apply. If you have an active warrant, a felony sex conviction, a violent history or are under 18 years old, you may not qualify. Garrett invites those with questions to phone the station at (502) 267–0503.

Since the program's August 1, 2016 start, seven people have entered the program and been placed directly into residential rehab facilities.

No wait lists. No jail. No criminalization of their illness. Just help is received.

''We have to find innovative ways to deal with the heroin problem,'' said Garrett, the Angel Program Coordinator. ''A lot of it comes down to just being empathetic, compassionate and educated of what we're dealing with.''

A NATIONAL SCOURGE

What J-Town and other communities across the nation are dealing with is an epidemic. Heroin use continues to rise, and overdoses soar. Jefferson County on average experiences one overdose death each day.

In addition to health concerns, crime has risen in the town of about 27,000. Increased thefts, general incidence reports and car accidents occur as ramifications of drug use. Garrett has even seen an uptick in more serious offenses as well.

''Especially on the level of law enforcement, when you deal with people with substance abuse disorder on the street, it's always bad. It's never good. It's someone committing a crime,'' Garrett said.

''It's hard for us to see the human side of addiction, that you committed a crime because of your addiction.''

But humanizing those with substance-abuse issues is a hallmark of the program's creation.

THE BEGINNING

The Gloucester Police Department in Massachusetts established the now national initiative in 2015, with the aim of targeting the demand side of the drug problem. Get help for those who are addicted so they stop using, and both supply and crime should go down too. Furthermore, law-enforcement agencies would face less strain on their limited resources, and be able to concentrate on serious criminal cases.

Not only did they find these actions more compassionate, but also more successful.

So far, roughly 400 people have been referred to treatment facilities through the Gloucester program. As predicted, drug-related crimes in the surrounding area fell by more than 30 percent. Costs for treatment also fall far below the price of housing prisoners, providing another incentive.

''If you have a choice between a bed in incarceration, or a bed in treatment, I'm for the bed in treatment,'' said Jeffersontown Police Chief Ken Hatmaker.

Enforcement still remains important, he added. When people break the law, consequences must be faced.

But providing treatment opportunities to those suffering from substance-use disorder can stop many of the more serious crimes from happening in the first place, a balancing act between service and enforcement that Hatmaker has learned to embrace.

''That's what it took for me to buy in was the education,'' the chief said. ''When you can have a 33 percent drop in property crime, I'm going to listen.''

THE IMPACT

Changing perceptions isn't always easy for law enforcement or those who find themselves addicted. At times, both face stereotypes. The program aims to correct these biases and facilitate greater communication between the police department and the larger community.

''People tend to believe that (substance-abuse disorder) is a moral failing, that people chose to have a life of destruction, which couldn't be further from the truth,'' said Tara Moseley, a recovery advocate and Angel Program volunteer.

Moseley understands the impact of addiction. For more than five years, the 30-year-old Louisville resident has been in recovery. Now, through her work in organizations like Young People in Recovery and the Angel Program, she tells others with the illness that better days can be in their future.

''People need to know there is a way out and that there is hope,'' she said. ''A program like the Angel Program, they actually do all that stuff for you. They're going to help you and take you where you need to go and make sure you are in somewhere and it's right now.''

The immediacy of the initiative plays a key role in its ingenuity. Those seeking assistance oftentimes face long wait lists to get into residential treatment. Not so with the Angel Program.

''Unfortunately, as it relates to the drugs of choice today, it's very possible they are risking their lives by waiting on a waiting list,'' said Jennifer Hancock, president and CEO of Volunteers of America (VOA) Mid-States, a non-profit partner of Angel Program.

In addition to providing a staff member to help with the station's intake center three days a week, VOA also has placed several of the referrals from the program into its facilities.

''It's important that we strike while the iron is hot and make sure we're providing them with immediate access. Otherwise . . . then they're waiting without the security and safety net of a very structured and accountable program, and it's extremely common that they will continue using.''

Through several different initiatives that focus on specific populations, VOA maintains 185 residential treatment beds in Louisville and Lexington. More, though, are needed. Only additional funding can alleviate the overwhelming demand.

And that's the tricky part.

The J-Town Angel Program only facilitates people finding treatment. Funding of that treatment remains with the patient and the medical provider. Some facilities have pledged scholarships to the program, and many others can enroll patients in Medicaid or work with them to manage costs if they can't afford the treatment.

But funding doesn't come close to meeting the demand.

''If we have people lined up at our door, that's great,'' Garrett said. ''But if we can't take them somewhere because there are no beds available, no funding for these treatment centers, we're just turning people away at that point and doing the opposite of what we're wanting to do.''

Current legislation in Congress called the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act could give more money to address these broader funding problems for treatment initiatives. But until that occurs, the Angel Program will do its best to continue combatting the effects of the addiction epidemic one life at a time.

''We've always been counselors and social workers as law enforcement, mediating conflict and these types of things, but this is a whole new level,'' Garrett said. ''We're entering into a new realm.''

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is hard to believe that 15 years ago this Sunday the Twin Towers fell, smoke from the Pentagon could be seen from miles away, and a plane went down in a Pennsylvania field. For those who lived through that horrible day, the memory still feels fresh.

Of course, this is especially true for those who lost loved ones. This weekend, Americans across the country will gather to remember the thousands of innocent lives that were taken so callously and indiscriminately in those terrorist attacks. And we remember the first responders, law enforcement, intelligence, and military personnel who work every single day to keep our country safe.

This year, we must also take a moment to remember the spirit that united us in the days after the attacks. Americans of all races, religions, and backgrounds stood together in solidarity to support one another and stand against the cowardice of terrorism. Following the attacks, President George W. Bush visited a mosque. At a joint session of Congress, he reminded Americans that ''no one should be singled out for unfair treatment or unkind words because of their ethnic background or religious faith.'' In the years after September 11, our country did not always live up to those words, but we must remember the ideals, values, and humanity that sustained us through those first dark days.

In today's political environment, it is easy to lose sight of that common spirit. Some are trying hard to divide us. A Federal judge has been accused of bias because of his ethnic heritage. Religious and ideological tests for visitors to the United States are discussed as though they are serious policy proposals. The sacrifices of war heroes and

Gold Star families are belittled. And that is just the beginning.

On this 15th anniversary of September 11, we must reject this divisiveness. While Americans will continue to mourn the loss of so many on September 11 and in the wars that followed, we will never lose sight of the core principles that so many generations of Americans fought to protect.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this Sunday we will solemnly observe the 15th anniversary of the 9/11 terrorist attacks that killed 2,977 people from 93 different nations and injured more than 6,000 others at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and a field near Shanksville, PA. For those of us old enough to remember, the events of that horrific day are seared into our memories as if they just happened yesterday. Over 3,000 children lost at least one parent on 9/11. Many of these children were too young at the time to comprehend what was happening or to remember it today, even though they suffered such a devastating personal loss. According to the Census Bureau, nearly 59 million Americans have been born since 9/11. Most of these young people learn about 9/11 in school, much the same way an earlier generation of Americans learned about Pearl Harbor.

For those younger Americans who don't remember 9/11, I think it is important for them to understand that the attacks did not just test our character; they revealed it. The worst attack in American history brought out the best in the American people. Americans responded with courage and self-sacrifice, with charity and compassion and volunteerism and with resolve.

There were incredible acts of individual heroism. ''Numerous civilians in all stairwells, numerous burn [victims] are coming down. We're trying to send them down first . . . We're still heading up.'' So said New York City Fire Department Captain Patrick ''Paddy'' Brown, Ladder 3, as he and 11 of his men climbed an emergency stairwell in the North Tower, making it to the 40th floor before the Tower collapsed. His remains were recovered 3 months later. Three hundred and forty-three members of the New York City Fire Department and 71 law enforcement officers gave their lives while helping evacuate 25,000 people to safety.

''Are you guys ready? Let's roll.''—so said 32-year Todd Beamer as he and other passengers aboard United Airlines flight 93 rushed the cockpit in an attempt to regain control of the jet, which the four al-Qaeda hijackers apparently intended to crash into the White House or the U.S. Capitol. The heroism of the flight 93 passengers undoubtedly saved thousands of lives here in Washington. Todd's wife, Lisa, was one of at least 17 pregnant women who became widows on 9/11; Morgan Kay Beamer was born on January 9, 2002.

There were incredible acts of charity and compassion and volunteerism. The National September 11 Memorial & Museum at the World Trade Center has documented some of them. Ada Rosario Dolch was the principal of a high school located just two blocks from the World Trade Center. On 9/11, she helped to evacuate 600 students safely; meanwhile, Ada's sister Wendy Wakeford was killed. To honor Wendy's memory, Ada helped to build a school in Afghanistan that opened in 2005.

In 2006, Tad Millinger started the ''Walk to Raise'' campaign with high school friends Brandon Reinhard, Chad Coulter, and Dustin Dean. They walked 650 miles from their hometown of Rossford, OH, to New York City to raise money for the National September 11 Memorial & Museum at the World Trade Center and the Flight 93 National Memorial in Pennsylvania. Tad is now a volunteer firefighter and emergency medical technician in his hometown.

Sonali Beaven was 5 years old when her father, Alan, was killed on Flight 93. ''My loss is central to my identity,'' Sonali has said. ''In a sense, each choice I've made since that day has been crafted by my experience. But, because of my loss and the nature of my loss, I choose love and life every day. Because of my father and the other passengers, I can't let fear limit me. I have to take today and every day and try to improve the world we live in and spread the ideology of love.''

There has been resolve. We resolved as a nation to bring to justice the people responsible for 9/11. Roughly 2.5 million Americans have served in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq; despite the horrors of war and multiple deployments, 89 percent of those veterans say they would join the military again. On May 2, 2011, Navy SEAL Team Six located and killed Osama bin Laden in Abbottabad, Pakistan, in Operation Neptune Spear. The global war on terror is far from over, but I am confident we will prevail. As President Franklin Delano Roosevelt said in his May 26, 1940 fireside chat, ''We defend and we build a way of life, not for America alone, but for all mankind.''

What I hope our young people—those who don't have a personal memory of 9/11—will understand is that, out of many, we are truly one. That was evident on 9/11, and it is still true. Our partisan, political, philosophical, and regional differences come to the fore during a Presidential campaign. But these differences ultimately are dwarfed by what binds us together as Americans: our hopes for our families, our communities, our Nation, and the world. The best way for all of us to honor those who died on 9/11 is to remember that and act accordingly—courageously, generously, compassionately, and with resolve to defend and promote justice, freedom, and peace at home and abroad.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent from this afternoon's vote on confirmation of the nomination of Peter Michael McKinley to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federative Republic of Brazil.

On vote No. 137, had I been present, I would have voted yea on the McKinley nomination. I hope the Senate will continue to confirm President Obama's highly qualified nominees in the weeks ahead.•

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for September 2016. The report compares current law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the budget resolution for Fiscal Year 2016, the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11, and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, P.L. 114–74, BBA 15. This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budget points of order lie against pending legislation. It has been prepared by the Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, CBA.

This is the sixth report I have made this calendar year. It is the third report since I filed the statutorily required Fiscal Year 2017 enforceable budget limits on April 18, 2016, pursuant to section 102 of BBA 15, and the tenth report I have made since adoption of the Fiscal Year 2016 budget resolution on May 5, 2015. My last filing can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 8, 2016. The information contained in this report is current through September 6, 2016.

Tables 1–7 of this report are prepared by my staff on the Budget Committee. Only table 1, which tracks compliance with committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA, has changed from my previous report due to legislative activity. Of the 16 authorizing committees in the Senate, 14 are in compliance with their allocation over the enforceable 10-year period, Fiscal Year 2017–2026. The two committees not in compliance, the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, were pushed out of compliance through passage of the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management and Economic Stability Act, PROMESA, P.L. 114–187, and the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act, P.L. 114–182, respectively. During this same period, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation reduced direct spending by $8 million over the 10-year period with the passage of the FAA Extension, Safety and Security

Act of 2016, P.L. 114–190. In total, table 1 shows that authorizing committees are $502 million in budget authority and $483 million in outlays above allowable direct spending levels over the 10-year window.

Tables 2–7 remain unchanged due to the legislative impasse over the Fiscal Year 2017 appropriations process.

In addition to the tables provided by the Senate Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting additional tables from CBO that I will use for enforcement of budget totals agreed to by the Congress.

Because legislation can still be enacted that would have an effect on Fiscal Year 2016, CBO provided a report both for Fiscal Year 2016 and Fiscal Year 2017. This information is used to enforce aggregate spending levels in budget resolutions under section 311 of the CBA. CBO's estimates show that current law levels of spending for Fiscal Year 2016 exceed the amounts in last year's budget resolution by $138.9 billion in budget authority and $103.6 billion in outlays. Revenues are $155.2 billion below the revenue floor for Fiscal Year 2016 set by the budget resolution. As well, Social Security outlays are at the levels assumed for Fiscal Year 2016, while Social Security revenues are $23 million below levels in the budget.

For Fiscal Year 2017, CBO estimates that current law levels are below the Fiscal Year 2017 enforcement filing's allowable budget authority and outlay aggregates by $974.1 billion and $592.2 billion, respectively. The allowable spending room will be reduced as appropriations bills for Fiscal Year 2017 are enacted. Revenues are above the levels assumed in the enforcement filing by $200 million in Fiscal Year 2017, $410 million over 5 years, and $544 million over 10 years. This is the product of revenue increases in both PROMESA, $370 million over 10 years, and P.L. 114–182, $192 million over 10 years, and an $18 million reduction in revenues over 10 years from the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016, CARA, P.L. 114–198. Finally, Social Security outlays are at the levels assumed in the Fiscal Year 2017 enforcement filing, but the enactment of CARA reduced Social Security revenues by $6 million over 10 years.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate's pay-as-you-go rule. As part of the Fiscal Year 2017 enforcement filing, the Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard was reset to zero. Since my last filing, legislative activity has resulted in an increase in the deficit of $81 million over the Fiscal Year 2016–2021 period, but deficit reduction of $61 million over the Fiscal Year 2016–2026 period. Over the initial 6-year period, Congress has enacted legislation that increased outlays by $491 million and revenues by $410 million. Over the 11-year period, outlays were increased by $483 million and revenues by $544 million. The Senate's pay-as-you-go rule is enforced by section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21, the Fiscal Year 2008 budget resolution.

Finally, there is one new entry in the enforcement table included at the end of this submission, which tracks the Senate's budget enforcement activity on the floor. On June 29, 2016, a 425(a)(2) unfunded-mandate budget point of order was raised against PROMESA. This point of order was waived through a motion from Senator HATCH by a vote of 85–13.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (−) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	2016	2017	2017–2021	2017–2026
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Armed Services				
Budget Authority	−66	0	0	0
Outlays	−50	0	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation				
Budget Authority	130	−3	−33	−8
Outlays	0	−3	−33	−8
Energy and Natural Resources				
Budget Authority	0	200	365	370
Outlays	0	200	365	370
Environment and Public Works				
Budget Authority	2,880	2	72	212
Outlays	252	1	57	193
Finance				
Budget Authority	365	0	0	0
Outlays	365	0	0	0
Foreign Relations				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Judiciary				
Budget Authority	−3,358	−9	102	−72
Outlays	1,713	−9	102	−72
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Rules and Administration				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Intelligence				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs				
Budget Authority	−2	0	0	0
Outlays	388	0	0	0
Indian Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Small Business				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	1	0	0	0
Total				
Budget Authority	−51	190	506	502
Outlays	2,669	189	491	483

TABLE 2.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS [1]

[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2016	
	Security [2]	Nonsecurity [2]
Statutory Discretionary Limits	548,091	518,491
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	21,750
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	5,101	50,621
Defense	514,000	136
Energy and Water Development	18,860	18,325
Financial Services and General Government	44	23,191
Homeland Security	1,705	39,250

TABLE 2.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS [1]—Continued

[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2016	
	Security [2]	Nonsecurity [2]
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	32,159
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	162,127
Legislative Branch	0	4,363
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	8,171	71,698
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	37,780
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	210	57,091
Current Level Total	548,091	518,491
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (−) Statutory Limits	0	0

[1] This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

[2] Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS [1]

[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2017	
	Security [2]	Nonsecurity [2]
Statutory Discretionary Limits	551,068	518,531
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	9
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0	0
Defense	45	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0
Homeland Security	0	9
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	24,690
Legislative Branch	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0	60,634
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0	4,400
Current Level Total	45	89,742
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (−) Statutory Limits	−551,023	−428,789

[1] This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

[2] Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 4.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	2016	
	BA	OT
OCO/GWOT Allocation [1]	73,693	32,079
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0	0
Defense	58,638	27,354
Energy and Water Development	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0
Homeland Security	160	128
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	0
Legislative Branch	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	14,895	4,597
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0	0

TABLE 4.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	2016	
	BA	OT
Current Level Total	73,693	32,079
Total OCO/GWOT Spending vs. Budget Resolution	0	0

BA = Budget Authority; OT = Outlays.

[1] This allocation may be adjusted by the Chairman of the Budget Committee to account for new information, pursuant to section 3102 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution of the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016.

TABLE 5.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

[Budget authority, millions of dollars]

	2016
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2016	19,100
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	600
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	9,458
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	725
Homeland Security	176
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	28
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	6,799
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	17,786
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution	−1,314

TABLE 6.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND

[Budget authority, millions of dollars]

	2016
Crime Victims Fund (CVF) CHIMP Limit for Fiscal Year 2016	10,800
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	9,000
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	9,000
Total CVF CHIMP Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution	−1,800

TABLE 7.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

[Budget authority, millions of dollars]

	2017
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2017	19,100
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	0
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution	−19,100

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 8, 2016.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2016 budget and is current through September 6, 2016. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016.

Since our last letter dated June 8, 2016, the Congress has not cleared any legislation for the President's signature that has significant effects on budget authority, outlays, or revenues in fiscal year 2016.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016, AS OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2016

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level [a]	Current Level Over/Under (−) Resolution
On-Budget			
Budget Authority	3,069.8	3,208.7	138.9
Outlays	3,091.2	3,194.9	103.6
Revenues	2,676.0	2,520.7	−155.2
Off-Budget			
Social Security Outlays [b]	777.1	777.1	0.0
Social Security Revenues	794.0	794.0	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

[a] Excludes emergency funding that was not designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

[b] Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016, AS OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2016

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: [a]			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,676,733
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,968,496	1,902,345	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	500,825	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	−784,820	−784,879	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,183,676	1,618,291	2,676,733
Enacted Legislation:			
An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes (P.L. 114–25)	0	20	0
Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act & Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–26)	0	0	0
Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–27)	445	175	−766
Steve Gleason Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–40)	5	5	0
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–41) [b]	0	0	99
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016 (P.L. 114–53)	700	775	0
Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–55)	130	0	0
Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–58)	−2	368	0
Protecting Affordable Coverage for Employees Act (P.L. 114–60)	0	0	40
Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–74)	3,424	4,870	269
Recovery Improvements for Small Entities After Disaster Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–88)	0	1	0
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (P.L. 114–92)	−66	−50	0
Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (P.L. 114–94)	2,880	252	471
Federal Perkins Loan Program Extension Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–105)	269	269	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (P.L. 114–113) [b]	2,008,016	1,563,177	−156,107
Patient Access and Medicare Protection Act (P.L. 114–115)	32	32	0
Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–125)	20	20	−7
Total, Enacted Legislation	2,015,853	1,569,914	−155,996
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	9,170	6,674	0
Total Current Level [c]	3,208,699	3,194,879	2,520,737
Total Senate Resolution [d]	3,069,829	3,091,246	2,675,967
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	138,870	103,633	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	155,230

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

[a] *Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during this session, but before the adoption of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016; the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014 (P.L. 114–1); the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015 (P.L. 114–4); and the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–10).

[b] Emergency funding that was not designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. These amounts, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–41)	0	917	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (P.L. 114–113)	−2	0	0
Total	−2	917	0

[c] For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

[d] Periodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels in S. Con. Res. 11, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution. The Initial Senate Resolution total below excludes $6,872 million in budget authority and $344 million in outlays assumed in S. Con. Res. 11 for disaster-related spending. The Revised Senate Resolution total below includes amounts for disaster-related spending:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Initial Senate Resolution:	3,032,343	3,091,098	2,676,733
Revisions:			
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 4311 of S. Con. Res. 11	445	175	−766
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and S. Con. Res. 11	700	700	0
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and S. Con. Res. 11	0	1	0
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 4313 of S. Con. Res. 11	269	269	0
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 3404 of S. Con. Res. 11	36,072	−997	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,069,829	3,091,246	2,675,967

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 8, 2016.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2017 budget and is current through September 6, 2016. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on April 18, 2016, pursuant to section 102 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–74).

Since our last letter dated June 8, 2016, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that have significant effects on budget authority, outlays, or revenues: Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act (Public Law 114–182); Puerto Rico Oversight, Management. and Economic Stability Act (Public Law 114–187); Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–190); and Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–198).

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL, *Director*.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AS OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2016

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (−) Resolution
On-Budget:			
Budget Authority	3,212.4	2,238.2	−974.1
Outlays	3,219.2	2,627.0	−592.2
Revenues	2,682.0	2,682.2	0.2
Off-Budget:			
Social Security Outlays [a]	805.4	805.4	0.0
Social Security Revenues	826.1	826.1	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

[a] Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AS OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2016

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted:			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,681,976
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,054,886	1,960,659	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	504,803	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	−834,250	−834,301	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,220,636	1,631,161	2,681,976
Enacted Legislation:			
Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act (P.L. 114–182)	2	1	0
Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act (P.L. 114–187)	200	200	200
Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act of 2016 (P.L. 114–190)	−3	−3	0
Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016 (P.L. 114–198)	−9	−9	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	190	189	200
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	1,017,381	995,610	0
Total Current Level [a]	2,238,207	2,626,960	2,682,176
Total Senate Resolution	3,212,350	3,219,191	2,681,976
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	200

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AS OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2016—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	974,143	592,231	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2017–2026:			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	32,351,296
Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	32,350,752
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	544
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

[a] For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the budget resolution does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS, AS OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2016

[In millions of dollars]

	2016–2021	2016–2026
Beginning Balance [a]	0	0
Enacted Legislation: [b c d]		
Breast Cancer Awareness Commemorative Coin Act (P.L. 114–148) [c]	0	0
Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act (P.L. 114–151)	*	*
Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016 (P.L. 114–153)	*	*

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS, AS OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2016—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	2016–2021	2016–2026
Transnational Drug Trafficking Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–154)	*	*
A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Archivist of the United States, to convey certain Federal property located in the State of Alaska to the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska (P.L. 114–161)	*	*
To take certain Federal lands located in Lassen County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Susanville Indian Rancheria, and for other purposes (P.L. 114–181)	*	*
Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act (P.L. 114–182)	−5	1
FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 (P.L. 114–185)	*	*
Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–186)	*	*
Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act (P.L. 114–187) [f]	0	0
FAA Extension, Safety, and Security Act of 2016 (P.L. 114–190)	−33	−8
Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Extension Act of 2016 (P.L. 114–194)	*	*
United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (P.L. 114–196)	*	*
Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016 (P.L. 114–198)	199	−54
Making Electronic Government Accountable By Yielding Tangible Efficiencies Act of 2016 (P.L. 114–210)	*	*
John F. Kennedy Centennial Commission Act (P.L. 114–215)	*	*
A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes (P.L. 114–216)	*	*
Current Balance	81	−61

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS, AS OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2016—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	2016–2021	2016–2026
Memorandum:		
Changes to Revenues	410	544
Changes to Outlays	491	483

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.e. = not able to estimate; P.L. = Public Law; FOIA = Freedom of Information Act; FAA = Federal Aviation Administration; * = between −$500,000 and $500,000.

[a] Pursuant to the statement printed in the Congressional Record on April 18, 2016, the Senate Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard was reset to zero.

[b] The amounts shown represent the estimated impact of the public laws on the deficit. Negative numbers indicate an increase in the deficit; positive numbers indicate a decrease in the deficit.

[c] Excludes off-budget amounts.

[d] Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.

[e] CBO estimates that P.L. 114–148 will cause a decrease in spending of $7 million in 2018 and an increase in spending of $7 million in 2020, resulting in a net effect on the deficit of zero over the six-year and eleven-year periods.

[f] EO estimates that P.L. 114–187 will cause an increase in spending over the six-year and eleven-year periods but would also increase revenues by the same amount over the same periods resulting in a net effect on the deficit of zero over the six-year and eleven-year periods.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF LEGISLATION POST-BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2015 ENFORCEMENT FILING

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waive[c]	Result
53	April 19, 2016	S. Amdt. 3787 (Sen. Paul, R–KY) to S. Amdt. 2953 to S. 2012 (Energy Policy Modernization Act of 2015).	311(a)(2)(B)—Revenues reduced below levels assumed in the budget resolution[a].	Sen. Paul (R–KY)	33–64, Not Waived
76	May 19, 2016	S. Amdt. 3900 (Sen. Blunt, R–MO) to S. Amdt. 3896 to H.R. 2577 (Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act of 2017).	314(e)—Inclusion of emergency designations pursuant to Sec. 251 of BBEDCA[b].	Sen. Collins (R–ME)	70–28, Waived
79	May 19, 2016	S. Amdt. 4039 (Sen. McCain, R–AZ) to S. Amdt. 3896 to H.R. 2577 (Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act of 2017).	314(e)—Inclusion of emergency designations pursuant to Sec. 251 of BBEDCA[c].	Sen. McCain (R–AZ)	84–14, Waived
115	June 29, 2016	House Amendment to S. 2328, the vehicle for the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act (PROMESA).	425(a)(2)—Unfunded intergovernmental mandate in excess of limit[d].	Sen. Hatch (R–UT)	85–13, Waived

[a] At the time of consideration, a point estimate was unavailable for the Paul amendment. However, it was estimated that it would decrease revenues below the levels assumed in the budget resolution.

[b] This amendment designated $1.1 billion in outlays as being for emergency purposes. This funding, which was not offset, would be used to combat the Zika virus.

[c] This amendment designated $7.7 billion in outlays as being for emergency purposes. This funding, which was not offset, would be used to extend the Veterans Choice Program.

[d] In its estimate for PROMESA, the Congressional Budget Office found that the bill would impose a number of mandates on the territorial government of Puerto Rico and its instrumentalities. The costs of these mandates on public entities would exceed the annual threshold in UMRA for intergovernmental mandates ($77 million in 2016, adjusted annually for inflation).

[e] Unless otherwise noted, the motion to waive was offered pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

LAUNCH OF THE OSIRIS-REx SPACE CRAFT

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I am proud to come to the Senate floor to call attention and to honor the OSIRIS-REx spacecraft, which is scheduled to launch from Cape Canaveral, FL, tonight at 7 p.m.

In the finest traditions of space exploration, this spacecraft will journey on a 7-year roundtrip mission to an asteroid that NASA has classified as ''potentially hazardous'' to Earth—to complete a survey and return to Earth with the largest sample of extraterrestrial material since the Apollo lunar missions.

This program will yield insights into asteroid composition and how asteroids move in space. The truth is that, despite the potential for large asteroids to impact the Earth in catastrophic ways, we still know relatively little about them. The OSIRIS-REx mission will shed light onto both their physical and chemical properties, which is information that will be critical for predicting their movements and designing strategies to prevent catastrophic asteroid impacts to the Earth, as well as aid in the commercial exploitation of near-earth objects.

The most unique aspect of the OSIRIS-REx mission is the large and pristine sample of the asteroid that will be brought back to Earth, which will allow scientists to examine the composition of an asteroid using instruments and techniques that are far more advanced than what could be done in space. Scientists from the University of Arizona, UA, will also examine the sample for the resources that could be mined from asteroids in the future, such as precious metals. Interestingly, medium- to large-sized space rocks might contain hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars in minerals and precious metals.

Perhaps the most important aspect of this mission is the research into the origins of our universe and galaxy it will provide. The samples that the mission will bring back will help begin to answer some of the most profound and fundamental questions that have intrigued mankind since the beginning.

The OSIRIS-REx mission is funded by NASA and led by UA from my own great State of Arizona. I would like to congratulate UA president Ann Weaver Hart and former president Robert Shelton for championing space exploration; Dr. Dante Lauretta of the UA Lunar and Planetary Laboratory for his leadership as principal investigator; and his team, for bringing this exciting mission to the launch stage. I understand that under the leadership of the late Dr. Michael Drake and Dr. Lauretta, UA has been working on this concept for the last 15 years.

I would also like to acknowledge the other project partners, which include NASA's Goddard Space Center; Lockheed Martin, which built the spacecraft bus on which the various science instruments are mounted; Arizona State University, which built an instrument on the spacecraft that will investigate mineral abundances and provide temperature information; KinetX Aerospace; Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and United Launch Alliance

I also appreciate our international collaborators, including, the Canadian Space Agency and the Centre national d'études spatiales, CNES, i.e., the French Government space agency.

This mission is the latest of a long list of achievements by UA and its globally recognized space scientists. In fact, UA scientists have collaborated in every single American mission to the Moon and contributed to every mission to Mars since 1964, including serving as the lead on the Phoenix Mars Mission.

With this mission, UA is expanding the boundaries of space science, including innovating in the global challenge of planetary orbital object tracking through their Space Object Behavioral Sciences, SOBS, Initiative. Furthermore, I applaud UA, NASA, and Lockheed Martin for helping maintain U.S. leadership in near-Earth space, particularly at a time when the international community is showing a high interest in moving into this arena.

I wish the OSIRIS-REx team the best of luck for a successful launch. As the OSIRIS-REx countdown clock that has been hanging in my office for the last year gets very close to zero, I look forward to tuning in to NASA TV to watch history being made.

Thank you.

HONORING CHARLES WATERBURY

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the exceptional service and the extraordinary life of New Hampshire firefighter Charles ''Charlie'' Waterbury of Orford, NH.

Born and raised in Orford, Charlie graduated from Orford High School in 1978. Following graduation, Charlie enlisted in the U.S. Army and served for 4 years. After returning home, Charlie continued to serve his country and joined the New Hampshire Army National Guard. After 20 years of dedicated service to our State and our Nation, Charlie rose to the rank of E–5 sergeant.

Demonstrating his commitment to service, Charlie was a devoted member of the Orford community and known for his willingness to step up whenever help was needed. Prior to becoming a firefighter, Charlie served his hometown as a member of the town budget advisory committee, as a town tree warden, and, impressively, as a road agent for 17 years.

Ten years ago, Charlie joined the all-volunteer Orford Fire Department, where he soon became a beloved member of the team. Orford fire chief Terry Straight described Charlie as an excellent public servant whom ''everyone respected and looked up to'' and ''a great

go-to guy.'' On Sunday, July 24, as reports of a brush fire in Lyme came in, Charlie rushed to the scene, as he had done so many times before, placing the safety of others first. Sadly, Charlie gave his life in the line of duty to help extinguish the fire in Lyme. We are all grateful for Charlie's selfless service to Orford and the rest of our State.

Firefighter Waterbury leaves behind a daughter, Whitney Banker; a grandson, Arlo Austin Banker, and parents; Allan and Shirley Waterbury. We are all deeply saddened by the loss of a wonderful friend to many and an outstanding public servant, Charlie Waterbury.

Charlie represented the best of our State, and I send my deepest condolences to Whitney, Arlo, Allan, and Shirley during this difficult time. While we mourn the loss of an extraordinary man, we know that he served our State, Nation, and community with honor, courage, and dedication. Charlie gave so much to New Hampshire and our Nation, and we are forever grateful for his sacrifice and service.

REMEMBERING HENRY RUEMPLER

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the life and service of my friend and former staff member Henry Ruempler, who passed away on August 29, 2016.

Mr. Henry Ruempler served as staff counsel to the House Committee on Government Operations before joining my staff in 1979 as counsel and later served as legislative director. Henry worked many years in my Washington, DC, office, and was a trusted colleague and friend to those who knew him. Following his departure from the U.S. Senate, he worked in the private sector, specializing in taxation and banking until his retirement in 2003.

Henry's accomplishments and service extended beyond the workforce. He was a Boy Scout leader, for which he received the Silver Beaver Award for distinguished service; PTA board member; and treasurer of Northern Virginia Senior Softball. Above all, Henry was a dedicated family man. He was married for 45 years to his wife Susan. They have to two children, Kyle and Shannon; and two grandchildren, Maryella and Charlie.

For myself and all those who knew Henry, I commemorate his years of service, his friendship, and a life well lived.

ENDOCRINE SOCIETY CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and congratulate the Endocrine Society in honor of its Centennial anniversary this year.

Founded in 1916, the Endocrine Society is the world's oldest and largest professional society for endocrinologists and endocrine scientists, who focus their efforts on understanding and caring for the large interconnected system of glands in our bodies that produce hormones needed for the daily function of our bodies. These physicians and researchers are at the core of solving the most pressing health problems of our time—from diabetes and obesity, to infertility, bone health, and hormone-related cancers.

Throughout this year, the Endocrine Society is celebrating its 100th anniversary by focusing on endocrinology's past contributions to science and public health, while keeping an eye on today's promising research, which will lead to the discoveries of tomorrow. I am very pleased that this included holding its annual meeting and expo in Boston which drew thousands of endocrinologists from around the globe to Massachusetts. I am also pleased to note that this year the president of the Endocrine Society is Dr. Henry Kronenberg, chief of the endocrine unit at Massachusetts General Hospital, and Professor of Medicine at Harvard Medical School in Boston, MA.

Over the Endocrine Society's past 100 years, there have been remarkable discoveries and advances in biomedical research, but there is still much to learn. Thankfully, advances in endocrine research are accelerating. Today, thanks in part to funding from the National Institutes of Health, we have many doctors and scientists working to create fascinating tools to improve human health.

As one example, the bionic pancreas, developed by Dr. Ed Damiano, a professor of biomedical engineering at Boston University, completely automates the process of tracking and adjusting blood sugar. This device does not cure diabetes, but it battles its greatest threat: the dramatic fluctuations in blood sugar that cause significant side effects and even death.

I am truly appreciative of the accomplishments of endocrinologists and endocrine researchers—many who work, study, and practice in Massachusetts—over the past 100 years, and I am excited about the future of this field and better understanding how our environment impacts the way in which our hormones function and contribute to disease.

I offer sincere congratulations to the Endocrine Society on their 100th anniversary, and I look forward to seeing future advancements in the field that lead to women and men living longer, healthier lives.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR WILLIAM GORBY

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I wish to acknowledge the service of my former defense fellow MAJ William Gorby, who is coming to the end of his assignment as part of his experience in the Army Congressional Fellowship Program.

Mike joined my office in 2014, and immediately, his dedication, work ethic, and intelligence made him a trusted voice on my legislative team. A proud member of the West Virginia National Guard, Mike has deployed multiple times in defense of our country, and through his service, our Nation is a safer place. Most importantly, Mike is also a devoted husband and father, and I have had the pleasure of watching his family grow over the last several years.

As Mike moves on to another assignment outside the realm of legislation, I want to extend my thanks for his service and wish him and his family continued success in his future endeavors.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING HOPE FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE RECOVERY

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize National Recovery Month and to applaud the accomplishments of a great organization in my home State: HOPE for New Hampshire Recovery. As New Hampshire battles a growing heroin and prescription opioid abuse crisis, the team at HOPE has brought a compassionate approach to caring for their fellow Granite Staters. Across our State, HOPE has opened six recovery centers in Manchester, Derry, Newport, Claremont, Concord, and Berlin. I was glad to join them at many of these grand opening ceremonies. These centers are important community resources, and I appreciate their work to reach every corner of our State. On Sunday, September 17, 2016, HOPE is hosting the Rally4Recovery NH, so that New Hampshire residents can show support for their families, friends, neighbors, and loved ones living in or seeking recovery.

National Recovery Month is sponsored by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration as a means to bring greater awareness and understanding of mental and substance use disorders and to celebrate people in recovery.

Ensuring support exists for policies, programs, and initiatives that can lead to long-term recovery is a critically important piece of our comprehensive response to the heroin and prescription opioid abuse epidemic. This crisis touches all of us and as a significant public health crisis; our response must be comprehensive in nature, focusing on prevention, treatment, recovery, and support for first responders, in addition to working together to eliminate the stigma associated with addiction. National Recovery Month helps bring awareness to the efforts of groups like HOPE, who work in their communities to provide long-term resources for individuals seeking and in recovery.

We are fortunate for the dedicated work that HOPE does on a daily basis to support recovery in New Hampshire, and I am deeply grateful for their efforts to change the conversation around substance use disorders and show that long-term recovery is achievable. As we recognize National

Recovery Month this September, I applaud organizations like HOPE for New Hampshire Recovery that are making significant differences in their communities and helping to save and improve lives.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

● Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to help commemorate the 50th anniversary of the founding of the New Hampshire College & University Council, NHCUC. Throughout the past half century, the NHCUC has consistently endeavored to advance the interests of both public and private higher education in my home State of New Hampshire.

Established in 1966 as a statewide consortium of both public and private higher education institutions, the council is committed to enhancing the quality of higher education in New Hampshire, offering students attending its member institutions opportunities for enriched experiences, as well as providing a foundation for enhanced communication among the member institutions.

The NHCUC is directed by the chancellors and presidents of the member institutions who have supported the collaborative work of the organization for 50 years. The council serves its member institutions through programs in academic affairs, admissions, library services, career services, and many other programs and initiatives in service to the students, faculty, and staff at the member institutions.

In addition, the NHCUC offers an important voice in advocating awareness of and appreciation for the importance of the higher education sector as a partner in growing New Hampshire's economic prosperity, educating the next generation of skilled workers for the twenty-first century, and enhancing the civic life of our State and local communities.

I appreciate the work of this unique statewide higher education consortium that strives to encourage all of New Hampshire's citizens to promote and advance both public and private higher education in the Granite State. It is my honor to recognize and congratulate the New Hampshire College & University Council as they reach this historic milestone, and I wish them many more years of success.●

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FREE & CHARITABLE CLINICS

● Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the National Association of Free & Charitable Clinics on their 15th anniversary and to recognize the outstanding work of our Nation's 1,200 free and charitable clinics in providing vital medical services to low-income, uninsured residents, including the eight clinics in my home State of West Virginia.

West Virginia's free and charitable clinics, with the assistance of their more than 1,000 dedicated volunteer professionals, provide health care for over 42,000 working poor of West Virginia. These clinics focus on the overall needs of patients by providing medical, dental, pharmaceutical, behavior health, vision, and health education services and ensure a medical home for vulnerable at-risk West Virginians.

Annually, America's 1,200 free and charitable clinics provide health care to 1.7 million people through 5.9 million patient visits. This is accomplished through a dedicated staff and over 160,000 volunteers, including 30,000 medical providers, 21,000 nurses, and almost 71,000 nonmedical volunteers.

Free and charitable clinics do not receive dedicated Federal funding. Instead, these clinics rely heavily on private donations from individual donors, foundations, grants, and volunteers, which allow them to keep their doors open and to deliver health care to those who need it the most.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in Congress to better address the needs of the medically underserved and to increase awareness and understanding of the important work that free and charitable clinics do every day.●

TRIBUTE TO LAURANCE M. MILLER

● Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I am pleased to share with my colleagues a remarkable achievement by a very distinguished American citizen, Laurance M. Miller. On October 29, 2016, Mr. Miller will have devoted over 50 years of his life to the service of his country as an officer and civil servant in the U.S. Air Force. His honorable career began when he was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Air Force on June 6, 1966, from ROTC at the University of Akron.

Miller was stationed at Chanute Air Force Base in Illinois for training as an aircraft maintenance officer and assigned to the 526th TAC Fighter Squadron in 1967. In 1969, Miller received his orders to Vietnam, but the Pueblo Crisis diverted him to Kunsan Air Force Base in Korea, where he served as a maintenance officer for the next year and was promoted to captain.

In 1970, Miller was honorably discharged from Active Duty, but remained an Air Force Reservist with the 916th TAC Fighter Squadron in Youngstown, OH, until 1977.

On August 11, 1973, Miller made the best decision of his life when he married Patricia Kraus at St. Sebastian's Catholic Church in Akron, OH. They are the proud parents of Kevin, Melissa, and Matthew, and now grandparents of Ethan, Joy, Dylan, and Joshua.

Miller resumed Active Duty in 1977 and was assigned to Air Force Reserve Headquarters, AFRH, at Robins Air Force Base in Georgia. During his assignment at AFRH, he was promoted to major and honorably discharged from Active Duty in 1982.

He and his family then moved to New Orleans, LA, where he was assigned to 526th TAC Fighter Squadron and the New Orleans Naval Air Station as an air reserve technician. There he had the unique distinction of serving simultaneously as a civil servant for the Air Force, as well as an active Air Force Reservist.

Miller was assigned to Air Force Materiel Command, AFMC, individual mobilization augmentee at Hanscom Air Force Base in Massachusetts in 1984. During this time, he continued to serve as both a civil service employee and an active Reservist for the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. Laurance Miller devoted his life to the U.S. Air Force. His patriotic and unselfish commitment to his chosen branch of service and to the United States of America are extraordinary. I am honored to recognize him for a job well done, and I sincerely wish Larry and Pat happy trails as they enjoy a well-earned retirement together.●

TRIBUTE TO TOM RUMMEL

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I recognize Tom Rummel of Sanders County, who has served as sheriff since 2010. Thanks to his initiative and hard work, citizens affected by the Copper King Fire have been kept safe and up to speed on the latest fire activity.

Sheriff Rummel has coordinated local law enforcement and emergency services for weeks to ensure the safety of Montanans and their property as the Copper King Fire has grown to be the largest wildfire in the State.

As the fire increased in size to over 28,000 acres, Mr. Rummel implemented evacuation and pre-evacuation notices to numerous residences. In addition to phone calls, public notices around the county, and house visits, Sheriff Rummel has used Facebook to keep the community apprised of the very latest information about the fire. He has posted regular updates to the Sanders County Sheriff's Facebook page, using the power of social media to get the word out to his community.

While recent weather has tempered the spread of the Copper King Fire, Sanders County will not be completely out of the woods until we see a season-ending weather event. As Montanans continue to suffer the consequences of Federal mismanagement of our forests, it is often up to local leaders to protect our communities from wildfires.

I commend Sheriff Rummel for his tireless work to keep Montanans safe and keep his community informed. All Montanans, and indeed all Americans, owe our local law enforcement and emergency responders a debt of gratitude for their daily efforts on our behalf.●

REMEMBERING DOUGLAS MOORE

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Douglas Moore

from Montgomery, AL, who passed away on June 4, 2016. Doug was a good man who loved his family, his country, his many friends, and was always positive and productive, and he was a good friend, adviser, and helper to me. He made his own decisions and worked hard to achieve the values he believed in even when it was not easy to do so. That determination and courage was something I appreciated and admired, as did so many.

Doug and I knew each other for many years and grew up in rural Alabama not too far away from each other and at a similar time. We understood each other and shared a history of time and place. Doug was one of my favorite people. His positive spirit was contagious, as he was always thinking and always working to make America a better place. That is the definition of a patriot.

He was a man of many talents and a successful businessman. He owned a wide variety of businesses, from restaurants to a cosmetics line, courier service, and a car dealership. He worked particularly hard in Alabama to promote small and minority businesses. I was pleased to successfully urge his appointment by President Bush to the committee overseeing the U.S. Department of Agriculture responsibilities in Alabama. The Alabama Farm Service Agency handles programs including commodities, loans, disaster assistance, food assistance, and export credits. He had a farming background and was a valuable member of the committee, fully understanding the needs of small and minority farmers in the State.

Doug will always be remembered for his love of his family, church, and fellow man. He leaves behind his wife of 45 years, Shirley Ann Moore; his loving daughter, Carmen Moore-Zeigler; son-in-law, Henry Zeigler; a granddaughter who was the apple of his eye, Da Brianna Zeigler; and 11 brothers and sisters.●

REMEMBERING TYREE A. RICHBURG

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I rise today to remember Tyree A. Richburg of Mobile, AL. Reverend, marshal, and chief, Richburg had a wonderful life that blessed so many. He was a great law enforcement officer, starting as a patrolman for the Mobile Police Department, where he worked for over 40 years earning the rank of lieutenant in 1978, and then as chief of police for Prichard, AL. Following that, he was appointed as U.S. marshal for the Southern District of Alabama, where he served with distinction from 1978 to 1981. Appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, U.S. marshals stand with the U.S. attorney as the representatives for the executive branch of the government in the judicial districts. Marshal Richburg was supported by his fine team of deputies and staff and, under his leadership, he fulfilled his duties in an exceptional manner.

In 1988, after years of dedicated service in law enforcement, he accepted a calling to ministry and in 2001 began his tenure as pastor of the Tabernacle Missionary Baptist Church. Indeed, in many ways his concept of law enforcement was as a ministry. He was firm with lawbreakers, but he treated each one with dignity and the kindness the situation would allow.

Tyree Richburg was honest, courageous, determined, generous, and kind. He reflected the great qualities we should all strive for. During the time I was U.S. attorney, he was a good friend and we worked together in a relationship of confidence and trust.

His beloved wife of 63 years, Celestine Richburg, preceded him in death, but he leaves behind 4 children, 10 grandchildren, 5 great-grandchildren, and many loving clergy associates and friends.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:47 a.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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2845. An act to promote access to benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4481. An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for developing countries to promote quality basic education and to establish the goal of all children in school and learning as an objective of the United States foreign assistance policy, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5063. An act to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5537. An act to promote internet access in developing countries and update foreign policy toward the internet, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

The message also announced that the Speaker appoints Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois as a conferee to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Whitfield of Kentucky on the conference committee on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2012) to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 4(a) of the John F. Kennedy Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 114–215), the Minority Leader appoints Mr. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY III of Massachusetts to the John F. Kennedy Centennial Commission.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2845. An act to promote access to benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 4481. An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for developing countries to promote quality basic education and to establish the goal of all children in school and learning as an objective of the United States foreign assistance policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 5063. An act to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5537. An act to promote internet access in developing countries and update foreign policy toward the internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 3296. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption to the individual mandate to maintain health coverage for individuals residing in counties with fewer than 2 health insurance issuers offering plans on an Exchange.

S. 3297. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption to the individual mandate to maintain health coverage for certain individuals whose premium has increased by more than 10 percent, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6740. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Citrus tristeza virus expressing spinach defensin proteins 2, 7, and 8; Temporary Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9947–19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the

President of the Senate on August 30, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6741. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Butanedioic acid, 2-methylene-, polymer with 1,3 butanediene, ethylbenzene and 2 hydroxyethyl-2-propenoate; Tolerance Exemption'' (FRL No. 9950–63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 30, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6742. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Chlorantraniliprole; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9950–04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6743. A communication from the Board Chair and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's proposed fiscal year 2016 budget; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6744. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director of Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rural Broadband Access Loans and Loan Guarantees'' (RIN0572–AC34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6745. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Viruses, Serums, Toxins, and Analogous Products; Packaging and Labeling'' ((RIN0579–AE19) (Docket No. APHIS–2008–0008)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 30, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6746. A communication from the Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–6747. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–6748. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interpretive Rule Under the Military Lending Act Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended to Service Members and Dependents'' (RIN0790–ZA11) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6749. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations to Include August 4, 2016 Continuation of Emergency Declared in Executive Order 13222'' (RIN0694–AH09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6750. A communication from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2015 management reports; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6751. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility; Sacramento County, CA, et al.'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2016–0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6752. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility; Athens-Clarke County, GA, et al.'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2016–0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6753. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Access to Data Obtained by Security-Based Swap Data Repositories'' (RIN3235–AL74) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6754. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6755. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting proposed legislation to approve the location of the National Desert Storm War Memorial; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6756. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Compact Fluorescent Lamps'' ((RIN1904–AC74) (Docket No. EERE–2015–BT–TP–0014)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 30, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6757. A communication from the Division Chief, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''BLM Internet-Based Auctions'' (RIN1004–AE46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6758. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the activities of the U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA) for fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6759. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the West Sacramento project in Yolo County, California; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6760. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Craig Harbor, Alaska, Navigation Improvement Project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6761. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the American River Common Features project in Sacramento and Yolo Counties, California; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6762. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Priorities List'' (FRL No. 9952–06–OLEM) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6763. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Connecticut; NOx Emission Trading Orders as Single Source SIP Revisions'' (FRL No. 9957–94–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6764. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Ocean Dumping: Modification of an Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site Offshore of Charleston, South Carolina'' (FRL No. 9951–96–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6765. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Redesignation of the Indiana Portion of the Louisville Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard for Fine Particulate Matter'' (FRL No. 9951–95–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6766. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for Maryland'' (FRL No. 9950–98–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6767. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Kansas; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2012 Annual Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)'' (FRL No. 9951–87–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6768. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Quality Designations for the 2012 Primary Annual Fine Particle Matter (PM2.5) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for Areas in Georgia and Florida'' (FRL No. 9951–91–OAR) received in

the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6769. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''State of Iowa; Approval and Promulgation of the Title V Operating Permits Program, the State Implementation Plan, and 112(1) Plan'' (FRL No. 9951–86–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6770. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers'' ((RIN2060–AS10) (FRL No. 9951–64–OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6771. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Puerto Rico; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2008 Ozone, 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter and 2008 Lead NAAQS'' (FRL No. 9945–84–Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6772. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Engines and Vehicles - Phase 2'' ((RIN2060–AS16 and RIN2127–AL52) (FRL No. 9950–25–OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6773. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Expiration Dates for Four Body Systems Listings'' (RIN0960–AI03) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6774. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2016–1114); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6775. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2016–1115); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6776. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 16–014); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6777. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (P.L. 107–243) and the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution (P.L. 102–1) for the April 11, 2016–June 9, 2016 reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6778. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 16–045); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6779. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 16–027); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6780. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 16–030); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6781. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 16–047); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6782. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 16–041); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6783. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 16–050); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6784. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period April 1, 2016 through May 31, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6785. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Presidential Appointments, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State (Western Hemisphere Affairs), received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6786. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Presidential Appointments, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a vacancy in the position of Ambassador at Large for War Crimes Issues, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6787. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Presidential Appointments, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of State (Political-Military Affairs), received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6788. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 16–056); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6789. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Labeling; Technical Amendments'' (Docket No. FDA–2016–N–0011) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6790. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Requirements for Foreign and Domestic Establishment Registration and Listing for Human Drugs, Including Drugs That Are Regulated Under a Biologics License Application, and Animal Drugs'' ((RIN0910–AA49) (Docket No. FDA–2005–N–0464)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6791. A communication from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's 2016 Annual Report; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6792. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease: 2016 Update''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6793. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Health, United States, 2015''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6794. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Programs and Activities Authorized by the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (Title II of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act)'' (RIN1830–AA22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6795. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, Miscellaneous Program Changes'' (RIN1820–AB71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6796. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''State Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program; State Supported Employment Services Program; Limitations on Use of Subminimum Wage'' (RIN1820–AB70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6797. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Head Start Performance Standards'' (RIN0970–AC63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6798. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, Miscellaneous Program Changes'' ((RIN1820–

AB71) (Docket ID ED–2015–OSERS–0002)) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6799. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Programs and Activities Authorized by the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (Title II of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act)'' ((RIN1830–AA22) (Docket ID ED–2015–OCTAE–0003)) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6800. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''State Vocational Rehabilitation Services program; State Supported Employment Services program; Limitations on Use of Subminimum Wage'' ((RIN1820–AB70) (Docket ID ED–2015–OSERS–0001)) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6801. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Savings Arrangements Established by States for Non-Governmental Employees'' (RIN1210–AB71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 30, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6802. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''The Food and Drug Administration Food Safety Modernization Act; Extension and Clarification of Compliance Dates for Certain Provisions of Four Implementing Rules'' ((RIN0910–AG10; RIN0910–AG35; RIN0910–AG36; and RIN0910–AG64) (Docket Nos. FDA–2011–N–0920; FDA–2011–N–0921; FDA–2011–N–0922; and FDA–2011–N–0143)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6803. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''New Animal Drugs for Use in Animal Feed; Category Definitions'' (Docket No. FDA–2016–N–1896) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6804. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final priority and requirement—Equity Assistance Centers'' ((CFDA No. 84.004D.) (Docket No. ED–2016–OESE–0015)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6805. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–449, ''Medical Marijuana Cultivation Center Relocation Temporary Amendment Act of 2016''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6806. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''District Agencies Did Not Provide Sufficient Oversight of Private Development Projects and Have Not Collected Potentially Significant Fines''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6807. A communication from the Office Program Manager, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Loan Guarantee: Delegation of Authority'' (RIN2900–AP77) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2016; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–6808. A communication from the Acting Director, Planning and Policy Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and Federal Employees Dental and Vision Insurance Program: Excepted Service and Pathways Programs Miscellaneous Clarifications and Corrections'' (RIN3206–AM97) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6809. A communication from the Acting Director, Pay and Leave, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Asheville, NC, and Charlotte, NC, Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas'' (RIN3206–AN37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6810. A communication from the Acting Director, Pay and Leave, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prevailing Rate Systems; Abolishment of the Newburgh, NY, Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area'' (RIN3206–AN26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6811. A communication from the Acting Director, Planning and Policy Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Program: Court Orders Prior to July 22, 1998'' (RIN3206–AM67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6812. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–469, ''Grocery Store Restrictive Covenant Prohibition Temporary Act of 2016''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6813. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–471, ''Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Compact Temporary Amendment Act of 2016''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6814. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–470, ''Gas Station Advisory Board Temporary Amendment Act of 2016''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6815. A communication from the Chief, Administrative Law Division, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, Central Intelligence Agency, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 31, 2016; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC–6816. A communication from the Chair of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a pending amendment to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–6817. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the activities and operations of the Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, and the nationwide federal law enforcement effort against public corruption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–6818. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5462)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6819. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–3989)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6820. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–0466)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6821. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5460)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6822. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–8468)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6823. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–8429)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6824. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–8841)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6825. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5464)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6826. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5594)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6827. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–8472)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6828. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–8838)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6829. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5459)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6830. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Continental Motors, Inc. Reciprocating Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6831. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5465)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6832. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (62); Amdt. No. 3703'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6833. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (69); Amdt. No. 3704'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6834. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (56); Amdt. No. 3706'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6835. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (73); Amdt. No. 3705'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6836. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Linton, ND'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5456)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6837. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Platte, SD'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5386)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6838. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Harvey, ND'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5487)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6839. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Park River, ND'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5856)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6840. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Michigan towns; Alma, MI; Bellaire, MI; Cadillac, MI; Drummond Island, MI; Gladwin, MI; Holland, MI; and Three Rivers, MI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–4629)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6841. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Minnesota Towns; Hutchinson, MN; Jackson, MN; Pipestone, MN; Two Harbors, MN; and Waseca, MN'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–4271)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6842. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class C Airspace; Syracuse Hancock International Airport, NY'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–3937)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6843. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class C Airspace; Boise, ID'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–7467)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6844. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class C Airspace; Peoria, IL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–7416)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6845. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Class E Airspace; Lake Providence, LA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–4236)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6846. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Class D Airspace; North, SC'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–1074)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6847. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Small-Mesh Multispecies Fishery; Adjustment to the Northern Red Hake Inseason Possession Limit'' (RIN0648–XE787) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6848. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Dusky Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XE708) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6849. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands'' (RIN0648–XE789) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6850. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts'' (RIN0648–XE810) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6851. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer'' (RIN0648–XE802) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6852. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Adjustment to the 2016 Winter II Quota'' (RIN0648–XE755) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6853. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''On-Time Performance Under Section 213 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008'' (RIN2140–AB22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6854. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of the Champlain Valley of New York Viticultural Area'' (RIN1513–AC19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6855. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Expansion of the Sta. Rita Hills Viticultural Area'' (RIN1513–AC10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6856. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazmat Division, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: FAST Act Requirements for Flammable Liquids and Rail Tank Cars'' (RIN2137–AF17) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6857. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Maryville, Missouri)'' ((MB Docket No. 16–68) (DA 16–894)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6858. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991'' ((FCC 16–99) (CG Docket No. 02–278)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6859. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2014 Quadrennial Regulatory Review—Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; 2010 Quadrennial Regulatory Review—Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Promoting Diversification of Ownership in the Broadcasting Services; Rules and Policies Concerning Attribution of Joint Sales Agreements in Local Television Markets'' ((FCC 16–107) (MB Docket No. 14–50; MB Docket No. 09–182; MB Docket No. 07–294; and MB Docket No. 04–256)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6860. A communication from the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice relative to the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Chairman's Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6861. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XE707) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 815. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians (Rept. No. 114–345).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment and an amendment to the title:

S. 1007. A bill to amend the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 to rename a site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park (Rept. No. 114–346).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 1448. A bill to designate the Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary in the State of Oregon (Rept. No. 114–347).

S. 2309. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish within the National Park Service the U.S. Civil Rights Network, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–348).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Kathleen Marie Sweet, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

Danny C. Reeves, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2019.

Charles R. Breyer, of California, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2021.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 3299. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to notify air carriers and

security screening personnel of the Transportation Security Administration of the guidelines of the Administration regarding permitting baby formula, breast milk, and juice on aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 3300. A bill to approve the settlement of water rights claims of the Hualapai Tribe and certain allottees in the State of Arizona, to authorize construction of a water project relating to those water rights claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 3301. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to ensure small businesses affected by the onset of transmissible diseases are eligible for disaster relief; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 3302. A bill establishing the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Emergency Response Fund for the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to provide assistance for a public health emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 3303. A bill to exempt firefighters and police officers from the government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 3304. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve the Veterans Crisis Line; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 3305. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the use of electronic visit verification systems for home health services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 3306. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit dismemberment abortions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 3307. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to avoid duplicative annual reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEE, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S.J. Res. 39. A joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of M1A1/A2 Abrams Tank structures and other major defense equipment; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. Res. 549. A resolution expressing a commitment by the Senate to never forget the service of aviation's first responders; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. ERNST, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 550. A resolution designating the week of September 5 through September 9, 2016, as ''Recognizing the 40th Anniversary of Women at the United States Naval Academy Week'' ; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 17

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 17, a bill to repeal the provision of law that provides automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 275, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare program.

S. 1476

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1476, a bill to require States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding shooting incidents involving law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 1634

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1634, a bill to amend the Federal antitrust laws to provide expanded coverage and to eliminate exemptions from such laws that are contrary to the public interest with respect to railroads.

S. 2253

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2253, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide veterans affected by closures of educational institutions certain relief and restoration of educational benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 2311

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2311, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, to make grants to States for screening and treatment for maternal depression.

S. 2645

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2645, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2645, supra.

S. 2702

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) 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 Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) 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 Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) 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. 2720

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2720, a bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to amend certain regulations, and for other purposes.

S. 2763

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2763, a bill to provide the victims of Holocaust-era persecution and their heirs a fair opportunity to recover works of art confiscated or misappropriated by the Nazis.

S. 2890

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2890, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe.

S. 2927

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2927, a bill to prevent governmental discrimination against providers of health services who decline

involvement in abortion, and for other purposes.

S. 2932

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2932, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the provision of emergency medical services.

S. 2934

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2934, a bill to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale.

S. 2993

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2993, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the spill prevention, control, and countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms.

S. 3039

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3039, a bill to support programs for mosquito-borne and other vector-borne disease surveillance and control.

S. 3065

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3065, a bill to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to invest in funding prevention and family services to help keep children safe and supported at home, to ensure that children in foster care are placed in the least restrictive, most family-like, and appropriate settings, and for other purposes.

S. 3153

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3153, a bill to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes.

S. 3155

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3155, a bill to amend chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, to clarify the exception to foreign sovereign immunity set forth in section 1605(a)(3) of such title.

S. 3164

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3164, a bill to provide protection for survivors of domestic violence or sexual assault under the Fair Housing Act.

S. 3179

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3179, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve and extend the credit for carbon dioxide sequestration.

S. 3195

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3195, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve Medicare beneficiary access to ventilators, and for other purposes.

S. 3230

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3230, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish an initiative, carried out by the Assistant Secretary for Aging, to coordinate Federal efforts and programs for home modifications enabling older individuals to live independently and safely in a home environment, and for other purposes.

S. 3251

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3251, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption to the individual mandate to maintain health coverage for certain individuals whose premium has increased by more than 10 percent, and for other purposes.

S. 3256

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3256, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for developing countries to promote quality basic education and to establish the goal of all children in school and learning as an objective of the United States foreign assistance policy, and for other purposes.

S. 3276

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3276, a bill to make habitual drunk drivers inadmissible and removable and to require the detention of any alien who is unlawfully present in the United States and has been charged with driving under the influence or driving while intoxicated.

S. 3281

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3281, a bill to extend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996.

S. 3285

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3285, a bill to prohibit the President from using funds appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, to make payments to Iran, to impose sanctions with respect to Iranian persons that hold or detain United States citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 3296

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3296, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption to the individual mandate to maintain health coverage for individuals residing in counties with fewer than 2 health insurance issuers offering plans on an Exchange.

S. CON. RES. 49

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 49, a concurrent resolution supporting efforts to stop the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items of Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians in the United States and internationally.

AMENDMENT NO. 4981

At the request of Mr. REID, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4981 proposed to S. 2848, a bill 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4983

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4983 intended to be proposed to S. 2848, a bill 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, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 3301. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to ensure small businesses affected by the onset of transmissible diseases are eligible for disaster relief; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I come to the floor again—I believe for the 10th time since March—to discuss the Zika virus.

The first time I talked about this was back in January. There was a report out that said Zika, the disease, was being transmitted by mosquitoes and

there was an outbreak in Brazil. Immediately for me alarm bells went off because being from Miami, FL, my hometown, if you go to the airport and look at the board, the number of flights coming from Brazil to South Florida, the numbers are high. There are dozens of flights a week back and forth. My immediate thought at that time was that this is going to be an issue for Florida and ultimately for America, given the amount of travel back and forth.

I also saw the outbreak in the territory of Puerto Rico, a place I have taken a tremendous interest in since my time here. As everyone knows, Puerto Rico is not officially represented in this Chamber, but I, along with my colleagues Senator MENENDEZ of New Jersey and Senator NELSON of Florida, have always looked out for the interests of the island and its people who are U.S. citizens. So knowing the link between Florida and Puerto Rico and the link between Zika and Puerto Rico, I knew as early as January that this was going to be an issue. I immediately talked to our Border Patrol folks and our Customs people at our airports and seaports about ensuring we are doing everything we can.

In March, when the President came out in February and March and talked about the need for $1.9 billion to fight Zika, I believe I was the first Republican—certainly in this Chamber—to come out in favor of that request because my argument at the time was, we don't know fully what we are dealing with here, but let's get ahead of it. Let's jump in front of it and let's deal with it. Otherwise it will only get worse. Unfortunately, that didn't happen.

In much of April and March, there was not much attention paid to this. So cases started coming up domestically, mostly travel-related. The Senate did move, and I am proud of the fact that after some back and forth, this place worked. We worked across the aisle, and I worked with Senator NELSON on his proposal and other proposals. In fact, I believe I am the only Member of Congress who voted in favor of every single Zika proposal because in my mind I wanted the money to flow so local governments and States could deal with it and researchers could develop a vaccine. We passed a law for $1.1 billion. It was a product of compromise. It was less than what the President asked for, but it began to move. Unfortunately, the House had a different idea and this is where we are today.

When we left in July, there had not been a reported case of a transmission of Zika by a mosquito, but as I warned through April, May, June, and July, it was only a matter of time. If you spent any amount of time in Florida, you know it is hot, it is humid, that it rains, and there are a lot of mosquitoes. You have a State which is a key entry point between key areas and the continental United States and you have mosquitoes. It didn't take a scientist or an expert in Zika to know the combination of those two things were going to lead to locally based transmission. Sadly, that is what is happening.

There is a neighborhood in Miami, FL, called Wynwood. This was an area that is economically depressed and it has come alive. It is a center of art. They have these murals where graffiti artists were allowed to come in and put in these extraordinary murals. It is not graffiti. It is art. It is a place where the art community is centered and has come alive with some of the best restaurants in South Florida. This is the Wynwood community.

It is a magnet for tourists. There are people who fly to Florida, and South Florida in particular, and go straight to Wynwood because they want to be in that area. It was the first area impacted, and the CDC came out with a warning telling people to avoid a neighborhood. This is usually the kind of advisory that goes out about avoiding other countries, telling Americans and travelers, specifically, to avoid a certain part of a certain neighborhood.

Can you imagine the impact it had on the businesses in that community? We talked about the human toll of Zika, of the infection, and of what it does to unborn children, but there is also the economic impact of having a lead health care agency in charge of public health in America issue a warning to Americans to avoid a neighborhood in an American city. I promise you that was not good for those businesses. Some of these businesses had to close for weeks on end and days on end.

Then a few weeks later we had reports of the disease being transmitted on Miami Beach. I don't need to tell you about Miami Beach. Everyone knows about Miami Beach. It is the cornerstone of tourism in South Florida. People come to Miami Beach from all over the world to enjoy world-class beaches, nightlife, entertainment, and restaurants. I want you to put yourself in a position of a small business owner—not just a large hotel chain, which is relevant here, but a small business owner.

Imagine if you are a family who runs a restaurant on Collins Avenue in Miami Beach. You are depending your whole year, your budget and your payroll is built on a predictable pattern of travelers coming in the summer and coming in the fall and especially in the winter. You are estimating the number of travelers who will come in. They will leave money at these restaurants and they are going to go home. Now you have a report of these transmissions and similar warnings as well. What you learn from this is that this Zika issue is not just a health care issue—and that is by far the primary focus of what our attention should be—but it is also an economic issue and it is hurting small businesses. It is hurting the municipalities. Miami Beach as a city is going to see tax revenues go down. It is going to hurt the State of Florida because of failed tax revenue and so forth. It is going to hurt one of the engines of our tourism sector—the reports of this transmission. You know what is hurting it even worse? When people turn on the news, people are hearing there are people being infected with Zika in Florida and Congress is still haggling and fighting over it and can't get anything done. That does not inspire confidence.

So today I have filed a bill, an additional bill, in addition to calling on us to move on Zika. Let me touch on this first. It is inexcusable. How did we get to this point? How did a public health crisis become a political tool to be played with back and forth? Yet that is what Washington has become, a place that has become expert at literally turning any issue into a political issue, and it has done so again with this issue. That is why people are grossed out and disgusted with American politics. When they watch the news and see this fighting, they don't get it. They understand there is this problem with Zika, and it is spreading and hurting people. We just had a case of a child born in Miami Dade County, at the Jackson Memorial Hospital—not with microcephaly but with Zika—a child, a baby, starting out life infected with Zika. They are asking: How can you guys turn this thing into a political issue? That is what Washington has done. Both parties are to blame. It took too long for some in my party to come to the realization this was important. On the Democratic side, they have come up with excuses to be against the proposal, but I will say this: The Senate did it. The Senate funded it. I think at this point, that is probably the fastest and best way forward, if we are serious about funding this, is to go back to what the Senate did. I continue to work with our colleagues to make sure that is a part of whatever vehicle we use to fund the government and keep it open through most of the rest of this year.

But today I filed a bill to help people being economically impacted by it. It is a bill that deals with the Small Business Administration. What it does is it basically gives the Small Business Administration the authority to give out small business loans to communities negatively impacted by health-related travel advisories issued by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. As you know, as I said earlier, the CDC has already issued those travel advisories to Wynwood and for the South Beach areas of Miami-Dade County, but that does not mean a week from now there will not be another area added to that, including another area in your State, my colleagues. You don't know when that is coming. So if they were hit by a storm, they would qualify for this. If they were hit by any other disaster, they would qualify for this. They have been hit by a storm. It happens to be a health care storm. It is hurting them economically. We need to

make sure they have the flexibility and the ability to provide this short-term, low-interest loans to small businesses to be able to weather this health care Zika storm.

I don't know for the life of me why anybody would be against this. I don't know what possible way you could try to politicize it. I am not sure why anybody would object to it. My hope is, we can move quickly on this. It is important.

I know there is a lot of jurisdictional pride around here and committees will say: Well, you have to come through us first because we are the chairmen and this is our committee. I hope you can make an exception on this issue because these businesses are hurting. They are hurting badly because of what has happened, and it is only going to get worse for them as these reports come out.

I hope we can get that passed. Here is another thing people don't know. Our service men and women are deployed all over the world. Unlike people who travel, they don't have a choice. When the U.S. military tells you and your dependents you must now go to Honduras, you are now going to be stationed at a base in Guantanamo Bay or you are going to be stateside, but you are going to be in Puerto Rico—when they deploy you, you can't say: Well, I am not going because there is Zika there. You have to go. We need to make sure we are protecting our men and women.

According to the Pentagon, as of today, there are 81 servicemembers and 19 dependents who have tested positive for the Zika virus. Three of them, by the way, are pregnant. So I have filed a second bill to protect our servicemembers from Zika. It is called the Servicemembers' Zika Protection Act. It provides U.S. troops with additional protections from the Zika virus by authorizing the Secretary of Defense to transfer funds within the existing Department of Defense medical and health research accounts in order to combat the Zika virus.

I am hopeful we can unite behind that as well. With over 100 members of our military and their families already infected with Zika, we need to take specific precautions to help them and to help our foreign partners who host Americans on military bases in regions that are affected by Zika. So I am also hopeful Congress will ultimately arrive at an agreement this month to fund our Nation's response to Zika, but also that we ensure that those being deployed on our behalf receive every protection we can provide.

So these, in addition to the broader argument about Zika, these are two commonsense approaches giving the Department of Defense flexibility to move existing money around, to provide additional protections for our service men and women and their dependents who are being deployed and impacted by Zika. This is not a theory. We have over 100 people now, including 81 in uniform, who have been impacted by it, and 19 of their dependents, 3 of them who are pregnant.

Second, the small business relief. Please put yourself in the position of a family-owned business on South Beach or in Wynwood. They are being hurt. Instead of having 50 people coming in a day, they have 5 or 10. They need help. If they had lost power or been hit by a hurricane or a tornado, this would not be an issue, but they have been hit by a tornado of a different kind, one they did not cause and they could not predict and they could not insure against; that is, Zika.

Let's make sure the SBA has the flexibility to provide them their loans. So in addition to funding this—we have to get the Zika thing done, it cannot continue to languish—we have to get the SBA flexibility built into our law so these small businesses can be provided the resources they need to stay open and not close down as a result of a travel advisory because of a disease being spread by mosquitoes.

I think we would all agree we have to make sure we are doing everything we can to protect our men and women in uniform who are not going by choice. They are being deployed to these places where Zika is prevalent. They are being infected. There is no excuse for us to not help them as well. So these are the three things I hope we will do before Congress adjourns at the end of this month: Fund Zika fully, give flexibility for our small businesses that have been impacted by Zika to get SBA loans, and do everything we can by passing a law that gives the Department of Defense the flexibility they need to use existing money to protect our men and women in uniform and their families from being infected by Zika when deployed.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 3302. A bill establishing the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Emergency Response Fund for the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to provide assistance for a public health emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I have introduced legislation that will ensure that when there is a public health emergency or the threat of a public health emergency, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention can respond immediately to prevent it from becoming a national or global crisis.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 549—EXPRESSING A COMMITMENT BY THE SENATE TO NEVER FORGET THE SERVICE OF AVIATION'S FIRST RESPONDERS

Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 549

Whereas the events of September 11, 2001, forever changed the United States as the people of the United States faced unspeakable destruction and grief that touched millions of lives;

Whereas 4 commercial aircraft were turned into weapons of mass destruction, killing nearly 3,000 innocent people at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and in Shanksville, Pennsylvania;

Whereas the crewmembers of United Flight 175, American Flight 11, American Flight 77, and United Flight 93 acted as first responders, providing the first information about the unfolding attacks and selflessly protecting the United States and the lives of countless others;

Whereas ever since 9/11, pilots and flight attendants in the United States report to work with heightened responsibilities as first responders and as the last line of defense in aviation security; and

Whereas the bravery of the crewmembers 15 years ago and our crewmember heroes are prominent in the hearts and minds of the people of the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) forever memorializes the service of aviation's first responders on that fateful day; and

(2) will always seek to honor the sacrifice of aviation's first responders, who continue to keep the United States safe today.

SENATE RESOLUTION 550—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 5 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 9, 2016, AS ''RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF WOMEN AT THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY WEEK''

Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. ERNST, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 550

Whereas, in 1975, Congress authorized women to attend military service academies;

Whereas, on July 6, 1976, 81 women midshipmen were inducted into the United States Naval Academy;

Whereas, in 1976, an African-American woman became the first African-American woman to attend the United States Naval Academy, and graduated in 1980;

Whereas, in 1980, 55 women became the first women to graduate from the United States Naval Academy, 47 percent of whom later became career officers;

Whereas, in 1980, a woman became the first woman to be a distinguished graduate and Trident Scholar of the United States Naval Academy;

Whereas, on May 24, 1984, a woman became the first woman to graduate first in class from the United States Naval Academy;

Whereas, in 1988, an African-American woman became the first African-American woman to be commissioned as a Naval Flight Officer from the United States Naval Academy;

Whereas, in 1991, a woman midshipman became the first woman Brigade Commander at the United States Naval Academy;

Whereas, on May 13, 1993, a member of the United States Naval Academy class of 1981 became the first woman to be assigned to a combat aircrew;

Whereas, on March 2, 1995, a member of the United States Naval Academy class of 1981 became the first woman from the Navy to travel to space aboard space shuttle *Endeavor*;

Whereas, on March 12, 1999, a member of the United States Naval Academy class of 1982 became the first African-American woman to captain a United States Naval Ship, the USS *Rushmore*;

Whereas, in 2004, a member of the United States Naval Academy class of 1998 became the first woman to be selected to attend the Fighter Weapons School of the Navy and become a Top Gun pilot;

Whereas, in 2004, a woman was first appointed Vice Academic Dean at the United States Naval Academy;

Whereas, in 2006, a member of the United States Naval Academy class of 1981 became the first woman Commandant of Midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy;

Whereas, in 2007, a member of the United States Naval Academy class of 1989 became the first woman to assume command of an operational fighter squadron;

Whereas, in May 2010, the first 11 women to be trained for the Ohio Class Submarine graduated from the United States Naval Academy;

Whereas, in 2013, the woman that was the first woman graduate of the United States Naval Academy to command an operational fighter squadron became the first woman to assume command of a carrier air wing;

Whereas, on July 1, 2014, a member of the United States Naval Academy class of 1982 became the first woman to be a 4-star naval officer and was the first woman and first African-American to be appointed to the position of Vice Chief of Naval Operations;

Whereas, on June 17, 2011, a member of the United States Naval Academy class of 1986 became the first woman to be Commander of the Marine Corps Recruit Depot at Parris Island;

Whereas, in 2013, a member of the United States Naval Academy class of 1991 became the first woman to be Deputy Commandant of the United States Naval Academy;

Whereas, in 2016, 25 percent of the graduating class of the United States Naval Academy were women; and

Whereas, between 1980 and 2016, more than 4,800 women commissioned through the United States Naval Academy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 5 through September 9, 2016, as ''Recognizing the 40th Anniversary of Women at the United States Naval Academy Week''; and

(2) honors past and present women who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4985. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4986. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4987. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4988. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4989. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4990. Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4991. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra.

SA 4992. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4993. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. SASSE, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4994. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4995. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4996. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4997. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4998. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4999. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5000. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5001. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5002. Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5003. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5004. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5005. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5006. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5007. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 2848, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4985. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. AMENDMENTS TO THE GREAT LAKES FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION ACT OF 1990.

(a) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this section an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 941 et seq.).

(b) FINDINGS.—The Act is amended by striking section 1002 and inserting the following:

''SEC. 1002. FINDINGS.

''Congress finds that—

''(1) the Great Lakes have fish and wildlife communities that are structurally and functionally changing;

''(2) successful fish and wildlife management focuses on the lakes as ecosystems, and effective management requires the coordination and integration of efforts of many partners;

''(3) it is in the national interest to undertake activities in the Great Lakes Basin that support sustainable fish and wildlife resources of common concern provided under the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan based on the recommendations of the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration authorized under Executive Order 13340 (69 Fed. Reg. 29043; relating to the Great Lakes Interagency Task Force);

''(4) additional actions and better coordination are needed to protect and effectively manage the fish and wildlife resources, and the habitats on which the resources depend, in the Great Lakes Basin;

''(5) as of the date of enactment of this Act, actions are not funded that are considered essential to meet the goals and objectives in managing the fish and wildlife resources, and the habitats on which the resources depend, in the Great Lakes Basin; and

''(6) this Act allows Federal agencies, States, and Indian tribes to work in an effective partnership by providing the funding for restoration work.''.

(c) IDENTIFICATION, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSALS AND REGIONAL PROJECTS.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPOSALS AND REGIONAL PROJECTS.—Section 1005(b)(2)(B) (16 U.S.C. 941c(b)(2)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (v), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (vi), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(vii) the strategic action plan of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative; and

''(viii) each applicable State wildlife action plan.''.

(2) REVIEW OF PROPOSALS.—Section 1005(c)(2)(C) (16 U.S.C. 941c(c)(2)(C)) is amended by striking ''Great Lakes Coordinator of the''.

(3) COST SHARING.—Section 1005(e) (16 U.S.C. 941c(e)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (4), not less than 25 percent of the cost of implementing a proposal'' and inserting the following:

''(A) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (5) and subject to paragraph (2), not less than 25 percent of the cost of implementing a proposal or regional project''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) TIME PERIOD FOR PROVIDING MATCH.—The non-Federal share of the cost of implementing a proposal or regional project required under subparagraph (A) may be provided at any time during the 2-year period preceding January 1 of the year in which the Director receives the application for the proposal or regional project.'';

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(C) by inserting before paragraph (3) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(2) AUTHORIZED SOURCES OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director may determine the non-Federal share under paragraph (1) by taking into account—

''(i) the appraised value of land or a conservation easement as described in subparagraph (B); or

''(ii) as described in subparagraph (C), the costs associated with—

''(I) land acquisition or securing a conservation easement; and

''(II) restoration or enhancement of that land or conservation easement.

''(B) APPRAISAL OF LAND OR CONSERVATION EASEMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The value of land or a conservation easement may be used to satisfy the non-Federal share of the cost of implementing a proposal or regional project required under paragraph (1)(A) if the Director determines that the land or conservation easement—

''(I) meets the requirements of subsection (b)(2);

''(II) is acquired before the end of the grant period of the proposal or regional project;

''(III) is held in perpetuity for the conservation purposes of the programs of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service related to the Great Lakes Basin, as described in section 1006, by an accredited land trust or conservancy or a Federal, State, or tribal agency;

''(IV) is connected either physically or through a conservation planning process to the proposal or regional project; and

''(V) is appraised in accordance with clause (ii).

''(ii) APPRAISAL.—With respect to the appraisal of land or a conservation easement described in clause (i)—

''(I) the appraisal valuation date shall be not later than 1 year after the price of the land or conservation easement was set under a contract; and

''(II) the appraisal shall—

''(aa) conform to the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP); and

''(bb) be completed by a Federal- or State-certified appraiser.

''(C) COSTS OF LAND ACQUISITION OR SECURING CONSERVATION EASEMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—All costs associated with land acquisition or securing a conservation easement and restoration or enhancement of that land or conservation easement may be used to satisfy the non-Federal share of the cost of implementing a proposal or regional project required under paragraph (1)(A) if the activities and expenses associated with the land acquisition or securing the conservation easement and restoration or enhancement of that land or conservation easement meet the requirements of subparagraph (B)(i).

''(ii) INCLUSION.—The costs referred to in clause (i) may include cash, in-kind contributions, and indirect costs.

''(iii) EXCLUSION.—The costs referred to in clause (i) may not be costs associated with mitigation or litigation (other than costs associated with the Natural Resource Damage Assessment program).''.

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICES.—Section 1007 (16 U.S.C. 941e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''FISHERY RESOURCES'' and inserting ''FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION''; and

(B) by striking ''Fishery Resources'' each place it appears and inserting ''Fish and Wildlife Conservation'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''FISHERY RESOURCES'' and inserting ''FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION''; and

(B) by striking ''Fishery Resources'' each place it appears and inserting ''Fish and Wildlife Conservation'';

(3) by striking subsection (a); and

(4) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (a) and (b), respectively.

(e) REPORTS.—Section 1008 (16 U.S.C. 941f) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2021'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2007 through 2012'' and inserting ''2016 through 2020''; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan based on'' after ''in support of''; and

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) CONTINUED MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT OF STUDY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Director—

''(1) shall continue to monitor the status, and the assessment, management, and restoration needs, of the fish and wildlife resources of the Great Lakes Basin; and

''(2) may reassess and update, as necessary, the findings and recommendations of the Report.''.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1009 (16 U.S.C. 941g) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2007 through 2012'' and inserting ''2016 through 2021'';

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''$14,000,000'' and inserting ''$6,000,000'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$4,600,000'' and inserting ''$2,000,000''; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''$700,000'' and inserting ''$300,000''; and

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the activities of'' and all that follows through ''section 1007'' and inserting ''the activities of the Upper Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Conservation Offices and the Lower Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Conservation Office under section 1007''.

(g) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8 of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 2006 (16 U.S.C. 941 note; Public Law 109–326) is repealed.

SA 4986. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) Congress finds that neither the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) or the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) authorize the use of military force against the Islamic State in Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS).

(b) It is the sense of Congress that the President, unless acting out of self-defense or to address an imminent threat to the United States, is not authorized to conduct military operations against ISIS without explicit authorization for the use of such force, and Congress should debate and pass such an authorization.

SA 4987. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 60___. STUDY ON OWNERSHIP OF NEENAH DAM, WISCONSIN.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine if it is in the interest of the Federal Government and the Secretary to assume ownership of the Neenah Dam, Fox River, Wisconsin.

SA 4988. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 80_____. PATTERSON LAKE LAND CONVEYANCES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means Dickinson Parks & Recreation in Dickinson, North Dakota (or a successor in interest to that entity).

(2) DICKINSON RESERVOIR.—The term '''Dickinson Reservoir''' means the Dickinson Reservoir constructed as part of the Dickinson Unit, Heart Division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, as authorized by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the ''Flood Control Act of 1944'') (58 Stat. 891, chapter 665).

(3) PERMITTEE.—The term ''permittee'' means the holder of a permit for a property.

(4) PROPERTY.—The term ''property'' means any 1 of the cabin sites located on Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir for which a permit is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation.

(b) PURCHASE OF PROPERTY BY PERMITTEE; TRANSFERS TO DEPARTMENT.—

(1) OPTION.—The Secretary shall provide to the permittee of a property the first option to purchase that property for fair market value in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) PURCHASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On an election by a permittee to exercise the option to purchase a property pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall convey to the permittee, for fair market value—

(i) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property, subject to valid existing rights; and

(ii) easements for—

(I) vehicular access to the property;

(II) access to, and use of, a dock for the property; and

(III) access to, and use of, all boathouses, ramps, retaining walls, and other improvements for which access is provided in the permit for use of the property as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) PERIOD FOR CONVEYANCE.—The Secretary shall convey to a permittee a property pursuant to subparagraph (A) during the period—

(i) beginning on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) ending on the date that is 2 years after that date of enactment.

(C) DISPUTES REGARDING FAIR MARKET VALUE.—Any dispute regarding the fair market value of a property shall be resolved in accordance with section 2201.4 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(3) TRANSFERS TO DEPARTMENT.—

(A) FAILURE TO PURCHASE.—If a permittee fails to exercise the option to purchase a property under paragraph (2) by the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transfer the property to the Department, without cost.

(B) CERTAIN OTHER LAND.—Effective beginning on the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transfer to the Department, without cost, any Federal land, as of that date—

on which no cabin is located.

(c) OIL, GAS, MINERAL, AND OTHER OUTSTANDING RIGHTS.—Each conveyance to a permittee, and each transfer to the Department, pursuant to subsection (b), shall be made subject to—

(1) oil, gas, and other mineral rights reserved of record, as of the date of enactment of this Act, by, or in favor of, a third party; and

(2) any permit, license, lease, right-of-use, or right-of-way of record in, on, over, or across the applicable property or land that is outstanding to a third party as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) RELEASE FROM LIABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date of conveyance or transfer of any property or land under this section, the United States shall not be liable for damages of any kind arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence relating to the property or land, except for damages for acts of negligence committed by the United States or an employee, agent, or contractor of the United States before the date of conveyance.

(2) NO ADDITIONAL LIABILITY.—Nothing in this section affects any liability of the United States under chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Federal Tort Claims Act'').

(e) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CONVEYANCES AND TRANSFERS.—

(1) INTERIM REQUIREMENTS.—During the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date of conveyance or transfer of a property or land, the provisions of the document entitled ''Management Agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation, et al., for the Development, Management, Operation, and Maintenance of Lands and Recreation Facilities at Dickinson Reservoir'' that are applicable to the property or land shall remain in force and effect.

(2) LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Department, shall provide to the Department a legal description of all properties and land that may be conveyed or transferred pursuant to this section.

(f) PROCEEDS FROM SALES OF FEDERAL LAND.—Any revenues from a sale of Federal land pursuant to this section shall be made available to the Secretary, without further appropriation, for—

(1) the costs to the Secretary of carrying out this section; and

(2) deferred maintenance activities relating to the operation of the dam in the Dickinson Reservoir.

SEC. 80_____. USE OF TRAILER HOMES AT HEART BUTTE DAM AND RESERVOIR (LAKE TSCHIDA).

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADDITION.—The term ''addition'' means any enclosed structure added onto the structure of a trailer home that increases the living area of the trailer home.

(2) CAMPER OR RECREATIONAL VEHICLE.—The term ''camper or recreational vehicle'' includes—

(A) a camper, motorhome, trailer camper, bumper hitch camper, fifth wheel camper, or equivalent mobile shelter; and

(B) a recreational vehicle.

(3) IMMEDIATE FAMILY.—The term ''immediate family'' means a spouse, grandparent, parent, sibling, child, or grandchild.

(4) PERMIT.—The term ''permit'' means a permit issued by the Secretary authorizing the use of a lot in a trailer area.

(5) PERMIT YEAR.—The term ''permit year'' means the period beginning on April 1 of a calendar year and ending on March 31 of the following calendar year.

(6) PERMITTEE.—The term ''permittee'' means a person holding a permit.

(7) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation.

(8) TRAILER AREA.—The term ''trailer area'' means any of the following areas at Heart Butte Dam and Reservoir (Lake Tschida) (as described in the document of the Bureau of Reclamation entitled ''Heart Butte Reservoir Resource Management Plan'' (March 2008)):

(A) Trailer Area 1 and 2, also known as Management Unit 034.

(B) Southside Trailer Area, also known as Management Unit 014.

(9) TRAILER HOME.—The term ''trailer home'' means a dwelling placed on a supporting frame that—

(A) has or had a tow-hitch; and

(B) is made mobile, or is capable of being made mobile, by an axle and wheels.

(b) PERMITTED USE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the requirements of this section, on request by a permittee, the Secretary shall issue a 5-year permit for the use of a lot in a trailer area as described in paragraphs (2) and (3).

(2) TRAILER HOMES.—With respect to a trailer home, a permit for each permit year shall authorize the permittee—

(A) from April 1 to October 31—

(i) to park the trailer home on the lot;

(ii) to use the trailer home on the lot; and

(iii) to physically move the trailer home on and off the lot; and

(B) at any time during the permit year—

(i) to leave the trailer home parked on the lot; and

(ii) to leave on the lot any addition, deck, porch, entryway, step to the trailer home, propane tank, or storage shed.

(3) CAMPERS OR RECREATIONAL VEHICLES.—With respect to a camper or recreational vehicle, a permit shall, for each permit year—

(A) from April 1 to October 31, authorize the permittee—

(i) to park the camper or recreational vehicle on the lot;

(ii) to use the camper or recreational vehicle on the lot; and

(iii) to move the camper or recreational vehicle on and off the lot; and

(B) from November 1 to March 31, require a permittee to remove the camper or recreational vehicle from the lot.

(c) RENEWAL OF PERMITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), when a permit expires, on request by the permittee, the Secretary shall renew the permit for an unlimited number of additional 5-year terms.

(2) REQUIREMENT FOR TRAILER HOMES.—The Secretary shall require removal of a trailer home in a trailer area if the trailer home has been flooded a majority of the years during any 5-year permit period.

(3) REMOVAL AND NEW USE.—If the Secretary requires removal of a trailer home under paragraph (2), on request by the permittee, the Secretary shall authorize the permittee—

(A) to remain on the lot; and

(B) to replace the trailer home with a camper or recreational vehicle.

(d) TRANSFER OF PERMITS.—

(1) TRANSFER OF TRAILER HOME TITLE.—If a permittee transfers title to a trailer home permitted on a lot in a trailer area, the Secretary shall issue a permit to the transferee, subject to the conditions described in paragraph (3).

(2) TRANSFER OF CAMPER OR RECREATIONAL VEHICLE TITLE.—If a permittee who has a permit to use a camper or recreational vehicle on a lot in a trailer area transfers title to the interests of the permittee on or to the lot, the Secretary shall issue a permit to the transferee, subject to the conditions described in paragraph (3).

(3) CONDITIONS.—A permit issued by the Secretary under paragraph (1) or (2) shall be subject to the following conditions:

(A) A permit may not be held in the name of a corporation.

(B) A permittee may not have an interest in, or control of, more than 1 seasonal trailer home site in the Great Plains Region of the Bureau of Reclamation, inclusive of sites located on tracts permitted to organized groups on Reclamation reservoirs.

(C) Not more than 2 persons may be permittees under 1 permit, unless—

(i) approved by the Secretary; or

(ii) the additional persons are immediate family members of the permittees.

(e) ANCHORING REQUIREMENTS FOR TRAILER HOMES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require compliance with—

(A) for each trailer home in a trailer area (other than a trailer home described in paragraph (2)(B)), the anchoring requirements described in paragraph (2)(A); and

(B) for other objects on a lot in a trailer area, the anchoring requirements described in paragraph (3).

(2) ANCHORING REQUIREMENTS DESCRIBED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For trailer homes other than the trailer homes described in subparagraph (B), the anchoring requirements referred to in paragraph (1)(A) are the following:

(i) For a trailer home that is fewer than 50 feet in length, a minimum of 6 frame ties per side shall be provided, to be located as follows:

(I) One frame tie at each corner.

(II) The remaining frame ties at intermediate locations.

(ii) For a trailer home that is 50 feet or more in length, a minimum of 7 frame ties per side shall be provided, to be located as follows:

(I) One frame tie at each corner.

(II) The remaining frame ties at intermediate locations.

(iii) If the quantity of frame ties and over-the-top ties provided on a trailer home by the trailer home manufacturer is in excess of the minimum quantity required under clause (i) or (ii), as applicable, the total quantity provided by the trailer home manufacturer shall be used.

(iv) If an over-the-top tie is located directly above a frame tie, both the over-the-top tie and the frame tie may be fastened to the same anchor.

(v)(I) Each frame tie shall connect the anchor to the main structural frame that runs lengthwise under the trailer home.

(II) Any tie made to an outrigger beam shall not be credited to the minimum quantity of frame ties required in clause (i) or (ii), as applicable.

(vi) With respect to each flat steel strap used as a tie—

(I) the steel strap shall—

(aa) be 1.25 inches by .035 inch, with a minimum breaking strength of 4,800 pounds; and

(bb) be—

(AA) fastened to a ground anchor, and fastened in such a manner that will not cause distortion on the strap or reduce the breaking strength of the strap; and

(BB) drawn tight with 1 or more galvanized fasteners or connectors and a tensioning device;

(II) any sharp edge of the trailer home that would tend to cut the steel strap shall be protected by a suitable device to prevent cutting; and

(III) if necessary, the steel strap shall be prevented from knifing through the trailer home.

(vii) Each ground anchor shall be of the auger-type, at least 48 inches long, and equipped with at least 1 helix having a minimum diameter of at least 6 inches.

(viii) Each ground anchor shall have—

(I) at least a ¾-inch steel shaft;

(II) a fastener or connector and a tensioning device; and

(III) a minimum breaking strength of 4,800 pounds.

(B) ALTERNATIVE ANCHORING REQUIREMENTS FOR TRAILER HOMES.—A trailer home shall not be required to comply with the anchoring requirements described in subparagraph (A) if—

(i)(I) the trailer home was or is installed after 2005; and

(II) the installation complied with and continues to comply with foundation installation requirements of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (as in effect at the time of the installation); or

(ii) the anchoring system of the trailer home is certified to be of equal or better strength than the system described in subparagraph (A), as determined by a person qualified to make such a certification.

(3) ADDITIONAL ANCHORING REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) ADDITIONS TO TRAILER HOMES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Each addition to a trailer home subject to the anchoring requirements described in paragraph (2)(A) shall be anchored in accordance with the applicable requirements described in that paragraph.

(ii) ALTERNATIVE REQUIREMENTS.—Each addition to a trailer home subject to the anchoring requirements described in paragraph (2)(B)(ii) shall be anchored in accordance with the requirements described in that paragraph.

(B) OTHER OBJECTS.—Each deck, porch, entryway, step, propane tank, and storage shed on a lot in a trailer area shall be anchored in a secure and practical manner.

(f) REPLACEMENT REMOVAL AND RETURN.—

(1) REPLACEMENT.—Permittees may replace their trailer home with another trailer home.

(2) REMOVAL AND RETURN.—Permittees may—

(A) remove their trailer home; and

(B) if the permittee removes their trailer home under subparagraph (A), return the trailer home to the lot of the permittee.

(g) LIABILITY.—The United States shall not be liable for damages arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence relating to a lot to which a permit applies, other than for damages caused by an act or omission of the United States or an employee, agent, or contractor of the United States before the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 4989. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 20____. REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT.

Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking ''For sediment'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For sediment'';

(B) in subparagraph (A) (as designated by subparagraph (A))—

(i) by striking ''an authorized'' and inserting ''any type of authorized''; and

(ii) by striking ''at locations'' and inserting ''at nearshore or onshore locations''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) SEDIMENT FROM OTHER FEDERAL SOURCES AND NON-FEDERAL SOURCES.—For purposes of projects carried out under this section, the Secretary may include sediment from other Federal sources and non-Federal sources, subject to the requirement that any sediment obtained from a non-Federal source shall not be obtained at Federal expense.''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

''(3) APPROPRIATE APPLICATION OF NON-FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—

''(A) DEFINITION OF PERIOD OF ANALYSIS.—In this paragraph, the term 'period of analysis', with respect to a project under this section, means the period—

''(i) beginning on the date of implementation of the project; and

''(ii) ending on the date on which the project no longer produces the beneficial outputs for which the project was designed.

''(B) REQUIREMENT.—For any project under this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the non-Federal requirements described in subsections (a)(1)(B), (b)(1), and (i) of section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213) shall apply to the project only during the period of analysis of the project.''.

SA 4990. Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 20____. EDUCATION AND RESEARCH HARBORS.

(a) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE HARBOR.—The term ''eligible harbor'' means a harbor that supports or will support a federally owned vessel operated by—

(1) a State maritime academy (as defined in section 51102 of title 46, United States Code); or

(2) a non-Federal oceanographic research facility.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary may establish a program to provide assistance to a non-Federal interest for a project relating to an eligible harbor.

(c) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—A non-Federal interest may receive assistance for a project for—

(1) the construction and maintenance dredging of an eligible harbor;

(2) the construction, installation, or maintenance of infrastructure in an eligible harbor, including bulkheads, aprons, and piles;

(3) the construction and maintenance dredging of a berth in an eligible harbor; or

(4) the construction and maintenance dredging providing access from an eligible harbor to the nearest navigation channel or deep water.

(d) LOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a local cooperation agreement (referred to in this subsection as an ''agreement'') with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—An agreement entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) PLAN.—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the Federal share of project costs for a project under this section—

(i) shall not exceed 50 percent; and

(ii) may be in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR DESIGN WORK.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of design work completed by the non-Federal interest before entering into an agreement with the Secretary for a project.

(C) CREDIT FOR INTEREST.—In the case of a delay in the funding of the Federal share of the costs of a project under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the Federal share of the project costs.

(D) LAND, EASEMENTS, RIGHTS-OF-WAY, AND RELOCATIONS.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations provided by the non-Federal interest toward the non-Federal share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but not to exceed 25 percent of the total project cost.

(E) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for a project under this section shall be 100 percent.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section waives, limits, or otherwise affects the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law (including regulations) that would otherwise apply to a project under this section.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section for each fiscal year an amount not greater than $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SA 4991. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 7206. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR LOCAL IRRIGATION DISTRICTS.

Subsection (j)(1) of section 603 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1383) (as redesignated by section 7202(b)(1)(A)(ii)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''to a municipality or an intermunicipal, interstate, or State agency'' and inserting ''to an eligible recipient''; and

(2) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting ''in assistance to a municipality or intermunicipal, interstate, or State agency'' before ''to benefit''.

SA 4992. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 20___. EMERGING HARBOR PROJECTS.

Section 210(c)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(c)(3)) (as amended by section 2009) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2015''.

SA 4993. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. SASSE, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. MODIFICATIONS TO EXEMPTION FROM REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN HEALTH COVERAGE.

(a) EXEMPTION FOR INDIVIDUALS IN AREAS WITH FEWER THAN 2 ISSUERS OFFERING PLANS ON AN EXCHANGE.—Section 5000A(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) INDIVIDUALS IN AREAS WITH FEWER THAN 2 ISSUERS OFFERING PLANS ON AN EXCHANGE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any applicable individual for any period during a calendar year if there are fewer than 2 health insurance issuers offering qualified health plans on an Exchange for such period in the county in which the applicable individual resides.

''(B) AGGREGATION RULES.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), all health insurance issuers treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52, or subsection (m) or (o) of section 414, shall be treated as a single health insurance issuer.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 4994. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 80___. RECREATIONAL ACCESS OF FLOATING CABINS.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 is amended by inserting after section 9a (16 U.S.C. 831h–1) the following:

''SEC. 9b. RECREATIONAL ACCESS.

''(a) DEFINITION OF FLOATING CABIN.—In this section, the term 'floating cabin' means a watercraft or other floating structure—

''(1) primarily designed and used for human habitation or occupation; and

''(2) not primarily designed or used for navigation or transportation on water.

''(b) RECREATIONAL ACCESS PERMITTED.—The Board may approve and allow the construction and use of a floating cabins on waters under the jurisdiction of the Corporation if—

''(1) the floating cabin is maintained by the owner to reasonable health, safety, and environmental standards, as required by the Board; and

''(2) the Corporation has authorized the use of recreational vessels on the waters.

''(c) FEES.—The Board may assess fees on the owner of a floating cabin on waters under the jurisdiction of the Corporation for the purpose of ensuring compliance with subsection (b) if the fees are necessary and reasonable for those purposes.

''(d) CONTINUED RECREATIONAL USE.—With respect to a floating cabin located on waters under the jurisdiction of the Corporation on the date of enactment of this section, the Board—

''(1) may not require the removal of the floating cabin—

''(A) in the case of a floating cabin that was granted a permit by the Corporation before the date of enactment of this section, for a period of 15 years beginning on that date of enactment; and

''(B) in the case of a floating cabin not granted a permit by the Corporation before the date of enactment of this section, for a period of 5 years beginning on that date of enactment; and

''(2) shall approve and allow the use of the floating cabin on waters under the jurisdiction of the Corporation at such time and for such duration as—

''(A) the floating cabin meets the requirements of subsection (b); and

''(B) the owner of the floating cabin has paid any fee assessed pursuant to subsection (c).''.

SA 4995. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 60___. TABLE ROCK LAKE, MISSOURI.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary—

(1) shall extend the public comment period for the Table Rock Lake Master Plan revision; and

(2) shall not finalize the revision for the Table Rock Lake Master Plan during the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) SHORELINE USE PERMITS.—During the period described in subsection (a)(2), the Secretary shall lift or suspend the moratorium on issuance of shoreline use permits for Table Rock Lake.

(c) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(A) carry out a study on the need to revise permit fees relating to Table Rock Lake to better reflect the cost of issuing those fees and achieve cost savings; and

(B) submit to Congress a report on the results of the study described in subparagraph (A).

(2) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall complete the study under paragraph (1)(A) before adopting any revision to the Table Rock Lake Shoreline Management Plan.

SA 4996. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment

SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 8_____. SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) FARM.—The term ''farm'' has the meaning given the term in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(3) GALLON.—The term ''gallon'' means a United States liquid gallon.

(4) HISTORY OF A SPILL.—The term ''history of a spill'' has the meaning given the term ''reportable oil discharge history'' in section 1049(a) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 1361 note; Public Law 113–121).

(5) SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.—The term ''spill prevention, control, and countermeasure rule'' means the regulations promulgated by the Administrator under part 112 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

(b) APPLICABILITY OF SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In implementing the spill prevention, control, and countermeasure rule with respect to any farm, the Administrator shall—

(A) require a certification of compliance with the spill prevention, control, and countermeasure rule by—

(i) a professional engineer for a farm with—

(I) an individual tank with an aboveground storage capacity that is greater than 10,000 gallons;

(II) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity that is not less than 42,000 gallons; or

(III) a history of a spill; or

(ii) the owner or operator of the farm (via self-certification) for a farm with—

(I) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity that is—

(aa) greater than 10,000 gallons; and

(bb) less than 42,000 gallons; and

(II) no history of a spill; and

(B) exempt from all requirements of the spill prevention, control, and countermeasure rule any farm with—

(i) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity that is not greater than 10,000 gallons; and

(ii) no history of a spill.

(2) CALCULATION OF ABOVEGROUND STORAGE CAPACITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the calculation of the aggregate aboveground storage capacity of a farm shall not include any container on a separate parcel with a capacity that is less than 1,320 gallons.

(B) ANIMAL FEED INGREDIENTS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the calculations of the aggregate aboveground storage capacity of a farm and the aboveground storage capacity of an individual tank on a farm shall not include any container holding animal feed ingredients that are approved by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs for use in livestock feed.

SA 4997. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 8_____. INTERNATIONAL OUTFALL INTERCEPTOR REPAIR, OPERATIONS, AND MAINTENANCE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the memorandum of agreement between the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission and the City of Nogales, Arizona, dated January 20, 2006, the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission shall be the sole entity responsible for the repair, operating costs, and maintenance of the international outfall interceptor and the Nogales wash, located in Nogales, Arizona.

SA 4998. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 20___. GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION SYSTEM.

Section 210(c)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''To sustain'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—To sustain''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, in making expenditures under paragraph (1) for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2024, the Secretary shall allocate for operation and maintenance costs of projects within the Great Lakes Navigation System an amount that is not less than 10 percent of the funds made available under this section for fiscal year 2015 to pay the costs described in subsection (a)(2).''.

SA 4999. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 80_____. EXEMPTION OF RURAL WATER PROJECTS FROM CERTAIN RENTAL FEES.

Section 504(g) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1764(g)) is amended in the eighth sentence by inserting ''and for any rural water project serving fewer than 3,300 individuals that is federally financed (including a project that receives Federal funds under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) or from a State drinking water treatment revolving loan fund established under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j–12))'' after ''such facilities''.

SA 5000. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 5001, add the following:

(i) ESSEX RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The portions of the project for navigation, Essex River, Massachusetts, authorized by the first section of the Act of July 13, 1892 (27 Stat. 96, chapter 158), and modified by the first section of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1133, chapter 425), and the first section of the Act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1075, chapter 2509), that do not lie within the areas described in paragraph (2) are no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) AREAS DESCRIBED.—The areas described in this paragraph are—

(A) beginning at a point N. 3056139.82, E. 851780.21;

(B) running southwesterly about 156.88 feet to a point N. 3055997.75, E. 851713.67;

(C) running southwesterly about 64.59 feet to a point N. 3055959.37, E. 851661.72;

(D) running southwesterly about 145.14 feet to a point N. 3055887.10, E. 851535.85;

(E) running southwesterly about 204.91 feet to a point N. 3055855.12, E. 851333.45;

(F) running northwesterly about 423.50 feet to a point N. 3055976.70, E. 850927.78;

(G) running northwesterly about 58.77 feet to a point N. 3056002.99, E. 850875.21;

(H) running northwesterly about 240.57 feet to a point N. 3056232.82, E. 850804.14;

(I) running northwesterly about 203.60 feet to a point N. 3056435.41, E. 850783.93;

(J) running northwesterly about 78.63 feet to a point N. 3056499.63, E. 850738.56;

(K) running northwesterly about 60.00 feet to a point N. 3056526.30, E. 850684.81;

(L) running southwesterly about 85.56 feet to a point N. 3056523.33, E. 850599.31;

(M) running southwesterly about 36.20 feet to a point N. 3056512.37, E. 850564.81;

(N) running southwesterly about 80.10 feet to a point N. 3056467.08, E. 850498.74;

(O) running southwesterly about 169.05 feet to a point N. 3056334.36, E. 850394.03;

(P) running northwesterly about 48.52 feet to a point N. 3056354.38, E. 850349.83;

(Q) running northeasterly about 83.71 feet to a point N. 3056436.35, E. 850366.84;

(R) running northeasterly about 212.38 feet to a point N. 3056548.70, E. 850547.07;

(S) running northeasterly about 47.60 feet to a point N. 3056563.12, E. 850592.43;

(T) running northeasterly about 101.16 feet to a point N. 3056566.62, E. 850693.53;

(U) running southeasterly about 80.22 feet to a point N. 3056530.97, E. 850765.40;

(V) running southeasterly about 99.29 feet to a point N. 3056449.88, E. 850822.69;

(W) running southeasterly about 210.12 feet to a point N. 3056240.79, E. 850843.54;

(X) running southeasterly about 219.46 feet to a point N. 3056031.13, E. 850908.38;

(Y) running southeasterly about 38.23 feet to a point N. 3056014.02, E. 850942.57;

(Z) running southeasterly about 410.93 feet to a point N. 3055896.06, E. 851336.21;

(AA) running northeasterly about 188.43 feet to a point N. 3055925.46, E. 851522.33;

(BB) running northeasterly about 135.47 feet to a point N. 3055992.91, E. 851639.80;

(CC) running northeasterly about 52.15 feet to a point N. 3056023.90, E. 851681.75; and

(DD) running northeasterly about 91.57 feet to a point N. 3056106.82, E. 851720.59.

SA 5001. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 80_____. LAKE OAHE EASEMENT.

The Secretary shall not grant an easement for the Lake Oahe crossing for the Dakota Access Pipeline until the date on which an environmental impact statement with respect to the easement is completed.

SA 5002. Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 8_____. PREPAYMENT OF CERTAIN REPAYMENT OBLIGATIONS UNDER CONTRACTS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE WEBER BASIN WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED CONTRACT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''covered contract'' means the repayment contract numbered 14–06–400–33 between the United States and the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, dated December 12, 1952, which provides for the repayment of Weber Basin Project construction costs allocated to irrigation and municipal and industrial purposes for which repayment is provided pursuant to the contract under terms and conditions similar to the terms and conditions used in implementing the prepayment provisions in section 210 of the Central Utah Project Completion Act (Public Law 102–575; 106 Stat. 4624).

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''covered contract'' includes—

(i) any amendments and supplements to the contract described in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) any applicable contracts related to the contract described in subparagraph (A).

(2) DISTRICT.—The term ''District'' means the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF PREPAYMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall allow for the prepayment of Central Utah Project, Bonneville Unit, repayment obligations under the covered contract.

(c) REQUIREMENTS AND AUTHORITIES.—The prepayment authorized under subsection (b)—

(1) shall result in the United States recovering the net present value of all repayment streams that would have been payable to the United States if this section was not in effect;

(2) may be provided in several installments;

(3) may not be adjusted on the basis of the type of prepayment financing used by the District; and

(4) shall be made in a manner that provides that total repayment is made not later than September 30, 2026.

SA 5003. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REAUTHORIZATION OF DENALI COMMISSION.

(a) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 303 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105–277) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''The Federal Cochairperson'' and inserting the following:

''(1) TERM OF FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON.—The Federal Cochairperson'';

(B) in the second sentence, by striking ''All other members'' and inserting the following:

''(3) TERM OF ALL OTHER MEMBERS.—All other members'';

(C) in the third sentence, by striking ''Any vacancy'' and inserting the following:

''(4) VACANCIES.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any vacancy''; and

(D) by inserting before paragraph (3) (as designated by subparagraph (B)) the following:

''(2) INTERIM FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON.—In the event of a vacancy for any reason in the position of Federal Cochairperson, the Secretary may appoint an Interim Federal Cochairperson, who shall have all the authority of the Federal Cochairperson, to serve until such time as the vacancy in the position of Federal Cochairperson is filled in accordance with subsection (b)(2)).''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) NO FEDERAL EMPLOYEE STATUS.—No member of the Commission, other than the Federal Cochairperson, shall be considered to be a Federal employee for any purpose.

''(g) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), no member of the Commission (referred to in this subsection as a 'member') shall participate personally or substantially, through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise, in any proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract claim, controversy, or other matter in which, to the knowledge of the member, 1 or more of the following has a direct financial interest:

''(A) The member.

''(B) The spouse, minor child, or partner of the member.

''(C) An organization described in subparagraph (B), (C), (D), (E), or (F) of subsection (b)(1) for which the member is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee.

''(D) Any individual, person, or organization with which the member is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment.

''(2) DISCLOSURE.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply if the member—

''(A) immediately advises the designated agency ethics official for the Commission of the nature and circumstances of the matter presenting a potential conflict of interest;

''(B) makes full disclosure of the financial interest; and

''(C) before the proceeding concerning the matter presenting the conflict of interest, receives a written determination by the designated agency ethics official for the Commission that the interest is not so substantial as to be likely to affect the integrity of the services that the Commission may expect from the member.

''(3) ANNUAL DISCLOSURES.—Once per calendar year, each member shall make full disclosure of financial interests, in a manner to be determined by the designated agency ethics official for the Commission.

''(4) TRAINING.—Once per calendar year, each member shall undergo disclosure of financial interests training, as prescribed by the designated agency ethics official for the Commission.

''(5) VIOLATION.—Any person that violates this subsection shall be fined not more than $10,000, imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 310 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105–277) (as redesignated by section 1960(1) of SAFETEA–LU (Public Law 109–59; 119 Stat. 1516)) is amended, in subsection (a), by striking ''under section 4 under this Act'' and all that follows through ''2008'' and inserting ''under section 304, $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2017, and such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2021.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 310 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105–277) (as redesignated by section 1960(1) of SAFETEA–LU (Public Law 109–59; 119 Stat. 1516)) is redesignated as section 312.

SA 5004. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 71____. MONITORING FOR UNREGULATED CONTAMINANTS.

Section 1445 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j–4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall promulgate regulations establishing the criteria for a monitoring program for unregulated contaminants for all public water systems, regardless of the number of people served by a public water system.

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—In promulgating regulations under clause (i), the Administrator shall—

''(I) require the monitoring of drinking water supplied by public water systems; and

''(II) vary the frequency and schedule for monitoring requirements for public water systems based on—

''(aa) the number of people served by a public water system;

''(bb) the source of the water supply; and

''(cc) the contaminants likely to be found in the water supply.''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''(i) IN GENERAL'' and all that follows through ''(ii) GRANTS FOR SMALL SYSTEM COSTS—''; and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

''(7) UNREGULATED CONTAMINANTS.—With respect to contaminants for which a national primary drinking water regulation has not been established, the data base shall include—

''(A) monitoring information collected by public water systems under subsection (a); and

''(B) other reliable and appropriate monitoring information on the occurrence of the contaminants in public water systems that is available to the Administrator.''.

SA 5005. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. KING COVE.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that the land exchange required under this section (including the designation of the road corridor and the construction of the road along the road corridor) is in the public interest.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 206 acres of Federal land located within the Refuge as depicted on the map entitled ''Project Area Map'' and dated September 2012.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term ''Federal land'' includes the 131 acres of Federal land in the Wilderness, which shall be used for the road corridor along which the road is to be constructed in accordance with subsection (c)(2)(B).

(2) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''non-Federal land'' means the approximately 43,093 acres of land owned by the State as depicted on the map entitled ''Project Area Map'' and dated September 2012.

(3) REFUGE.—The term ''Refuge'' means the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge in the State.

(4) ROAD CORRIDOR.—The term ''road corridor'' means the road corridor designated under subsection (c)(2)(A).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Alaska.

(7) WILDERNESS.—The term ''Wilderness'' means the Izembek Wilderness designated by section 702(6) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 96–487).

(c) LAND EXCHANGE REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the State offers to convey to the Secretary all right, title, and interest of the State in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the State all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(2) USE OF FEDERAL LAND.—The Federal land shall be conveyed to the State for the purposes of—

(A) designating a road corridor through the Refuge; and

(B) constructing a single-lane gravel road along the road corridor subject to the requirements in subsection (e).

(3) VALUATION, APPRAISALS, AND EQUALIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The value of the Federal land and the non-Federal land to be exchanged under this subsection—

(i) shall be equal, as determined by appraisals conducted in accordance with subparagraph (B); or

(ii) if not equal, shall be equalized in accordance with subparagraph (C).

(B) APPRAISALS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and State shall select an appraiser to conduct appraisals of the Federal land and non-Federal land.

(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The appraisals required under clause (i) shall be conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including—

(I) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(II) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(C) EQUALIZATION.—

(i) SURPLUS OF FEDERAL LAND.—If the final appraised value of the Federal land exceeds the final appraised value of the non-Federal land to be conveyed under the land exchange under this subsection, the value of the Federal land and non-Federal land shall be equalized—

(I) by conveying additional non-Federal land in the State to the Secretary, subject to the approval of the Secretary;

(II) by the State making a cash payment to the United States; or

(III) by using a combination of the methods described in subclauses (I) and (II).

(ii) SURPLUS OF NON-FEDERAL LAND.—If the final appraised value of the non-Federal land exceeds the final appraised value of the Federal land to be conveyed under the land exchange under this subsection, the value of the Federal land and non-Federal land shall be equalized by the State adjusting the acreage of the non-Federal land to be conveyed.

(iii) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—Notwithstanding section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)), the Secretary may accept a payment under clause (i)(II) in excess of 25 percent of the value of the Federal land conveyed.

(4) ADMINISTRATION.—On completion of the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land under this subsection—

(A) the boundary of the Wilderness shall be modified to exclude the Federal land; and

(B) the non-Federal land shall be—

(i) added to the Wilderness; and

(ii) administered in accordance with—

(I) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(II) other applicable laws.

(5) DEADLINE.—The land exchange under this subsection shall be completed not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) ROUTE OF ROAD CORRIDOR.—The route of the road corridor shall follow the southern road alignment as described in the alternative entitled ''Alternative 2-Land Exchange and Southern Road Alignment'' in the final environmental impact statement entitled ''Izembek National Wildlife Refuge Land Exchange/Road Corridor Final Environmental Impact Statement'' and dated February 5, 2013.

(e) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ROAD.—The requirements relating to usage, barrier cables, and dimensions and the limitation on support facilities under subsections (a) and (b) of section 6403 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1180) shall apply to the road constructed in the road corridor.

(f) EFFECT.—The exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land and the road to be constructed under this section shall not constitute a major Federal action for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

SA 5006. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 8_____. GUIDELINES FOR SPECIFICATION OF CERTAIN DISPOSAL SITES.

Section 404(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) Subject to subsection (c) of this section'' and inserting the following:

''(b) SPECIFICATION FOR DISPOSAL SITES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c)'';

(2) by striking ''the Secretary (1) through'' and inserting the following: ''the Secretary—

''(A) through'';

(3) by striking ''section 403(c), and (2) in any case where such guidelines under clause (1) alone'' and inserting the following: ''section 403(c); and

''(B) in any case in which guidelines under subparagraph (A) alone''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) LIMITATION.—Guidelines under paragraph (1) may not prohibit the specification of a site due to the lack of a final site plan resulting from the lack of an identified end user or industry or industrial classification for the site when determining whether there is a practicable alternative to a proposed discharge that would result in less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem.''.

SA 5007. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4979 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill 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, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 80____. SALT CEDAR REMOVAL PERMIT REVIEWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), any action by the Secretary relating to reviewing an application for a permit under section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) or section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (commonly known as the ''Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899'') (33 U.S.C. 403), and any action by the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (referred to in this section as the ''Director'') pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536), relating to the mechanized removal of salt cedar from

an area that consists of not more than 500 acres shall be completed by the Secretary or the Director, as applicable, by not later than 90 days after the date of receipt of the application.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may provide to an office conducting a review described in subsection (a) an extension of not longer than an additional 90 days to complete the review, if the Secretary determines that such an extension is warranted.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 8, 2016, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Pakistan: Challenges for U.S. Interests.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 8, 2016, following the first vote of the Senate, in S–216 of the Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 8, 2016, at 2 p.m., in room SH–219 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 8, 2016, at 10 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Reviewing Independent Agency Rulemaking.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MASTER CHIEF PETTY OFFICER JESSE DEAN VA CLINIC

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3969 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3969) to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Laughlin, Nevada, as the ''Master Chief Petty Officer Jesse Dean VA Clinic.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3969) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXPRESSING A COMMITMENT BY THE SENATE TO NEVER FORGET THE SERVICE OF AVIATION'S FIRST RESPONDERS

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 549, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 549) expressing a commitment by the Senate to never forget the service of aviation's first responders.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, 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. 549) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF WOMEN AT THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY WEEK

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 550, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 550) designating the week of September 5 through September 9, 2016, as ''Recognizing the 40th Anniversary of Women at the United States Naval Academy Week.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today having submitted a resolution honoring the 40th anniversary of women attending the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, MD. Forty years ago, in 1975, Congress proudly authorized women to attend military service academies. That act of Congress, created a milestone in our military history, setting the national stage for women's equality.

On July 6, 1976, the very first class of women entered the U.S. Naval Academy. Four years later, the graduating class of 1980, commissioned 55 women. Since then, more than 4,800 women, including this year's graduating class of 2016, have graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy and have transcended traditional military roles for women.

Women have had to fight every single day and in every single way to be able to advance ourselves. Today, women make up 27 percent of the U.S. Naval Academy's student body, the highest in the school's history. This year, midshipmen were admitted from every state in the U.S., as well as the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. The Naval Academy continues to evolve, depicting our Nation's diversity, and promoting equality.

Our country is stronger today because women have advanced in the military. There are 2.2 million women serving in our military, serving with their male counterparts in leadership capacities that now include combat occupations. These strong, powerful, and intelligent women have unselfishly chosen to serve their country in a time when our Nation's military is needed the most, and they have done so with passion, heroism and integrity.

The U.S. Naval Academy was founded in 1845. A school that began with merely 50 midshipman students and 7 professors now fosters a graduating class of 1,076 commissioned officers. A school rich with tradition, the Academy offers 43 different majors within 19 fields of study. The U.S. Naval Academy offers a premier education and continues to bolster some of the finest and most hardworking patrons of our society. But that society would not be complete without our women service members. When women succeed in the workplace, our economy succeeds, and our country is stronger for it.

The U.S. Naval Academy has groomed trailblazers, women who have commanded in combat, women who have set standards for success, and women who have paved the way for our daughters and granddaughters. I wish to honor just a few of those trailblazers, as we recount the importance of this 40-year revolution.

In 1995, CDR Wendy Lawrence, class of 1981, became the first Navy woman in space aboard space shuttle Endeavor.

In 2006, RADM Margaret D. Klein, class of 1981, became the first woman commandant at the U.S. Naval Academy. Later she served as the Chief of Staff for U.S. Cyber Command, pioneering in the cyber field.

In 2011, Marine Brig. Gen. Lori Reynolds, class of 1986, was the first woman to command the Marine Corps Recruiting Depot in Parris Island.

Of course, we can't celebrate the U.S. Naval Academy without celebrating

the accomplishments of ADM Michelle J. Howard, class of 1982; who was the first African-American woman to command a Navy ship. In 2014, Admiral Howard became the first woman to become a four-star admiral, and was then appointed the Vice Chief of Naval Operations; becoming the first African-American and the first woman to hold that position.

This list of accomplishments from our U.S. Naval Academy women graduates goes on. It is the reason I have introduced this resolution. We must ensure the legacy of this institution and the accomplishments of these amazing women are recognized and celebrated.

Last May, the U.S. Naval Academy commissioned 265 women officers. These women, like their predecessors, will go on to serve in some of the most demanding assignments in the Navy, the Marine Corps, and even inter-service agencies such as the U.S. Coast Guard. They will continue to break new ground and become firsts in their fields.

It is because of our Nation's heroes we are able to stand here today, but the service of women in the military is a milestone we must honor. These women have proven equality matters. These women have proven that they can achieve anything. These women have made many sacrifices to make our country safe.

We must continue to promote equality and encourage women to strive for success in order to guarantee future parity. In today's increasingly uncertain world, women serving in military leadership roles, are more important than ever before. Women service members are a necessity—they are dynamic, resilient leaders who inspire millions to make the world a better place. I am proud to promote and recognize such strength.

As the Navy proudly proclaims, ''Through Knowledge, Sea Power.'' As dean of the Women Senators, I am here to proudly proclaim, through women's equality, we gain knowledge and create power that is unstoppable. As a society, we must continue to promote and recognize our Nation's heroines and their outstanding efforts for future generations.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, 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. 550) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2016

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, September 12; 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 resume consideration of S. 2848; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Inhofe-Boxer substitute amendment, No. 4979, at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2016, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. BOOZMAN. 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 5:09 p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 12, 2016, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. JOHN E. HYTEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

PAUL K. CLARK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 1552:

To be colonel

ENRIQUE J. GWIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

ANTHONY S. ROBBINS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 4333(B) AND 4336(A):

To be colonel

GAIL E. S. YOSHITANI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

VEDNER BELLOT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

GRAHAM F. INMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ALEXANDER M. WILLARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RICHARD A. DORCHAK, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

ARISTIDIS KATERELOS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

SCOTT C. MORAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

MONA M. MCFADDEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

NICOLE N. CLARK
MARION R. COLLINS
RONALD A. CUPPLES
DAVID C. FEELEY
ANNETTE R. GRANDPRE
CHRISTINE L. HOFFMANN
NICK JOHNSON
THOMAS H. MANCINO
SHANE M. MARTIN
DOUGLAS L. SIMON
SUSAN R. SINGALEWITCH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

CLAYTON T. HERRIFORD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

JAMES R. BOULWARE
ADDISON BURGESS
MITCHELL A. BUTTERWORTH
LOUIS A. DELTUFO
DAVID J. DEPPMEIER
RICHARD D. GARVEY
JAMES R. GRIFFIN
ROBERT H. HART, JR.
MILTON JOHNSON
CHUL W. KIM
DAVID W. LILE
KAREN L. MEEKER
ROY M. MYERS
DANIEL S. OH
JULIE M. ROWAN
JACK J. STUMME
DAVID E. WAKE
MATTHEW S. WYSOCKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

DAVID E. FOSTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

JUSTIN J. ORTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 4333(B) AND 4336(A):

To be colonel

TINA R. HARTLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MELAINE A. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ANTHONY T. SAMPSON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

WILLIAM J. KAISER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

NICOLE A. AGUIRRE
TRAVIS C. ALLEMANG
JOSEPH AN
SARAH ANDERSON
CHAD T. ANDICOCHEA
JACOB T. ANKENY
STEPHEN S. AUSTAD
ANDREA L. AUSTIN
DEREK A. AUSTIN
THOMAS J. AVALLONE
JOSHUA C. BARNHILL
THOMAS S. BARROS II
ROBERT J. BEERS
PASHA L. BENTLEY
MICHAEL J. BERGE
JENNIFER E. BERGSTROM
MATTHEW S. BERNIARD
ANDREW J. BIGGS
JESSICA L. BLUHM
DAVID R. BOLTHOUSE
DANIEL E. BRADLEY
STEPHANIE M. BRASHEAR
BENJAMIN J. BRIGGS
MATTHEW R. BROCK
TIMOTHY R. BROOKS
KELLY L. BROWN
ADAM K. BRUST
ANDREW C. BUCHHOLZ
SARAH E. L. BUMPS
JACQUELYN M. BURNETT
KENDRA R. CAGNIART
PIERREETIENNE C. CAGNIART
SVETLANA CARAGHEAUR
MATTHEW D. CARPINELLO
HILLARY A. CHACE
ANDRE L. CHARTIER
JULIA H. CHERINGAL
COLEEN L. COLAHAN
JASON J. CONDINO
AARON C. CONWAY
JASON R. CROAD
ANTHONY M. CRUZ
CAITLIN O. CRUZ
MARK M. CRUZ
ANDREW J. DELLEDONNE
JOHN A. DERENNE
KATRINA L. DESTREE
BENJAMIN A. DREW
STEPHEN A. DUMONTIER
THOMAS A. EDWARDS
TAYLER B. ELDRIDGE
ROBERT P. ELIAS
MICHAEL J. ELIASON
THOMAS R. EVANS
MICHAEL C. FANGEROW
GREGORY R. FAULKNER
RYAN K. FAWLEY
MATTHEW T. FEELEY
JEFFREY P. FENNELLY
CHRISTOPHER W. FERGUSON
JASON F. FISHER
DANIEL J. GALKA
KIA M. GALLAGHER
CHIRAAG N. GANGAHAR
MICHELLE T. GANYO
DANIEL S. GARVIN
BETHANY J. GOD
JOAN M. GONZALEZ
MICA D. GRANTHAM
IAN A. GRASSO
MARGARET C. GREEN
JONATHAN E. S. GRUBER
ROBERT J. GRZYBOWSKI
JUAN D. GUERRA
MATTHEW L. HALDEMAN
GREGORY W. HALL
MATTHEW G. HANLEY
FRANCIS J. HARTGE IV
RUSTON L. HESS
ADRIENNE S. HIATT
MICHAEL H. HIGHT
CHARLES J. HORN
ALEXANDER HRAY III
JENNIFER L. HUNT
JOHN E. JACKSON
SUZANNE M. H. JENKINS
FREDERIC C. JEWETT III
MARC J. KAJUT
SEAN S. KIM
CHASE A. KISSLING
LAURA S. KLEIN
ANDREW S. KNECHT
PETER F. KNICKERBOCKER
STEPHEN A. KOPLIN
ADRIAN B. KORDUBA
ERICA J. KRELLER
JANELLE R. KRINGEL
JULIAN S. KU
COLLEEN F. LAIL
JOHN K. LAMBRIX
KATRINA N. LANDA
GRACE D. LANDERS
ALISON B. LANE
JONATHAN T. LAU
JOSHUA R. LEBENSON
NANCY A. LENTZ
DANA R. LILLI
DIANA R. LINDSEY
SAMUEL F. LIVINGSTON
ROBERT J. LONG
STARLA N. LYLES
JESSE H. LYNN
KRISTINE E. LYONS
HARRY T. MADHANAGOPAL
KRISTIN N. MANSON
GEORGIA L. MARSH
JOSEPH S. MARTIN
ADAM D. MARUSZEWSKI
HORACE G. MATTHEWS
KATIE M. MCAULIFFE
CASEY E. MCCANN
BRENT J. MCDANIEL
SEAN C. MCINTIRE
RUTH E. MCLAUGHLIN
STEPHEN M. MCMULLAN
STEPHANIE P. MEYER
WILLIAM E. MICHAEL
JUSTIN G. MILLER
MICHAEL J. MILLER
ERICA N. MINGO
ADRIAN J. MORA
JOHN W. MORRISON, JR.
PATRICK B. MORRISSEY
SHEILA MULLIGAN
KELLI R. MURPHY
PRITI V. NATH
MATTHEW D. NEALEIGH
KARI A. NEAMANDCHENEY
VU Q. NGHIEM
KIM T. NGUYEN
YUMMY NGUYEN
NATHAN M. OEHRLEIN
THOMAS F. OLSON
EJIROGHENE ONOS
CLAUDIO A. OSORIO
AMY A. OSTROFE
ADAM N. OVERBEY
KAITLIN D. PALA
BRIAN B. PARK
BRIAN Y. PARK
HYUN J. PARK
JENNIFER L. PARK
JOSEPHINE A. PEARSON
KELLY C. PENG
RICHARD A. PIERSON
DOUGLAS M. POKORNY
WILLIAM B. POKORNY
CATHERINE A. POPADIUK
MANDY M. POTTER
BRITTANY E. POWELL
WILLIAM M. PULLEN
CHRISTINE M. PUTHAWALA
MICHAEL J. RACS
VICTOR A. RAMOS
JEFFEREY M. RAUNIG
CLIFFORD J. RAYMOND
MATTHEW C. RE
MATTHEW J. RICHTER
BRENDAN J. RINGHOUSE
SHAYNA C. RIVARD
MELANIE E. ROBERSON
JOHN S. ROBERTS
CARRIE L. ROBINSON
CHRISTOPHER M. ROCK
AMY E. ROGERS
ANTHONY M. ROMERO
BENJAMIN J. ROPER
ANNA L. RUTHERFORD
RAUBBY C. SABALERIO
ALANA B. SABENE
STEVEN W. SAITO
GORDON P. SALGADO
JORGE SALGADO
JOSEPH N. SARUBBI
PATRICK L. SCARBOROUGH
ERIC C. SCHMIDGAL
RYAN J. SCHUTT
ANGELA L. SENESE
MATTHEW S. SERAFINE
CHARLES I. SIMERMAN
BRIGHID H. SIMMONS
PATRICK C. SIMPSON III
ANUMEHA SINGH
EVAN P. SLEIPNESS
HEATHER S. SLUSSER
EUGENE R. SMITH III
MARGO Z. SMITH
MATTHEW E. SMITH
CHRISTOPHER L. SNITCHLER
HEATHER M. SOLORIA
KIMBERLY M. SPAHN
SHELBY R. SPANDL
ALISON P. SPANIOL
JOSEPH W. SPELLMAN
CASANDRA M. SPREEN
CARL E. STARR
JENA L. SWINGLE
TESHOME M. TAFES
NICHOLAS A. TAMORIA
BRIAN E. TAYLOR
ALEXANDER S. TEEFEY
PATRICK M. THOMAE
JENNIFER L. THOMPSON
KIMBERLY A. THOMPSON
MATTHEW M. THOMPSON
KATHLEEN T. TILMAN
TIMOTHY D. TODD
DUY P. TRAN
GABRIEL S. VALERIO
TIMOTHY M. VEAL
BRANDON R. VIER
ADAM D. VOELCKERS
AUDREY C. VOSS
KATHERINE N. VU
SEAN M. S. WADE
MERCY D. WAGNER
ANDREW L. WARD
BRIAN P. WEIMERSKIRCH
JASON J. WEINER
ALLISON G. WESSNER
MATTHEW J. WESSNER
ANDREW H. WESTMORELAND
STEVEN A. WHELPLEY
NATHAN R. WHITLOW
JESSICA R. WINTERS
AMELIA L. WRIGHT
KEVIN T. WRIGHT
KURT C. WUKITSCH
PHILIP M. YAM
JOSEPH M. YETTO
TATYANA O. YETTO
CELESTE D. YOUNG
RYAN M. ZALESKI
KRIS E. ZAPORTEZA
AMETHYST K. ZIMMERMAN
AMY F. ZUCHARO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ALICE A. T. ALCORN
ERIK D. ANDERSON
KARIMA AYESH
ERIN S. BAILEY
BRYAN J. BEHM
BRADLEY A. BENNETT
NICHOLAS A. BENNETTS
SPENCER W. BJARNASON
DAVID G. BURKE
CAMRON S. BUTTARS
JOSEPH R. BYRAM
ADAM J. CATZ
JOHN A. CHAMBERLAIN
KAI C. J. CHANG
JERRY CHENG
SARAH H. CHILDS
KELVIN Z. C. CHOU
JOSEPH R. COOK
JOSEPH E. DEHMER
RACHEL V. DULEBOHN
DANIEL J. FISHER
MICHAEL P. FITZGERALD
ERIC H. FREDERIKSEN
BRANDON L. GEDDES
GREGORY M. GITTLEMAN
LINDSAY A. GODFREY
JOSEPH GRANT III
UJVAL R. GUMMI
PETER J. HAM
FARID HAMIDZADEH
DANIEL A. HAMMER
MARINA HERNANDEZFELDPAUSCH
SEAN B. HERSHBERGER
MARKUS S. HILL
CYNTHIA R. HOLLIDAY
RYAN K. HUKILL
ELISE V. HURRELL
JOSEPH M. JARMAN
MELISSA M. JOY
GABRIELLE K. JUNG
DAVID J. KOSEK
CATHERINE L. KUBERA
BRITTANY L. KURZWEG
TAYLOR M. LANDON
MICHAEL H. LEE
MICHAEL J. LEWIS
CHRISTINA L. LILLI
ELLA T. A. K. LIM
ALICE C. L. MA
JAREN T. MAY
REBECCA S. MCGUIRE
STEPHANIE N. MORA
JAMES S. MORRIS, JR.
DAVID L. NELSON
KYLE T. NELSON
BRANDI B. NOORDMANS
JASON M. NOTARIO
ERIC W. OLENDORF
ELIZABETH G. PADILLA
DONALD G. PRITCHETT, JR.
RYAN J. PRYOR
STEVEN G. RABENSTEIN
HILLARY C. REEVES
AMANDA L. RICE
MATTHEW A. ROUSE
DAVID L. SANDBERG
ABIGAIL L. SCHMIDT
ADAM E. SCHMIDT
LINDSEY G. SHOWERS
JEREMIAH J. SPARKS
ALEXANDER TARASOV
ARTHUR S. VALERI
WILLIAM S. WALKER III
GEOFFREY L. WARD
WESLEY D. WEIBEL
BEECHER C. WHITEAKER III
NATHANIEL D. WILLIAMS
KEVIN C. WIMAN
DAVID S. YI
STACY L. YU
MALKA ZIPPERSTEIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JULIE M. C. ANDERSON
BRIAN C. ANDREWSSHIGAKI
ELIZABETH R. ANGELO
THOMAS S. ANNABEL
MICHAEL C. AVANTS
JOHN L. BALSAMO

RENARDIS D. BANKS
BENJAMIN J. BARRUS
MICHAEL B. BAUN
CHRISTINE S. BRADY
BYRON M. BREEDING
KEVIN M. BRIGHTON
DAVID L. BRODERICK
ALEXANDER P. BULAN
GRETCHEN S. BURNS
WILLIAM J. BURRELL
QINGYUAN CAO
AUDREY J. CARTER
HUNTER R. COATES
CARLOS M. COLEMAN
BRENT D. COLLINS
JORGE L. CONCEPCION
COLLEEN I. CORDRICK
FRANCISCO A. CORNEJO
JILL S. CUNNINGHAM
TAMMY L. DALESANDRO
JONATHON R. DAVIS
LEONARDA M. DEGUZMAN
JOSEPH W. DICLARO II
PHILLIP S. DOBBS
KATHERINE V. DOZIER
KIMBERLY A. EDGEL
ANTHONY M. EISENHARDT
DAVID B. ENGLAND II
ANALIZA M. ENRIQUEZ
LUIS A. ESTRELLA
ELIZABETH D. FARRAR
FELIPE P. FINLEY
JOSEPH C. FISCUS
SARAH E. FLETCHER
JEREMIAH D. FORD
SETH L. GARCIA
AMANDA A. GARDNER
KRYSTAL S. GLAZE
LINDSAY H. GLEASON
KEVIN A. GOODELL
KRISTEN D. GROSS
MATTHEW D. GRYPP
ZACHARY W. HARE
WILLIAM F. HAYES, JR.
RICK W. HECKERT
JEFFREY C. HERTZ
SUSAN A. HINEGARDNER
TONY H. HUGHES
ANN M. HUMMEL
ANDREW J. HUNTER
KYLEIGH B. HUPFL
ERIC J. INFANTE
VINCENT P. JONES
JOSEPH K. KALEIOHI
MICHAEL D. KAVANAUGH
MICAH J. KINNEY
SANDEEP KUMAR
RACHEL E. LANTIERI
THUY D. T. LE
LAURA A. J. LETCHWORTH
AMANDA F. LIPPERT
MELISSA M. LIWANAG
WILFREDO L. LUCAS, JR.
ENKELEIDA MABRY
JOHN W. MAHONEY III
RYAN P. MAID
DANIEL N. MANNIS
CRYSTAL C. MASSEY
KARL M. MATLAGE
ALISTAIR S. MCLEAN
RODERICK S. MEDINA
JUSTIN W. MEEKER
LYNDSY M. MEYER
JACQUELINE L. MILLER
JEREMY K. MILLER
REBECCA M. L. MIRANDA
LEAH D. MOSS
ANGELA M. MYERS
MARY L. NEAL
JOSEPH W. NEIL
JAMES A. NEIPP
JOHN O. OCHIENG
JOHN R. OLIVA
NINA A. PADDOCK
CHRISTOPHER L. PAULETT
GIAO B. PHUNG
JOHN J. PICCONE
AILEEN M. PLETTA
JOSE A. PULIDO
EVA K. REED
MARK A. RIEBEL
REBECCA L. ROOT
HEATHER L. ROSATI
ROBERT A. RUSSELL
VAHE L. SARKISSIAN
JESSE J. SCHMIDT
LEE W. SCIARINI
GARY L. SEARS
BRENDA L. SHARPE
ADAM J. SHARRITS
RYAN L. SHEPPARD
MATTHEW R. SHIPMAN
TARA M. SMALLIDGE
RYAN W. SMITH
GEORGE T. STEGEMAN, JR.
ROBERT C. SUMMERS
JOSHUA M. SWIFT
BRENT A. SZYCHULDA
BLAKE V. TOWNS
MARION G. VANZIE
DAWN B. WALKER
CHRISTOPHER WASHINGTON
BRADLEY S. WELLS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

BENJAMIN D. ADAMS
ADRIENNE M. BALDONI
LAURA R. BATEMAN
KEVIN R. BRANDWEIN
SHAWN W. BRENNAN
DANIEL M. BRIDGES
STEPHEN W. BUCKLEY
AUBREY D. CHARPENTIER
STEPHANIE L. CIRONE
ANDREW M. COFFIN
MARGARET V. COLE
BRIAN D. CORCORAN
MATTHEW C. COX
ARI E. CRAIG
THOMAS L. EATON
SCOTT W. FISHER
JESSICA L. FORD
JARROD R. FRANKS
GEOFFREY T. GILLESPIE
CHARLES C. GOUGH
EDWARD T. GRIFFIS, JR.
LEIGHA B. F. GROVES
CANDACE M. HOLMES
ALEXANDER G. HOMME
LAUREN E. HUGEL
CHRISTOPHER H. HUTTON
ADAM E. INCH
MEGAN R. JACKLER
MATTHEW J. KADLEC
JENNIFER L. LUCE
JEFFREY S. MARDEN
LAUREN A. S. MAYO
ANDREW J. MOORE
PAUL B. MORRIS
SARA P. NEUGROSCHEL
KATHRYN A. PARADIS
ADAM G. PARTRIDGE
MICHAEL T. PIERCE, JR.
THERESA D. POINDEXTER
PHILIP W. ROHLFING
CHARLES M. ROMAN
DENISE L. ROMEO
BRANDON H. SARGENT
JOHN A. SCHAFFER
KEVEN P. SCHREIBER
KIMI K. SCHULTHEISS
ANTHONY P. SHAM
NICOLE T. STARING
TIA R. SUPLIZIO
JAMES C. SYLVAN
JON T. TAYLOR
MATTHEW P. THRASHER
MICHAEL F. WHITICAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

STEPHEN K. AFFUL
BETSY L. ALBERS
NGUYET N. ALLBAUGH
JUSTIN E. ALLEN
RACHEL D. ALLNUTT
CANDY S. ANDERSON
DAVID A. ANTICO
AMY E. APARICIO
JOURDAN K. ASKINS
KRISTIN S. AUCKER
JONATHAN M. AUKEMAN
ROBERT B. BAILEY
ERIC S. BANKER
AMY H. BARENDSE
KATHRYN A. BARGER
JOHN B. BENEFIELD III
TRACI L. BENSON
RACHEL A. BRADSHAW
JASON L. BROUGH
JERRY J. BROWN
TERRY J. BROWN
TRACI E. BURRELL
JOHANNA M. CARLSON
ROGER G. CASON
CHERYL Q. CASTRO
CHANTEL D. CHARAIS
KRYSTAL M. CHUNACO
SHARON A. CROWDER
LESLIE A. DALEY
JESSICA E. DALRYMPLE
ALAWAH C. DAVIS
ADA C. DEE
WILBERT C. DIXON III
BRIAN C. DUENAS
ERIC E. DUNBAR
PHYLLIS J. A. DYKES
DANNY J. EASON, JR.
ALESHA K. EGTS
APRIL L. EHRHARDT
NICHOLAS W. EIGHMY
DARCEY L. R. ENDICOTT
YVES H. EYIKE
COREY M. FANCHER
SARAH E. FARIS
JESSICA M. FERRARO
TRAVIS J. FITZPATRICK
JEAN A. FORTUNATO
ROBERT H. FOWLER III
CLEMENT FRANCIS
JENNIFER T. FRANCIS
KEITH J. FREEMAN
JOHN D. GARDNER
LEEYANNA M. GERBICH
CARLA J. GRAHAM
STACIE B. GROVES
JONATHAN D. HAMRICK
LANAE Z. HARRISON
CHRISTOPHER L. HARVIE
ANGELA R. HEALY
NANCY G. HELFRICH
KIMBERLEY L. HENDRICKS
SERINA A. HERNANDEZ
ANTHONY S. HOFER
JUANITA T. HOPKINS
MICHAEL J. HOWARD
JASMYNE C. IRIZARRY
SARAH A. JAGGER
SAMANTHA J. JENNINGS
ANDY L. KELLER
JENIQUE B. KEYS
JAMES W. KILPATRICK
CHARLES J. KINARD
MARY E. KING
ROBERT M. LEAHY
JENNIFER H. LORAN
YVONNE M. MARENCO
SCOTT E. MCCLURE
LEAH U. MCCOY
LINDSAY K. MCQUADE
DANILO R. MENDOZA, JR.
MEGAN K. MOODY
JOSHUA J. MORGAN
AMANDA P. MUNRO
ERICA H. NICOLETTI
FARZAN NOBBEE
STEFANIE A. NOCHISAKI
OTIS OSEI
RHYS A. PARKER
ALLEN K. PAYNE
ERICA L. PHILLIPS
COURTNEY V. POWELL
NIKKI L. PRITCHARD
RENEE M. QUEZADA
TY M. QUINN
JERICHO H. RAMIREZ
BARBARA M. REMEDIOS
MARY K. REYNA
BRANDON A. RUDY
EDWARD L. S. RUNYON
SARAH D. RUSHNOV
BRETT A. SALAZAR
KAREN J. SANCHEZ
CRYSTAL M. M. SARACENI
BRANDON J. SARTAIN
ERIKA D. SCHILLING
LESLIE R. SCHNEIDER
NATHANIEL J. SCHWARTZ
RACHEL I. SEHNERT
JUAN D. SERRATO
MELISSA A. SLACK
JUDITH SMART
LATARYA D. SMITH
DONELLE J. SPIVEY
ANGELA G. SPRUILL
JENNIFER D. SQUAZZA
STEVEN A. STARR
DOMINICK B. STELLY
KIMBERLY A. STEVENS
MICHAEL A. STEVENS
KRISTIN P. STONIECKI
LOUIS D. STREB
KASSY L. STRICKLAND
CHRISTOPHER O. SUTHERLAND
STACEY A. SWINDELLS
ADAM M. TAYLOR
KOA J. THOMAS
ANDREW B. TINGUE
MARYPAT A. TOBOLA
JOEL P. TRAUSCH
MEREDITH K. TVERDOSI
DAVID T. UHLMAN
NATESHA A. VAILLANCOURT
SUSAN R. VIDAURRE
CLAIRE M. VIDRINE
STEPHANIE E. WALLACE
CRAIG A. WILKINS
MELINDA S. WILLIAMS
MICHAEL C. WILLIAMS, JR.
VANITA J. WILLIAMS
BRIAN C. WILSON
PETER J. WOODS
CAITLIN M. WORKMAN
JOSHUA A. WYMER
BRITTANY L. YANG
ALESSANDRA E. ZIEGLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

SCOTT E. ADAMS
PATRICK D. AMUNDSON
LAURA A. ANDERSON
ANJA D. ANLIKER
ZACHARY J. ARMSTRONG
CARNELL P. AURELIO
JATAN BASTOLA
JOHN R. BING
STEPHEN T. BLONSKI
BERT R. BRATTON, JR.
ANDREA K. BUCK
ANTHONY M. CASTLEBERRY
JENNIFER L. CHARLTON
LISA CHEN
PHILIP F. CLARK, JR.
KATHRYN M. DAMORE
MICHAEL P. DAUSEN
ELDRIDGE L. DAVIS
JAMMIE L. DOWNER
BRADFORD L. EDENFIELD
JEFFREY J. EOM
GARRY K. FERGUSON

ANDREW W. FOURSHA
PAUL D. FUERY
JOSE A. GALVAO
JARED A. GIBSON
CASEY J. GILLETTE
RAYFIELD N. GOLDEN
JASON E. HARNISH
DAVID W. HILL
TIMOTHY M. HILL
ADAM G. HILLIARD
WESLEY P. HITT
EUGENE K. J. HO
THOMAS D. HOUSE
FRANKLIN J. JENSEN, JR.
KYLE A. JOHNSON
JAMES W. JONES
PAUL J. KLOEPPING
ANDREW J. KRANTZ
JOSHUA L. G. LANGHORNE
CHRISTOPHER M. LEBEL
JOSHUA D. LONGWORTH
MATTHEW M. LORGE
DANIEL MALDONADO III
STEPHEN J. MANNILA
CHRISTOPHER M. MASON
RUDY MASON
CHARLES E. MCCANDLESS
JAY T. MCFARLAND
JOHN W. G. MCNEIL
DAVID A. MEDICI
TRAVIS M. MILLER
WILLIAM E. MORRISON
EDUARDO A. NICHOLLSCARVAJAL
EDWARD P. NIXON
DAVID F. ODOM
JOHN P. ODONNELL
JONATHAN P. PAGNUCCO
BRANDON W. PALMER
CARLISLE C. PENNYCOOKE
SHANNON E. PERCIVAL
JESSE P. PETTY
JEFFREY M. PHILLIPS
JASON L. REVITZER
JONATHAN R. RICHMOND
PETER RIESTER
STEPHEN C. RYAN
ALBERTO H. SABOGAL
WILLIAM E. SHIELDS
MARY E. B. SLY
JOSEPH A. SMUTZ
AMPHAY SOUKSAVATDY
JAMIE J. STEFFENSMEIER
EDWIN J. STEVENS
DAVID J. STONECIPHER
TYHEEM SWEAT
AARON T. THORNTON
BENJAMIN D. THORNTON
MICHAEL S. TUDDENHAM
GILBERT P. UY
REMUIS D. WALLS
XIAO Y. WANG
DWANN E. WASHINGTON
ANTHONIO R. WEATHERSPOON
CHARMAINE R. YAP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

RAYMOND B. ADKINS
MICHAEL W. BEASLEY
JEREMY P. BLYTHE
STEPHEN B. BROWN
STEPHEN B. CHAPMAN
YOON J. CHOI
VITO M. CRECCA III
DAVID A. DAIGLE
JOEL R. DEGRAEVE
CONRAD T. DELANEY
CHRISTOPHER N. EARLEY
JOSHUA R. EARLS
KEN R. ESPINOSA
ROBERT D. FASNACHT
CHAD O. HAMILTON
DIANE M. HAMPTON
GREGORY R. HAZLETT
JAMES P. HOGAN
CLAYTON D. JONES
MICHAEL S. KENNEDY
TAE H. KIM
DIEGO H. LONDONO
SCOTT P. MASON
DANIEL J. MCGRATH
DAVID S. PAHS
JEFFREY A. PERRY
MATTHEW A. PICKERING
JAMES C. RAGAIN III
JOSEPH L. ROACH
ARTHUR J. ROBBINS II
JAMES M. RUTAN
MARK A. TORRES
STEPHEN E. VELTHUIS
CHRISTILENE WHALEN
GALE B. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

PAUL I. AHN
JAMES G. ANGERMAN
JOSHUA S. BETTIS
BRYAN J. BEYER
RICHARD E. BUECHEL
BRENDAN B. BUNN
MICHELLE S. B. CAPONIGRO
NATHAN H. DEUNK
BENJAMIN R. DUNN
DOUGLASS G. FARRAR
JOHN D. FRANK
BRIAN R. GATES
ADAM J. GERLACH
JANNIRA L. GREGORY
MARJORIE J. GRUBER
DEREK B. HALL
JOHN H. HEATHERLY
KIRK W. HEUTEL
BRIAN A. HOLMES
SEAN R. HUGHES
CHRISTOPHER E. JAMES
RUSSELL B. JARVIS
MARK S. JUSTISS
CODY W. KEESEE
HARRY Y. KIM
MATTHEW J. KING
DOUGLAS H. KNOTTS
JOHN D. KVANDAL
JOSHUA M. LEWIS
CHRISTOPHER J. MCDOWELL
JAMIE R. MCFARLAND
JACK D. MCLEOD
MATTHEW R. MILKOWSKI
KENA K. MONTGOMERY
JOSE D. MORA
NIGEL T. MORRISSEY
ANDREW G. MOYER
RAMA K. MUTYALA
CHRISTOPHER J. OVER
JONATHAN M. PILON
BRADLEY J. ROBERTS
MARK Z. ROUSSEL
JOHN V. RUGGIERO
DAVID N. SARE
HENDRIK A. SCHOEMAN, JR.
ANDREW M. TAKACH
GEORGE C. TOMALA
JOSHUA A. TURNER
IAN H. UNDERWOOD
MICHAEL A. WARREN
JEFFREY J. WATSON
CHRISTOPHER J. WIDHALM
ANTHONY L. WILLIAMS
ANDREW P. WINCKLER
SHANNON L. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DENNIS L. LANG, JR.
YASMIRA LEFFAKIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

KAREN J. SANKESRITLAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

MARK F. BIBEAU

To be lieutenant commander

MATTHEW K. KOKKELER
JASON A. LAURION

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

RANDALL L. MCATEE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JOHN F. CAPACCHIONE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

STUART T. KIRKBY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

CARRIE M. MERCIER

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 8, 2016:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

PETER MICHAEL MCKINLEY, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF BRAZIL.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MR. CRAIG J. ROLISH OF JOHNSTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. KEITH J. ROTHFUS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Mr. Craig J. Rolish of Johnstown, Pennsylvania. He is an Airforce veteran who served in Vietnam as an enlisted airman, and is a 2002 recipient of the Four Chaplains Legion of Honor Award.

In 1993, Craig was involved in the founding of the Veteran Community Initiatives (VCI). For the past 23 years, Mr. Rolish has been instrumental in the growth and credibility of the VCI's efforts to enhance the lives and well-being of veterans and their families.

As the Vice President-Treasurer, and original Board Member, Mr. Rolish has been long involved in ensuring VCI assists in meeting the social and economic needs of the disabled, disadvantaged, physically and mentally challenged, unemployed and underemployed, and current and previously incarcerated.

Craig's dedication to veterans and their families for more than 20 years has created a lasting legacy at VCI.

Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania values its veterans, and it is my great pleasure to honor the man who has spent more than two decades building an organization that provides assistance to those who have served in our armed military and their families.

HONORING JAMES CARMICHAEL

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend and a great American, James "Jim" Carmichael, of Wooster, Ohio. Our nation, the state of Ohio, and his beloved Wayne County lost a friend, a father, a husband, and a dedicated public servant on July 13, 2016.

God, country, and family were Jim's guiding stars. He was a man of incredible faith, integrity, and love. Jim served in the Ohio Army National Guard from 1959 to 1964, and from 1971 to 1979, he was the mayor of Shreve, Ohio. During this time he was president of the Wayne County Mayors Association and president of the Shreve Friends of the Library. Jim was also a member of the Shreve Police and Fire Departments. He continued his public service as a member of the Wayne County Board of Elections from 1980 to 1999, and served as the board's chairman from 1989 to 1999; Jim also served as chairman of the Wayne County Republican Party from 1981 to 2000.

In 2001, Jim was elected to the Ohio House of Representatives, an office he held until 2009. During his time in the legislature, he held a number of positions including Assistant Majority Whip, Majority Whip, and Assistant Majority Floor Leader. He also led as the Chairman of the House State Government Committee and Chairman of the Ohio House and Senate Cancer Caucus. After his tenure in the Ohio House of Representatives, Jim was elected Commissioner for Wayne County from 2009 until this year. Jim loved his community. He served as a Merit Badge Counselor for the Boy Scouts' Citizen in the Nation merit badge. He was also very proud to be a longtime fan of Tri-Way-Shreve School and sports, and loved to cheer on the home team.

Jim is survived by his wife Carolyn, his daughters Keely and Debbie, grandchildren Matt, Lindsay, Jamie, Garrett, Grace, and Gavin; great-grandchildren, Aubrey, Gage, and Evelyn, and his sisters, Ruth Flinner and Jane Carmichael.

I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in paying tribute to a reliable friend, a thoughtful lawmaker, and very simply, a good man.

KINGWOOD HIGH SCHOOL RUGBY

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Kingwood Girls' Rugby Club 2015–2016 team for going undefeated in the regular season, making it to the state finals, and participating in the 2016 High School Division at the Penn Mutual Rugby Championship in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Their achievement is a testament to the dedication of head coach, Josh Dill, and assistant coach, Nick Carline, and the player's work ethic. Balancing school and athletics is not an easy task and these student athletes work hard in the classroom and continually strive to improve their craft. The families, teachers, friends, and the entire community are very proud of the Kingwood Girls' Rugby team. It is with great pleasure to recognize the members of the 2015–2016 Kingwood Girls' Rugby team:

Amber Balow
Mckenzie Borchers
Isabelle Haro
Ella Hurley
Avery Lobusch
Delanna Martin
Bryanna Matschiner
Monica Reescano
Katie Rozum
Deja Steinbrecher
Sierra Titus
Jennifer Villanueva
Taylor Welch
Tori Wilson
Nick Carline (assistant coach)
Josh Dill (head coach)

And that's just the way it is.

GOLD STAR FAMILIES VOICES ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JODY B. HICE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 6, 2016

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4511, the Gold Star Families Voices Act, to commemorate the missing voices of American veterans who died as a result of their wartime service or were missing in action. In 2000, Congress created the Veterans History Project at the Library of Congress to turn the memories of our veterans into history and to memorialize the lives of the heroes whose selfless sacrifice has contributed—and continues to contribute—to our collective understanding of who we are as Americans.

After hearing of this remarkable project, my staff and I have sat down with over a dozen veterans from the 10th District of Georgia in order to properly document their brave service. These dedicated men and women in uniform and their equally dedicated families shared their experiences, always with their patriotism, commitment, and sacrifice at the forefront.

Once again, I am awed by the inspirational people of the 10th District of Georgia, and I am honored to represent such heroic veterans in Congress. With the passage of H.R. 4511, we, as a Nation, commemorate the sacrifice of these families through the stories they share, aptly expanding and enhancing the collection of the Veterans History Project.

HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF MACEDONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Macedonian-American community in honor of their homeland's 25th Independence Day. The people of the Republic of Macedonia voted on September 8, 1991, to officially gain independence from the former Yugoslavia. By voting for independence, the people decided that it was time for their country to forge its own democratic path and to begin a new era in their history. This 25th anniversary of their independence provides us all an opportunity to recognize the Macedonian-American community's significant contributions within the United States.

But first, I would like to ask for a moment of silence for the 24 victims of devastating floods that affected Macedonia's capital Skopje (Scop-yay) last month, which left hundreds injured and thousands displaced. Our own government provided over $50,000 in aid to help these flood victims and repair schools in time for the start of the school year.

Since 2001, Macedonia has been one of the staunchest allies of the United States in the War on Terror. Macedonia was the fourth and fifth largest contributor of troops, per capita, in the mission in Afghanistan. Macedonian troops guarded American troops at the compound in Kabul. And, Macedonia welcomed 50,000 and 400,000 refugees during the wars in Bosnia and Kosovo, respectively. For a country of little over two million, Macedonia has done its fair share and deserves to be in NATO. On that note, I ask that you join me, and 35 colleagues, in cosponsoring H. Res. 56 in support of Macedonia's NATO accession as soon as possible.

With American support, Macedonia has become a model of stability in a region known for ethnic strife and tension. Up until earlier this year, Macedonia was struck with the unprecedented refugee crisis facing Europe, as hundreds of thousands of migrants and refugees fled war-torn countries in the Middle East and North Africa. In one year, an estimated one million migrants traveled through Macedonia, and the country's institutions organized an orderly response to the influx of people, including organizing daily trains to ferry migrants from the southern to the northern border. If the partnership between the United States and Macedonia is to remain strong, the country needs our continued support.

I also use this opportunity to urge Macedonia's leaders to continue strengthening their institutions and reforming its democracy and rule of law, especially following the slated December 11, 2016 elections, which will prove a true test of its democracy.

As a way to recognize and strengthen this strategic U.S.-Macedonia partnership, I started the first Congressional Caucus on Macedonia and Macedonian-Americans. This Caucus is a bipartisan group of members of Congress dedicated to maintaining and strengthening a positive and mutually beneficial relationship between the United States and the Republic of Macedonia, as well as advocating for the concerns and interests of the Macedonian-American community in the United States.

Michigan's 10th District has one of the largest populations of Macedonian-Americans in the Nation. I would like to acknowledge their contributions to our District and our State, and I look forward to continuing that relationship as we deal with the problems facing our great Nation.

Again, congratulations to all of Macedonian heritage for their achievements as we commemorate this important 25th anniversary of Macedonia's independence.

Long Live Macedonia (Da Zivee Makedonija)

Long Live the United States (Da Zivee Amerika)

''TURN THE PAGE'' LITERACY INITIATIVE

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every summer youth without access to books lose academic skills, while those who are reading continue to make progress in developing their proficiency. Studies show that summer learning loss is a significant cause of the achievement gap between lower- and higher-income youth. Students from low-income households learn at the same rate as their peers while school is in session, but while middle- and upper-income students show slight gains in their reading performance after the summer months, lower income students experience a two-month loss in reading achievement.

It is what teachers refer to as the ''summer slide'' or ''summer setback.'' This loss is cumulative: while teachers spend 4 to 6 weeks re-teaching material to the students who have fallen behind over the summer, other students are progressing with their skills. The result? By the end of the sixth grade, children who lose reading skills during the summer are on average 2 years behind their peers. Even more startling is the conclusion of University of Nevada research, which has shown that students without access to books are less likely to complete their basic education.

The simple fact is that there are fewer opportunities for daily summer reading when both parents are away at work. Without access to books, our kids fall behind.

My daughter teaches English at Baylor University. She has dedicated her life to edifying the young people of this country by instilling in them a love for reading, and for the intellectual tradition it gives them access to. This love needs to start early, and the inheritance of that tradition should be accessible to all Americans. That is why I am proud of the efforts of KHOU and Star Furniture, who are rolling out a new community effort to increase the literacy rate in Houston. They are soliciting donations for the non-profit group ''Books Between Kids,'' which provides at-risk children with books that they can keep in their home. We need more programs like this in our country.

IN HONOR OF JAN BLACK

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the remarkable personal and professional achievements of Dr. Jan Black, a great educator, selfless activist, and dear personal friend. Jan is at the same time a model American and a global citizen. Over the years she has devoted countless hours to local political campaigns for offices ranging from the President and Congress to city council and school board. Equally, she has been a tireless advocate and traveled around the world on behalf of international education and human rights.

Jan has taught for many years at the Middlebury Institute of International Studies in Monterey, California. She earned her BA in Art and Spanish from the University of Tennessee. She earned her MA in Latin American Studies and PhD in International Studies at the American University School of International Service in Washington DC.

Jan's international experience includes Senior Associate Membership at St. Antony's College, Oxford University; Fulbright, Mellon and other grants and Fellowships in South America, the Caribbean, and India; on-site or short-term teaching and honorary faculty positions in several Latin American countries, and extensive overseas lecturing and research. She was also a Peace Corps Volunteer in Chile and a faculty member with the University of Pittsburgh's Semester-at-Sea program.

Jan was a research professor in the Division of Public Administration, University of New Mexico, and editor and research administrator in American University's Foreign Area Studies Division. She has also served on some two dozen international editorial and non-governmental organization boards and has published numerous articles and books, including most recently a 2009 book titled ''The Politics of Human Rights Protection.''

In 2011, Jan was elected to the Board of Directors of Amnesty International USA, she is a member of the Advisory Boards of the International Political Science Association's Committee on Civil-Military Affairs; the Global Studies Program of California State University, San Jose; and the PhD Fellowship Program of the U.S. Inter-American Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House in recognizing Dr. Jan Black for her remarkable personal and professional achievements. The world is a better place because of her efforts.

RECOGNIZING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF THE CITY OF MIAMI SPRINGS

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the city of Miami Springs on the occasion of its 90th birthday.

Miami Springs was founded in 1926 by aviation pioneer Glenn H. Curtiss. Since that time, Miami Springs has grown to be home to 14,000 Floridians who prize the town for its small-town feel and civic amenities.

Miami Springs has been distinguished with several awards. In recognition of the historic nature of the town and numerous buildings and memorials that illustrate Florida history, the city was designated a ''Preserve America Community'' by former First Lady Laura Bush in 2008. Today, visitors and residents can tour over twenty historic sites. Additionally, Miami Springs has been certified as a Tree City USA since 1993.

For 90 years, Miami Springs has profited from and contributed to the community surrounding Miami International Airport. The city is a vibrant part of South Florida, and continues to be a wonderful place to live, raise a family, and open a business. I am proud to have collaborated with the thriving City of Miami Springs, and look forward to partnering with its leaders for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to the City of Miami Springs on this auspicious milestone, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this exceptional city.

CONSTITUTION WEEK 2016

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following proclamation:

Whereas, it is the privilege and duty of the American people to commemorate the two hundred and twenty-ninth anniversary of the drafting of the Constitution of the United States of America by the Constitutional Convention; and

Whereas, it is fitting and proper to officially recognize this magnificent document and the anniversary of its creation; and

Whereas, public law 915 guarantees the issuing of a proclamation each year by the President of the United States of America designating September 17 through 23 as Constitution Week;

Now, therefore, I, TOM RICE, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Representative of the Seventh District of the State of South Carolina, do hereby proclaim September 17 through 23, 2016 to be Constitution Week and ask our citizens to reaffirm the ideals the Framers of the Constitution had in 1787.

HONORING EAGLE SCOUT REECE O'CONNOR

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Reece O'Connor, an exceptional and accomplished young man from the Sixth District of Illinois. Reece is a senior at Hinsdale Central High School and has not only earned the rank of Eagle Scout but has earned every single merit badge the Boy Scouts of America have to offer.

This achievement represents many years of diligence and personal determination in support of the ideals of scouting. What makes this achievement even more impressive is the fact that Reece did not join Boy Scouts until the 7th grade.

Even with the late start, Reece made it his goal to ''catch up'' to the rest of his scout mates—and ultimately he surpassed his goal. While the Scouts only offer 136 merit badges, he currently has 138 badges. The Boy Scouts frequently add new badges and retire old ones for special occasions; for example Reece earned several badges that were only offered during the Scouts' 100th anniversary. According to a spokesman for the Boy Scouts of America Reece's success is ''an extremely rare achievement.''

Reece's Eagle Scout project was also an impressive accomplishment. In 2013, the summer before he started high school, he organized a shoe drive and collected more than 1,000 pairs of shoes. These shoes were sent to people in Oklahoma displaced by tornadoes, and to refugees in Nicaragua and Rwanda. Reece is a testament to the Boy Scouts organization and all that it stands for.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Reece for his remarkable achievements.

11TH ANNUAL NATIONAL NIGHT OUT IN THE CITY OF BULVERDE, TEXAS ON OCTOBER 4, 2016

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, National Night Out is an annual community-building campaign that promotes police-community partnerships and neighborhood camaraderie in order to make our neighborhoods safer. The City of Bulverde, which is located in the 21st Congressional District in Texas, facilitates National Night Out as a unique opportunity to join with thousands of other communities across the country in promoting cooperative, police-community crime prevention efforts.

Congratulations to the City of Bulverde as it marks its 11th consecutive year participating in this important event with the Bulverde Police Department. Each year, community participation has increased. In 2015, Bulverde placed 2nd in Texas in the National Night Out Awards Program and 14th in the U.S. in their population category.

Thanks go to the citizens of Bulverde as they join the Bulverde Police Department and the National Association of Town Watch in supporting the Annual National Night Out on October 4, 2016. These efforts keep our communities, and our citizens, more safe and secure.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST FIRE CHIEF SPENCER CHAUVIN

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of St. John the Baptist Fire Chief Spencer Chauvin. Chief Chauvin lost his life on August 28th after being struck by a charter bus while responding to a car accident.

From the time he was a teenager, Chauvin knew that he wanted to serve his community by following in the footsteps of his father and grandfather who both served as firefighters. At the age of 14, Chauvin became a volunteer firefighter with the St. John the Baptist Parish Westside Volunteer Fire Department.

He continued to show his dedication to service by working as an EMT for Acadian Ambulance then later receiving his Associate's Degree in Fire Science. In 2004, Chauvin joined the St. John the Baptist Fire Department full-time where he then became District Chief.

After 40 years of service, Chief Chauvin leaves behind a legacy that will resonate for years to come. My deepest condolences and prayers are with Chief Chauvin's family, his fellow firefighters, and especially his two young children.

FL INVENTOR HALL OF FAME 2016

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the seven inventors who have been recognized as the 2016 Inductees of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame. These inventors were nominated by their peers and have undergone the scrutiny of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame Selection Committee, having had their innovations deemed as making a significant impact for the citizens of Florida and the United States on quality of life, economic development, and welfare of society.

The Florida Inventors Hall of Fame was founded in 2013 by Paul R. Sanberg, Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation and Economic Development, and Judy Genshaft, President, at the University of South Florida. It was recognized by the Florida Senate with Senate Resolution 1756 and adopted on April 30, 2014. Its mission is to encourage individuals of all ages and backgrounds to strive toward the betterment of Florida and society through continuous, groundbreaking innovation by commending the incredible scientific work that has been or is being accomplished in Florida and by its citizens.

Nominations to the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame are open to all Florida inventors who are or who were residents of Florida and whose connection to the state has informed their inventive work. The nominee must be a named inventor on a patent issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The impact of the inventor and his or her invention should be significant to society as a whole, and the invention should have been commercialized, utilized, or led to important innovations.

The 2016 Inductees of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame are: William Dalton, Tampa physician, founder and CEO of M2Gen at Moffitt Cancer Center, for his revolutionary developments in personalized cancer treatment; Yogi Goswami, Distinguished Professor at the University of South Florida in Tampa, for his pioneering contributions and technology development in solar energy and indoor air quality; Alan Marshall, professor and chief scientist at Florida State University in Tallahassee, who invented the Fourier transform ion cyclotron resonance (FT–ICR) mass spectrometry, used to analyze complex structures; Nicholas Muzyczka, microbiologist at University of Florida in Gainesville, whose ground breaking research in adeno-associated virus has led to numerous breakthroughs in gene therapy; Jacqueline Quinn, environmental engineer at Kennedy Space Center in Cape Canaveral, who invented multiple, globally-impacting environmental cleanup technologies, including NASA's most licensed and recognized technology for groundwater remediation, Emulsified Zero Valent Iron (EZVI); Andrew Schally, Nobel Laureate, Distinguished Professor at University of Miami School of Medicine, and Distinguished Medical Research Scientist and Chief of the Endocrine, Polypeptide and Cancer Institute at the Miami Veterans Affairs Medical Center, for his discovery of hypothalamic hormones and subsequent applications of their analogues to treatment of cancer and other diseases; and MJ Soileau, professor

at the University of Central Florida in Orlando, for his innovative research in the advancement of high energy laser optics used by the Department of Defense and leading the development of UCF's internationally recognized Center for Research & Education in Optics & Lasers (CREOL).

These contributions made to society through innovation and invention are significant and life changing. I commend these individuals for the work they have done to benefit the world. In contemplating the work of these inventors, future generations can strive to emulate these honorees and their dedication to innovation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Roll Call Number 479, yes.

Roll Call Number 480, yes.

IN RECOGNITION OF HOME INSTEAD SENIOR CARE'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, please allow me to take a moment to congratulate the Home Instead Senior Care in Manassas, Virginia who are celebrating their 10th anniversary this October. Opened by Jack and Jacqueline St. Clair in 2006, Home Instead provides quality care to nearly 600 senior citizens throughout our great Commonwealth.

Home Instead caregivers seek to build quality relationships with the clients they serve, giving a personal touch to home care. The company operations are all derived from their mission ''to enhance the lives of again adults and their families''. This mission is evident as their care allows seniors to remain at home with family where they are comfortable and happy. Home Instead Senior Care in Manassas is a company run with compassion and a focus on providing excellent care for their clients. As local residents themselves, Jack and Jacqueline St. Clair pride themselves on providing friendly and responsive service to their neighbors and have dedicated themselves to making their community a better place to live for seniors and their families.

In closing Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in sending our most sincere appreciation to a company that has given so much to their neighbors. Jack, Jacqueline, and the staff at Home Instead Senior Care in Manassas serve as an example to all. On behalf of Virginia's 10th Congressional District I wish them continued success in the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF TIO TACHIAS

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tenure and accomplishments of a community leader, an elected official, and an advocate for higher education in Arizona, Mr. Tio Tachias.

Mr. Tachias has proudly served the state of Arizona for over 40 years through his work as a Coconino County Supervisor, a member of the Arizona Board of Regents and a board member for countless community and educational organizations.

He developed personal and political relationships with Arizona Governors Castro, Babbitt, Mofford and Napolitano and is widely regarded as the best person to identify, register and turnout new voters on the Navajo Nation. His work contributed to countless electoral victories and he has helped thousands of new voters exercise their right to vote on Election Day.

Mr. Tachias has also served as a mentor for the next generation of Latino and Native American youth in Arizona. He has been involved in organizations such as the Boy's and Girl's Club of Flagstaff, the Phoenix Boys Choir and Northern Arizona Crisis Nursery.

Arizona is lucky to have Tio as part of our community and I know that even in retirement he will continue to contribute to our state in countless ways.

CITY OF BRONSON'S SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the City of Bronson's Sesquicentennial celebration.

The city of Bronson—located in the heart of Branch County—was first incorporated as a village in 1866 under the name Bronson's Prairie. Named for Jabez B. Bronson, who was the first settler to the area and later the first village postmaster, Bronson was officially chartered as a city in 1934.

Known as the ''Gladiolus Capital of the United States,'' Bronson grows the finest gladiola flowers along with other diverse agricultural commodities on over 300 local farms. The city is also home to a strong industrial base, with a mixture of precision metal machining, tool and die, and automotive assembly, among numerous other manufacturing shops.

With its many lakes and trails, farmer's markets, and concerts in the park, Bronson is busy with countless activities for all. Its yearly Polish Festival attracts visitors from throughout the region, featuring Polish food, vendors, crafters, and a parade.

A gem of the community—the Bronson Public Library—remains as one of the few remaining Carnegie Libraries still in its original unaltered configuration.

It is truly an honor to commemorate this exciting celebration for the people of Bronson—where family, friends, and neighbors proudly come together to make the community a special place to call home. Congratulations to the citizens of Bronson as they celebrate 150 years.

THANKING TINA HANONU FOR HER DEDICATED SERVICE TO THE HOUSE

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and thank Ms. Tina Hanonu, who, after 31 years of dedicated service to the United States House of Representatives, retired August 5, 2016.

Tina began her career in 1984 serving as an advisor and consultant to Representative Connie Morella and went on to become a senior systems administrator for Representative Sherwood Boehlert. Recognizing her technical know-how and proven ability to provide seamless customer solutions in the IT field, Ms. Hanonu was hired by the House's Chief Administrative Officer as a systems administrator for House Information Resources. During her tenure with House Information Resources, Ms. Hanonu was promoted multiple times and took on several important roles, including the Director of Technology Support, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer and then finally the Senior Advisor for the Transition to the 115th Congress.

Having worked in various capacities on the Hill, Tina developed a comprehensive understanding of the House's complex IT needs and worked tirelessly to serve the House community. Tina's colleagues at the CAO and the countless congressional offices she worked with over the course of her three-decade career, not only praised her many skills, but also her upbeat attitude, positive approach to every problem and strong work ethic that cultivated strong relationships between Member offices and administrative House organizations.

Ms. Hanonu's supervisor, Chief Information Officer Catherine Szpindor, praised Tina's ''deep commitment to the House and genuine love for the role she played in supporting the Member, Committee, and Leadership offices and CAO offices over her 31 year tenure.''

Tina once said that despite her many years working on the Hill, she would get ''goosebumps every day'' when she saw the Capitol Dome. The privilege of working here at the Capitol was not lost on Ms. Hanonu and it showed every day. Mr. Speaker, I think it's clear that those who worked with Ms. Hanonu considered it a privilege to call her a colleague and a friend.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I personally congratulate Tina on her retirement, and thank her for her outstanding dedication and contributions to this institution.

RECOGNIZING TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to applaud the work of Texas Instruments Incorporated and to recognize the important contributions they have made to accelerate U.S. innovation and increase access to high-quality science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education in my home state of Texas.

Texas Instruments was founded in 1951, when Cecil H. Green, J. Erik Jonsson, Eugene McDermott, and Patrick E. Haggerty reorganized Geophysical Service Incorporated after the company had produced the world's first commercial silicon transistor. They evolved the business from a company primarily serving the oil and gas industry to a semiconductor manufacturer. As an organization fundamentally built by engineers and scientists, research and development has always been a top priority. Sincere in their desire to invest in innovation and education in their own community, the founders helped establish the University of Texas at Dallas in 1969 with the vision of creating a local science, technology, and research institution.

Over the years, the leadership of Texas Instruments has not lost the vision of the founders. They have continued a commitment to improving STEM education in Texas and creating high-skilled jobs across the nation by investing in the surrounding community and schools and by maintaining manufacturing facilities within the United States.

In early August 2016, Texas Instruments and the Texas Instruments Foundation announced a commitment of $5.4 million to the advancement of STEM education in public schools, with an emphasis on creating opportunities for girls and minorities. The majority of this contribution will be distributed to North Texas schools, including $1.7 million for Southern Methodist University to train a large new cadre of middle school science teachers. An additional $2 million will support the professional development of math and science teachers as well as teacher training for Advanced Placement courses through the proven National Math and Science Initiative.

Mr. Speaker, Texas Instrument's generous 2016 contribution to STEM education is testament to their unwavering 65-year commitment to the Dallas area and to our nation. Their philanthropic history represents the best of what can be accomplished in partnership between companies and their local communities. I am proud to honor Texas Instruments today, and I look forward to all they will continue to do in the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RIALTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. NORMA J. TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Rialto Unified School District (USD) on their 125th anniversary. For 125 years, the Rialto USD has taken part in educating our children and fostering the bright leaders of tomorrow.

Rialto USD services a diverse population of approximately 25,500 students, with more than 2,700 district employees. Presently, the District has three comprehensive high schools, one adult education school, one continuation high school, 5 middle schools, 19 elementary schools, and 20 preschools. Not only is the Rialto USD the largest employer of the City, but they are always looking for ways to give back to their community. They embrace a vision of providing an education that prepares all students for their future. They pursue a mission to provide high levels of instruction for all students and to inspire every student to set goals and maximize their potential.

In 2010, Rialto USD inaugurated the 'Cesar Chavez/Dolores Huerta Center for Education,' a new professional development center and location for community events.

Under the leadership of Dr. Cuauhtémoc Avila, the District's first Latino school chief, Rialto USD has received several awards including state academic, athletic, and fine arts awards. In 2015, Dollahan and Myers Elementary Schools in Rialto were honored as the California 'Gold Ribbon Schools' which recognizes outstanding educational programs and practices.

For their many contributions to the greater community of Rialto, I would like to recognize the Rialto Unified School District for their 125 years of service to the 35th District.

HONORING DR. JUAN QUINTANA, DNP, MHS, CRNA, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NURSE ANESTHETISTS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Juan Quintana, DNP, MHS, CRNA. Dr. Quintana will soon complete his year as national president of the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists (AANA) whose headquarters are located in my district. I am proud that Dr. Quintana was elected as 2015–2016 president, and I want to congratulate him on his year of leadership of this prestigious national organization.

Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetists (CRNAs) are advanced practice registered nurses who administer approximately 43 million anesthetics to patients each year. They work in every setting where anesthesia is delivered, including the Veteran Health Administration, Department of Defense, hospital surgical suites, obstetrical delivery rooms, ambulatory surgical centers, and the offices of dentists, podiatrists, and specialty surgeons. They also provide acute and chronic pain management services to patients in need of such care. CRNAs provide anesthesia for all types of surgical cases and are the sole anesthesia providers in many rural hospitals.

The president of Sleepy Anesthesia, an anesthesia practice founded in 1999, Dr. Quintana has been practicing anesthesia since 1997. Graduating with a Doctor of Nursing Practice degree from Texas Christian University in 2009, Dr. Quintana is a leader in the area of education and evaluation of cost-effectiveness and efficiency. A highly sought-after lecturer, he has been invited to speak at hospitals and numerous anesthesia meetings on the state and national levels about the business of anesthesia, cost effectiveness of best anesthesia practice models, cost effectiveness of anesthesia professionals, and anesthesia billing and compliance.

In 2010, Dr. Quintana became the first CRNA to serve on the Medicare Evidence Development and Coverage Advisory Council (MEDCAC), an independent body that provides the Medicare agency guidance and expert advice on the science and technology affecting healthcare delivery.

Dr. Quintana, is also an educator, ex-officio faculty to the Texas Christian University (TCU) Doctor of Nursing Practice program, and adjunct faculty to TCU's Nurse Anesthesia Program, both in Fort Worth, Texas. Dr. Quintana resides in Winnsboro, Texas.

During his AANA Presidency, Dr. Quintana has been a prominent advocate before federal agencies and with members of Congress for nurse anesthetists and the patients they serve so well. He has worked tirelessly to improve veterans' access to care through recognition of CRNAs and other advanced practice registered nurses as Full Practice Authority Providers in the Veterans Health Administration (VHA), promote anesthesia patient safety and the value of CRNAs to our healthcare system, ensure proper implementation of the provider non-discrimination provision of the Affordable Care Act, and obtain appropriate recognition of the full scope of CRNA practice including pain management and related services in the Medicare system.

I extend my sincere congratulations to Dr. Quintana today on a job well done. His service to the AANA, our veterans, and patients is deeply appreciated, and his commitment to guaranteeing access to high quality health care nationwide is commendable. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing his notable career and outstanding achievements.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LIMITING INHUMANE FEDERAL TRAPPING (LIFT) FOR PUBLIC SAFETY ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to severely restrict the use of inhumane body-gripping traps on certain public lands and by certain public officials. Countless dogs, cats, and wild animals are injured and killed each year in body-gripping traps such as leg and foothold, Conibear, and snare traps. These traps are used by federal agencies, state and local governments, private entities, and individual trappers to catch creatures for their fur, keep animals away from livestock and crops, and even for recreational purposes. Unfortunately, body-gripping traps subject captured animals to intense pain—sometimes for hours or even days—before they may eventually die from dehydration, injuries, predation, or when a trapper eventually finds them. Furthermore, these traps are non-selective in their victims, and

may capture and even kill non-target species such as pets and other companion animals, particularly if set in popular areas. There are many effective non-lethal methods that can be deployed in place of these cruel traps.

Wildlife Services, a federal agency notorious for its secrecy and use of inhumane animal management techniques, is responsible for the death or capture of thousands of animals per year in cruel body-gripping traps, often used as a first resort. Wildlife Services also advises and enters into contracts and cooperative agreements with state and local governments, as well as with private entities, to kill animals using these traps. Other federal agencies, too, use body-gripping traps to control animal species—too often without attempting more humane, effective, and non-lethal control options first. This bill will severely limit Wildlife Services' and other agencies' ability to deploy or counsel others to deploy cruel body-gripping traps, increasing transparency for this agency and ensuring that taxpayer dollars are prioritized for nonlethal methods of control.

Although trapping is regulated at the state level, federal land management agencies have oversight of where and when trapping occurs on federal land. Unfortunately, federal agencies have limited data showing where traps are deployed on public lands, thereby prolonging the suffering of trapped animals and leaving the public to learn about traps only when pets and humans are injured. The bill tackles this issue as well, making sure that federal agencies in the Departments of Agriculture and Interior do a better job of regulating trapping by non-federal entities on public lands, thereby limiting cruelty and protecting public safety.

In Oregon and across the country, there have been too many concerning examples of wild animals suffering and pets falling victim to these traps. This bill complements efforts by other colleagues in the House and Senate to crack down on the use of body-gripping traps, in light of the growing public acknowledgement that we should not and cannot continue to endorse the widespread use of these inhumane devices.

BIG BEAR CITY COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the Big Bear City Community Services District (BBCCSD) 50th anniversary. BBCCSD hosted a special ceremony on Monday, August 1, 2016 during their regularly scheduled board meeting to mark this special occasion.

BBCCSD was formed in 1966 to provide water, solid waste, and sewer services to residents of Big Bear City and East Valley.

As the representative of Big Bear City in the U.S. House of Representatives, I'd like to congratulate BBCCSD Board President Paul Terry, Board Vice President John Green, Board Member Karyn Oxandaboure, Board Member Larry Walsh, and Board Member Al Ziegler. In addition, I'd like to recognize past and current BBCCSD employees for their contributions to the residents of Big Bear City and surrounding communities.

CAPE LOOKOUT LIFE SAVING STATION

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, commencing first in 1848, the United States Life Saving Service was a federal government agency that grew out of private and local humanitarian efforts to create and man rescue stations along the coast. These outposts were often remote. The men stationed there took great pride in their deep commitment to save the lives of shipwrecked mariners and passengers, often against overwhelming odds. In 1874, life saving stations were added along the coast of Maine, Cape Cod, and the famed Outer Banks of North Carolina. In 1878, this network of stations was formally organized as a separate agency of the United States Department of the Treasury. In 1915, the Service formally merged with the Revenue Cutter Service to form the United States Coast Guard. These lonely, isolated outposts were always manned by the bravest of men who knew no fear, and who were dedicated to their sworn duty of rescuing seamen in distress. Their motto was ''to always go, but not always return''. Even now, many stories are told about the daring rescues by such men, some admittedly embellished a bit for literary interest. Proudly beat the hearts today of all who can call themselves their descendants.

One of the most notable of these rescues occurred on a cold, blustery winter's night in February of 1905. The three-masted schooner, *Sarah D. J. Rawson,* was two days out of Georgetown, South Carolina and bound for New York with a full cargo of lumber. While running under reefed sails in a heavy winter squall on February 8, she ran up hard aground on Cape Lookout Shoals at approximately 5:00 PM. Managing as best he could under extreme conditions, the captain gave orders to take in all canvas and prepare for the worst. While the brave crew performed its work, a Norwegian seaman—Jacob Hansen—was swept overboard to his death, his body given up to the shoals. The violent onslaughts of the treacherous waves continually broke over the ship eventually carrying away her spars, deckhouses, running rigging, and life boat, her cargo of lumber likewise being scattered like match sticks among the unforgiving seas. Positioning themselves among the highest points of her masts, the crewmen did the best they could to preserve their lives while hoping and praying throughout the night that help would soon arrive, but no doubt fearful of a bad ending to their ordeal.

The following morning broke with a thick mantle of fog enshrouding the sea. While scanning the ocean at approximately noon of the 9th, the duty watchman of the Cape Lookout life saving crew who was posted atop the watch tower spotted the uppermost mast heads of the *Rawson* through the fog bank. Realizing the ship was in dire distress, he immediately called forth his fellow life savers from their barracks. Though many had high fevers and suffering from the flu, all leapt into action according to their rigorous training and hastened to the shore with their mule drawn wagon and such other equipment as they knew would be required. The surf boat was then launched through breaking seas, and with all hands aboard, they began to row the nine mile journey through the shoal waters to the stricken ship. Arriving on the scene about 4 PM, the life savers found themselves seriously surrounded and endangered by floating wreckage and lumber being cast about in the waves. As night was setting in, orders were given to stand away a bit and wait for more favorable sea conditions. With anchor set, these crewmen spent the entire night in the freezing cold huddled together in their little boat, awaiting the morning hour when seas would subside and be more in their favor for a rescue attempt. Throughout the night, the surf men suffered greatly from exposure, fatigue, and hunger, but none failed or faltered to perform their sworn duty as life savers.

At about 1 PM of the 10th, and with their hopes encouraged and renewed, the life savers were able to commence a rescue attempt due to better conditions of wind and tide, and so they approached the *Rawson* close enough to lay in amongst the nearby wave troughs and cast over their ''heaving line'' to the deck of the ship. With the first attempt successful, the first fortunate seaman tied the rope around his waist, jumped into the sea, and was pulled to the safety of the life boat. His companions followed his example, and one by one in turn, all hands were rescued in like fashion. Once all were brought aboard, the life savers began the long, exhausting pull back to the shore, now loaded with the weight of fourteen men—eight life savers and the six rescued seamen. The savers gave up their oil skins and wrapped those and other garments about the huddled, suffering seamen so they could better endure the perils of the freezing weather.

The crew of the *Rawson* had been forty-eight hours without food or water. The life savers had spent twenty-eight hours in their cramped, open boat being cast about in the treacherous seas without food or sufficient warmth, uncertain whether a successful rescue could even be achieved, given the perilous conditions. Upon their return to the shore, the *Rawson* seamen were given food and shelter at the station and eventually returned to their families and employers through intermediary assistance. The fate of the *Sarah D. J. Rawson* and her crew would never have been known but for the unflinching heroism of the crew of the Cape Lookout Life Saving Station. Each member was subsequently awarded the Gold Lifesaving Medal for extreme and selfless service in this famous rescue. All had admirably performed their sworn duty in the face of incredible obstacles and in the highest traditions of the Life Saving Service. A more complete report of the *Rawson* rescue appears at: http://www.coastalguide.com/helmsman/rawsonrescue.shtml.

The names of the members who were attached to the Cape Lookout Station and participated in this rescue are: William H. Gaskill (the ''Keeper''), Kilby Guthrie, Walter M. Yeomans, Tyre Moore, James W. Fulcher, John E. Kirkman, Calupt T. Jarvis, and Joseph L. Lewis, some of the bravest ''Tar Heel'' sons ever hatched out of Carteret County homes. During World War II, the U.S. Government made a request of these men to return their gold medals to support the war effort. The

medals have never been returned to the men or their families.

I thank the United States Coast Guard for agreeing to provide replicas of these medals to the surviving families of the members of the Cape Lookout life saving crew. These brave men will be honored in perpetuity by the display of these replica medals in the Core Sound Waterfowl Museum in Harkers Island, North Carolina for their brave efforts they gave during the rescue of the *Sarah D. J. Rawson.*

IN RECOGNITION OF LOUDOUN COUNTY'S 2016 FUTURE LEADERS

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the eight Loudoun County students selected by the Claude Moore Charitable Foundation to be a part of the 2016 Future Leaders Program. I would like to personally commemorate Gabby Lewis, Ryan Wells, Maria Fernando Peña, Matthew Eberhart, Oriella Meija, Jasmine Lu, Devin MacGoy, and Madison Ojeda, each of whom has proven to be both outstanding students and remarkable people. They truly embody the very best of this nation's values through their continued hard work and commitment to excellence in education.

Loudoun County has continually provided a top notch learning environment with numerous opportunities and programs above and beyond its expectations, which has cultivated many young leaders like the ones I am recognizing today. These future leaders have developed amiable qualities similar to those of our nation's leaders. This recognition is a clear testament to the outstanding works these exemplary individuals exhibit and they are deserving of recognition.

Mr. Speaker, it brings me immense pride to recognize such a fine group of students, and I sincerely hope that we all can live up to their remarkable example. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating them and I wish them the best of luck and continued success in their futures.

IN RECOGNITION OF STATER BROS. 80TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. NORMA J. TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Inland Empire based supermarket chain Stater Bros. on their 80th year anniversary and their commitment to provide value, quality, and friendly service to families all across Southern California.

On August 17, 1936, the first Stater Bros. store was opened in the San Bernardino County by two World War II veteran brothers, Cleo & Leo Stater. The company has become the largest privately owned chain of supermarket stores in Southern California and is the largest private employer in both San Bernardino County and Riverside County.

Stater Bros. currently operates 168 supermarkets with approximately 18,000 members working as part of the Stater Bros. family. As a company that was founded by veterans, nearly 2,000 employees have served or continue to serve in multiple branches of our armed forces. Stater Bros. advances the legacy of its founders by continuing to give back to the communities it serves.

Stater Bros. is among the top 100 privately owned businesses in the country and it is a valued and valuable member of the community. They have provided funding to countless local organizations benefitting hunger relief, children's well-being, education, health care, and help for our nation's veterans. This includes support for organizations such as Feeding America, Toys for Tots, the Children's Fund, and the 'Believe Walk' to fight cancer.

Their generosity has garnered Stater Bros. several honors and recognitions such as the Donor of the Year award from Feeding America's Riverside/San Bernardino chapter for leading efforts to donate over 3 million pounds of food to local food charities each year. Stater Bros. also received the Best Emissions Rate award from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for helping remove nearly 40 million pounds of waste from landfills each year through their Green Waste Composting Program.

Because they go above and beyond to serve their community, I would like to recognize and congratulate Stater Bros. on their 80th Anniversary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted: Roll Call Number 481, No; Roll Call Number 482, No.

IN RECOGNITION OF BURR GRAY

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable service of Burr Gray to our community. Burr has served as the President of the Cabin John Citizens Association in Cabin John, Maryland for 20 years. He was elected to lead the Association in 1997 and has served the Cabin John community with vision and distinction ever since.

Burr is an exemplar of what it means to be engaged in a community. In 1997, at the beginning of his first term, Burr encouraged members of the Cabin John community to become volunteers, to be active in its Citizens Association, and to participate in the first Cabin John Stream Cleanup. Thanks to Burr's leadership, the Cabin John Stream Cleanup is now a community tradition that keeps this waterway to the Potomac River and, ultimately, the Chesapeake Bay, clean. Burr also encouraged community members to support Friends of Cabin John Creek, a coalition of neighborhood community organizations working to curb stormwater runoff.

Burr brought the community's love for the Potomac River to a new level when he began the Cabin John Regatta in 1999. This annual canoe trip has increased respect for the River within the community and allows members of the community to enjoy the natural beauty of Cabin John.

Burr's other endeavors are numerous and include an annual community blood drive, plans for a playground at the Clara Barton Community Center, and formation of Friends of the Clara Barton Community Center. The list goes on and on.

In 2008, Burr spearheaded the neighborhood effort to celebrate the 400th Anniversary of Captain John Smith's voyage on the Potomac River in 1608. This event brought the community together and led the Citizens Association to publish Cabin John: Legends and Life of an Uncommon Place.

Burr has served on the Boards of the Potomac Conservancy and Glen Echo Park. He also spearheaded efforts to preserve Gibson Grove, a cemetery for freed slaves. These efforts led to the restoration of the area and a historical panel to highlight the significance of the site.

Over the last two decades, Burr has put the needs of the Cabin John community first and has personified Cabin John's traditions of service and leadership. I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our deepest gratitude and appreciation to Burr Gray for his 20 years of creative and visionary service to the community.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 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 $19,478,308,415,366.69. We've added $8,851,431,366,453.61 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING BURNHAM JOHN ''BUD'' PHILBROOK'S 70TH BIRTHDAY

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Burnham John ''Bud'' Philbrook as he celebrates his 70th birthday. As Bud commemorates this milestone with his wife Michele and their family, I would like to call to attention some of the remarkable work that Bud has done in his 70 years.

As newlyweds, Bud and Michele embarked on a honeymoon they would later describe as a ''blending of Disney World and the real world''. From Florida, Bud and Michele traveled to Guatemala to volunteer in the rural village of Conacaste. This experience stayed

with Bud and Michele and changed the course of their lives,

This tireless couple went on to found Saint Paul-based Global Volunteers. This non-profit sends as many as 2,500 volunteers each year to 100 communities in 20 countries around the world. Bud and Michele understood that for programs like theirs to work, change had to come from within the developing communities. By building local partnerships, Global Volunteers has made strides in agriculture, education, and public health care, impacting thousands of lives.

Before Bud co-founded Global Volunteers, he was already acting as a community leader in Minnesota. Bud worked on the campaigns of Senators Eugene McCarthy and George McGovern. After law school, Bud represented the people of Minnesota in the State Legislature, where he served on the education, agriculture, and financial institutions committees. Later, he became the Assistant Commissioner for the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.

In 2009, Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack appointed Bud as the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Deputy Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services (FFAS). In this role, Bud coordinated the international elements of the FFAS mission. Keeping with his past international development work, at the USDA Bud was also able to provide food aid as well as technical assistance to foreign countries in times of need.

In his 70 years, Bud has come to exemplify the term ''global citizen''. From his leadership at home in Minnesota to the countless lives Bud and Michele have improved around the world, Bud represents the positive change a person can make in the world. Here is to a happy birthday for Bud, and for many more years of family, health, and happiness.

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE CREATION OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the centennial of the creation of the United States International Trade Commission. As Ranking Member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the committee that oversees the Commission, I want to congratulate the Commission on this anniversary and the Commission's staff who do important work.

Congress has tasked the Commission with a number of important roles, including administering U.S. trade remedies laws in a neutral and objective fashion, maintaining the harmonized tariff schedule, and determining whether foreign goods violate U.S. intellectual property laws or are otherwise unfairly traded.

Congress has also called upon the Commission to independently investigate and analyze a wide range of issues related to international economics. The Commission's role in this regard is highlighted by the lack of detailed analysis on many international economic issues that impact the lives of American workers and families. The impact of U.S. trade agreements is not a hypothetical issue, and we cannot simply assume that the benefits of trade will outweigh its costs or that those who benefit will compensate those who lose. We need new models and new thinking regarding how we analyze the impact of international trade, and it is important that the Commission be a leader in that regard.

I look forward to working with the Commission, as it begins its second century of work, to ensure that the analysis of international trade addresses 21st century economic issues.

MR. GEORGE PIRO

HON. LEE M. ZELDIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a special tribute to Mr. George Piro, who passed away on July 23, 2016, at the age of 95.

George's story is unlike any other. When he answered his country's call to duty and enlisted in the U.S. Army in January of 1942 during World War II, he could have never envisioned the trials and tribulations that would await him just a year later. In September 1943, on his ninth combat mission, George was forced to parachute from a B–24 Liberator after it was shot down in the mountains about 80 miles east of Rome. When they made landfall, they were unfortunately taken by the local police and found themselves continually on the move from one POW camp to the next until they arrived at Stalag Luft 1, where they would spend the remainder of the war as prisoners.

George and his fellow service members were finally liberated on April 30, 1945, the same year he returned to Bellport, NY. In 1946, he married Madeleine Myers, whom he had met prior to enlisting, and started working at the local post office. In addition to all he managed to accomplish as a service member and in his personal life; he was also a charter member of the VFW in East Patchogue, NY. George is survived by his brother, daughter, two grandchildren, four great-grandchildren, and two great-great grandchildren.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank George for his years of dedication and service to our country and community. What he had to endure as a POW cannot be summarized in a few words; however it is important we honor these types of individuals as best we can. It is my hope that many will follow in his footsteps and give back to our country as graciously as he did. People like him are a rare breed and they help make not only our country, but our world a much safer and better place.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE AND DEDICATION OF THE MEMBERS AND VOLUNTEERS AT GLEANING FOR THE WORLD, INC.

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks to recognize the service and dedication of the members and volunteers at Gleaning for the World, Inc.

Gleaning for the World is a non-profit, humanitarian aid organization that provides life-saving supplies and equipment to those in need at home and abroad. From its beginnings in the basement of its founder, Reverend Ronald Davidson, the organization expanded to an ever-growing facility in Concord, Virginia and now serves more than 55 countries. Gleaning for the World currently utilizes over 2,100 local volunteers and expects that number to increase to over 4,000 with the recent addition of its new Volunteer Center.

The organization prides itself on operating innovatively and efficiently. Forbes Magazine recognized Gleaning for the World four of the last five years as ''The Most Efficient Large Charity in America.'' Rather than serving as a stand-alone charity, it partners with churches and other charitable organizations to coordinate and maximize the strengths of all for the common good. Over the course of 17 years, Gleaning for the World saved over 35 acres of landfill space by repurposing products for humanitarian purposes. For every dollar donated, it places $103 worth of supplies domestically and $212 worth of supplies internationally.

Gleaning for the World serves as a first responder non-profit for emergencies in the United States and provides water and other critical supplies within hours of natural disasters at home. Recently, the organization served as a critical resource in its own backyard following devastating tornado damage in Appomattox County. Gleaning for the World continues that role to this day as a long-term relief coordinator for Appomattox County.

I ask the Members of this House of Representatives to join with me in thanking Gleaning for the World, Reverend Ronald Davidson, and all of its members and volunteers, for its unwavering, dedicated service at home and abroad.

IN TRIBUTE TO RICHARD MASLOWSKI

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Richard Maslowski who has served as the City of Glendale, Wisconsin's City Administrator since 1980. After 36 years of exemplary service to the City of Glendale, he retired effective on August 31, 2016. Richard Maslowski may well be the longest-serving city administrator in the State of Wisconsin and is a native of South Milwaukee, Wisconsin. He held similar positions in West Bend and Butler prior to assuming the Glendale City Administrator position.

Richard Maslowski has been a transformative figure for the City of Glendale, Wisconsin. He leaves behind a city that has undergone major positive changes due in large part to his broad influence and great leadership. When Richard Maslowski started working as Glendale's City Administrator, the community's most visible properties were Bayshore Mall and Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co.'s massive grain elevator. More than three decades later, the mall has been redeveloped as the mixed-use Bayshore Town Center, while a business park has replaced the grain elevator.

Under Mr. Maslowski's direction, Glendale created its first tax incremental financing (TIF) district in 1981, for a hotel project; eight more districts followed during his tenure. The nine commercial developments developed during Mr. Maslowski's tenure utilizing the city's TIF district authority include: hotels, business parks, apartments and the conversion of Bayshore Mall into Bayshore Town Center being the largest TIF project.

Mr. Maslowski always found a way to move the project forward. I was proud to work with Richard Maslowski to obtain a federal grant to help finance an off-ramp from I–43 to Bayshore's main parking structure on N. Port Washington Road. At the time, I obtained the funds I did not represent Glendale in Congress but had previously represented Glendale in Wisconsin's State Senate. I knew the area well and knew what it represented for the future of the City of Glendale and for this development, Bayshore Town Center, which opened in 2006.

Mr. Maslowski has been an innovator, he was among the first to utilize TIFs for environmental cleanup costs. In 1992, Glendale used a TIF for environmental cleanup costs, an unusual tactic then but is now commonplace, to convert a closed hotel, built on the site of a former dump, into a new Hotel complex. Glendale also became perhaps the first city in Wisconsin where the developer/company paid the costs upfront for environmental cleanup. The company later received property tax rebates to compensate it for the environmental cleanup costs.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Mr. Richard Maslowski. He leaves big shoes to fill and a rich legacy of innovation, creativity, growth and sustainability for the City of Glendale. Mr. Maslowski has many skill sets and is always professional. However, I believe perhaps his strongest ability is bringing the right people together at critical times to complete a project and ultimately recreate a city. He is a true trailblazer. The citizens of the Fourth Congressional District, the State of Wisconsin and the nation have benefited tremendously from his dedicated service. I am honored for these reasons to pay tribute to Mr. Richard Maslowski.

HONORING NASA'S LAUNCH OF THE OSIRIS-REX

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of NASA's launch of the spacecraft OSIRIS-REx to the asteroid Bennu. I am extremely proud that Tucson is once again a key player in a critical NASA mission, as it was with the Mars Phoenix Lander mission a few years ago, and many others throughout our Nation's history.

In a seven-year roundtrip mission, OSIRIS-REx will journey to an asteroid that NASA has classified as "potentially hazardous" to Earth to complete a survey and return with the largest sample of extra-terrestrial material since the Apollo lunar missions. This program will yield insights into asteroid composition and how asteroids move in space. The most unique aspect of the OSIRIS-REx mission is the large and pristine sample that will be brought back to Earth, which will allow scientists to research the origins of our universe and galaxy and help us answer some of the most profound and fundamental questions that have intrigued mankind since our beginnings. We will be able to examine the composition of the asteroid using instruments and techniques that are far more advanced than those in space, including the potential for resources that could be mined from asteroids.

The OSIRIS REx mission is funded by NASA and its science is led by the University of Arizona (UA). I would like to congratulate Dr. Dante Lauretta of the UA Lunar and Planetary Laboratory for his leadership as principal investigator and, along with his team, for bringing this exciting mission to the launch stage. I understand that Dante has been working on this concept for the last 15 years, and I greatly look forward to celebrating even more milestones with his team as the mission progresses.

This mission is the latest in a long list of achievements by scientists at the University of Arizona in my home district. In fact, UA scientists have collaborated in every single American mission to the Moon and Mars since 1964, including serving as the lead on the Phoenix Mars Mission. I look forward to announcing the next big milestone in Aug. of 2018, when the spacecraft will rendezvous with the asteroid called "Bennu" to begin surveying it before taking a sample and returning to Earth by 2023. In the meantime, the University of Arizona will house mission control, as it did for the Phoenix Mars mission, continuing to involve undergraduate and graduate students in the research, which will help cultivate the next generation of STEM leaders—many of whom will be from my home state of Arizona.

I wish the OSIRIS REx team the best of luck in their historic mission and congratulate them in their profound success.

HONORING HELEN LANDERS

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I, along with Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Representative HASTINGS, and Representative FRANKEL, rise today to honor the life and legacy of Helen Landers, who passed away on September 4, 2016. We commend Mrs. Landers' decades of service to Broward County and offer our sincerest condolences to her loved ones on her passing.

Helen Landers served as Broward County Historian for over twenty years until her retirement at the age of 90. With her knowledge of the region and passion for history, she educated South Floridians young and old about our rich heritage. Through her participation in historical events like Pioneer Days, she fostered a love of learning about the past.

Helen Landers also dedicated much of her life to helping women empower women. She was a member of the Broward County Women's Hall of Fame, a founding member of the Broward County Women's History Coalition, Chair of the Broward County Commission on the Status of Women 1989, and served on the National Board of Directors of the American Association of University Women. She advocated remarkably for women's rights and passage of the Equal Rights Amendment.

Through her archival work and community service, Helen Landers preserved the stories of how South Florida came to be the home we know and love today. Her many contributions to our community will never be forgotten. It is with gratitude that we remember her life of service in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HONORING MARION ASHEN LUSARDI

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Marion Ashen Lusardi, or Midge as she is known to many. Midge is a longtime Michigan resident and a community treasure.

Midge is the wife of Dr. Bob Lusardi, whom she married in 1970, and the proud mom of Matthew and Gregory. She graduated from St. Mary's College in Indiana with a Bachelor of Arts in 1973 and received her Master's degree in Library Science from Wayne State University in 1991. She worked tirelessly as a Librarian at the Troy Public Library for several years before becoming the Director of the Chesterfield Township Library, where she has served for the past 20 years.

Throughout her time at the Chesterfield Township library, she secured over $1.2 million in awards and grants, which have provided innumerable resources to our local community. She is also the recipient of several awards, including the State Librarian's Citation of Excellence Awards from the Library of Michigan. She also chaired the Michigan Library Association's Public Policy Committee in 2002.

In addition to her service at the library, she has been a member of many community organizations that have all been proud to have her input and positivity. She has promoted a love of reading and learning throughout the 10th District of Michigan, and, although she is retiring from her current post at the Chesterfield Township Library, I have no doubt that she will continue to serve our community in countless ways.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can all agree that providing our children and our communities with invaluable educational resources is a noble pursuit, and Midge has been a diligent example of this. I ask that my colleagues join me today in honoring Midge for her contributions to the 10th District of the great State of Michigan, our children, and the future of this country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted: Roll Call Number 483, no; Roll

Call Number 484, no; Roll Call Number 485, no; Roll Call Number 486, no; Roll Call Number 487, yes; Roll Call Number 488, yes.

HONORING MAJ. RAYMOND WINDMILLER

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Maj. Raymond Windmiller on his retirement from the United States Army.

Ray enlisted in the Army in 1989. After completing Basic Combat Training, Advanced Individual Training and Airborne School, he was stationed with the 82nd Airborne Division in Fort Bragg, NC. Ray has served our nation honorably over his long and distinguished career spanning numerous assignments here and abroad, most notably two deployments to Iraq and one to Afghanistan. A decorated combat veteran and infantryman, Ray has earned dozens of awards, including a Bronze Star.

I was fortunate to have Ray on my staff as an Army Congressional Fellow in 2012. His hands-on field and training experience and in-depth knowledge of national security affairs assisted me greatly in my role as a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, Ray has dedicated himself to the United States Army every day for 27 years. I want to thank Ray, his wife, Amy, and their children, Hailey and Alex; they have served our community and made many sacrifices for our country. Ray represents the very best of our Armed Forces, and I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on September 7, 2016, on Roll Call No. 481 on the motion on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 843, Providing for consideration of H.R. 5063, the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2016, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted no on the motion on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 843.

On September 7, 2016, on Roll Call No. 482 on agreeing to the Resolution, H. Res. 843, Providing for consideration of H.R. 5063, the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2016, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted no on agreeing to the Resolution, H. Res. 843.

On September 7, 2016, on Roll Call No. 483 on agreeing to the Amendment, Conyers of Michigan Amendment No. 1, offered to H.R. 5063, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on agreeing to the Amendment, Conyers of Michigan Amendment No. 1.

On September 7, 2016, on Roll Call No. 484 on agreeing to the Amendment, Cicilline of Rhode Island Amendment No. 2, offered to H.R. 5063, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on agreeing to the Amendment, Cicilline of Rhode Island Amendment No. 2.

On September 7, 2016, on Roll Call No. 485 on agreeing to the Amendment, Jackson Lee of Texas Amendment No. 4, offered to H.R. 5063, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on agreeing to the Amendment, Jackson Lee of Texas Amendment No. 4.

On September 7, 2016, on Roll Call No. 486 on agreeing to the Amendment, Gosar of Arizona Amendment No. 5, offered to H.R. 5063, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted no on agreeing to the Amendment, Gosar of Arizona Amendment No. 5.

On September 7, 2016, on Roll Call No. 487 on the motion to recommit with instructions, H.R. 5063, Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2016, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to recommit with instructions.

On September 7, 2016, on Roll Call No. 488 on passage of H.R. 5063, Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2016, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted no on passage of H.R. 5063.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5421–S5486

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3299–3307, S.J. Res. 39, and S. Res. 549–550. **Pages S5469–70**

Measures Reported:

S. 815, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–345)

S. 1007, to amend the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 to rename a site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park. (S. Rept. No. 114–346)

S. 1448, to designate the Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary in the State of Oregon, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–347)

S. 2309, to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish within the National Park Service the U.S. Civil Rights Network, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–348) **Page S5469**

Measures Passed:

Master Chief Petty Officer Jesse Dean VA Clinic: Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3969, to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Laughlin, Nevada, as the "Master Chief Petty Officer Jesse Dean VA Clinic", and the bill was then passed. **Page S5482**

Service of Aviation's First Responders: Senate agreed to S. Res. 549, expressing a commitment by the Senate to never forget the service of aviation's first responders. **Page S5482**

40th Anniversary of Women at the United States Naval Academy Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 550, designating the week of September 5 through September 9, 2016, as "Recognizing the 40th Anniversary of Women at the United States Naval Academy Week". **Pages S5482–83**

Measures Considered:

Water Resources Development Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of 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, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S5424–44, S5445**

Adopted:

Inhofe (for Heller/Heinrich) Amendment No. 4981 (to Amendment No. 4979), to ensure the proper implementation of the rural Western water program. **Page S5435**

Inhofe (for Merkley/Wyden) Amendment No. 4991 (to Amendment No. 4979), to provide loan forgiveness under Clean Water State Revolving Funds to local irrigation districts. **Page S5435**

Pending:

McConnell (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 4979, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S5424**

Inhofe Amendment No. 4980 (to Amendment No. 4979), to make a technical correction. **Page S5424**

A motion was entered to close further debate on McConnell (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 4979 (listed above) and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of September 8, 2016, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, September 12, 2016. **Page S5445**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of McConnell (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 4979. **Page S5445**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments for the cloture motion on McConnell (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 4979 and the cloture motion on the bill be at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, September, 12, 2016. **Page S5483**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, September 12, 2016, Senate resume consideration of the bill. **Page S5483**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By a unanimous vote of 92 yeas (Vote No. EX. 137), Peter Michael McKinley, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Federative Republic of Brazil.

Pages S5444–45, S5486

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Navy.

Pages S5483–86

Messages from the House: **Page S5464**

Measures Referred: **Page S5464**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S5464**

Executive Communications: **Pages S5464–69**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S5469**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5470–71**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S5471–74**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5462–64**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S5474–82**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S5482**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—137) **Page S5445**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 5:09 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, September 12, 2016. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5483.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

PAKISTAN

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Pakistan, focusing on challenges for United States interests, after receiving testimony from Toby Dalton, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Nuclear Policy Program, Daniel S. Markey, Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies Global Policy Program, and Robert L. Grenier, ERG Partners, all of Washington, D.C.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY RULEMAKING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management concluded a hearing to examine reviewing independent agency rulemaking, after receiving testimony from Robert R. Gasaway, Kirkland and Ellis LLP, and Adam J. White, Hoover Institution, both of Washington, D.C.; and Cary Coglianese, University of Pennsylvania Penn Program on Regulation, Philadelphia.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Danny C. Reeves, of Kentucky, and Charles R. Breyer, of California, both to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission, and Kathleen Marie Sweet, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 32 public bills, H.R. 5951–5976; 32 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 149; and H. Res. 849–853, were introduced.

Pages H5222–24

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5225–26**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 5587, to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–728); and

H.R. 5226, to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of information relating to pending agency regulatory actions, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–729).

Page H5222

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Fleischmann to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5165**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:17 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5173**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on Wednesday, September 7th:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives to support the territorial integrity of Georgia: H. Res. 660, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives to support the territorial integrity of Georgia, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 410 yeas to 6 nays, Roll No. 491. **Pages H5187–88**

Accelerating Access to Capital Act: The House passed H.R. 2357, to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise Form S–3 so as to add listing and registration of a class of common equity securities on a national securities exchange as an additional basis for satisfying the requirements of General Instruction I.B.1. of such form and to remove such listing and registration as a requirement of General Instruction I.B.6. of such form, by a recorded vote of 236 ayes to 178 noes, Roll No. 493. **Pages H5188–H5201**

Rejected the Kilmer motion to recommit to recommit the bill to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 180 yeas to 233 nays, Roll No. 492. **Pages H5199–H5200**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–62 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H5198**

H. Res. 844, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2357) and (H.R. 5424) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 237 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 490, after the previous question was ordered by a recorded vote of 238 ayes to 180 noes, Roll No. 489. **Pages H5178–87**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5186, H5186–87, H5187–88, H5199–H5200, and H5200–01. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

Committee Meetings

VIEWS ON H.R. 4298: VIETNAM HELICOPTER CREW MEMORIAL ACT AND H.R. 5458: VETERAN'S TRICARE CHOICE ACT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled ''Views on H.R. 4298: Vietnam Helicopter Crew Memorial Act and H.R. 5458: Veteran's TRICARE Choice Act''. Testimony was heard from Representative Amodei; Patrick Hallinan, Executive Director, Arlington National Cemetery; and public witnesses.

EXAMINING LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE PUBLIC HEALTH

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Examining Legislation to Improve Public Health''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

RURAL CALL QUALITY AND RELIABILITY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Rural Call Quality and Reliability''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FUELING TERROR: THE DANGERS OF RANSOM PAYMENTS TO IRAN

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Fueling Terror: The Dangers of Ransom Payments to Iran''. Testimony was heard from Lisa Grosh, State Assistant Legal Advisor, Office of International Claims and Investment Disputes, Department of State; Christopher R. Backemeyer, State Deputy Assistant Secretary, Iranian Affairs, Department of State; Mary McCord, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, National Security Division, Department of Justice; Paul Ahern, Assistant General Counsel, Enforcement and Intelligence, Department of the Treasury; and public witnesses.

REFORMING THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL: EFFICIENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Reforming the National Security Council: Efficiency and Accountability''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN ENERGY: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR U.S. REGIONAL PRIORITIES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa; and the Subcommittee on Energy of the House Committee on

Science, Space, and Technology, held a joint hearing entitled ''Eastern Mediterranean Energy: Challenges and Opportunities for U.S. Regional Priorities''. Testimony was heard from Amos J. Hochstein, Special Envoy and Coordinator for International Energy Affairs, Bureau of Energy Resources, Department of State; and Jonathan Elkind, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, Department of Energy.

ASIA'S GROWING HUNGER FOR ENERGY: U.S. POLICY AND SUPPLY OPPORTUNITIES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled ''Asia's Growing Hunger for Energy: U.S. Policy and Supply Opportunities''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STATE AND LOCAL PERSPECTIVES ON FEDERAL INFORMATION SHARING

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a hearing entitled ''State and Local Perspectives on Federal Information Sharing''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3438, the ''Require Evaluation before Implementing Executive Wishlists Act of 2015''. H.R. 3438 was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 3764, the ''Tribal Recognition Act of 2015''; H.R. 4564, the ''Robert Emmet Park Act of 2016''; H.R. 5032, to allow certain property in the town of Louisa, Virginia, to be used for purposes related to compliance with water quality standards, and for other purposes; and H.R. 5259, the ''Certainty for States and Tribes Act''. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 3764 and H.R. 5259. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 4564 and H.R. 5032.

EXAMINING FOIA COMPLIANCE AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Examining FOIA Compliance at the Department of State''. Testimony was heard from the following Department of State officials: Patrick F. Kennedy, Under Secretary for Management; Janice Jacobs, Transparency Coordinator; Karin Lang, Director, Executive Secretariat; and Clarence N. Finney, Jr., Deputy Director for Correspondence, Records, and Staffing Division, Executive Secretariat.

STRUGGLING TO GROW: ASSESSING THE CHALLENGES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES IN RURAL AMERICA

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access held a hearing entitled ''Struggling to Grow: Assessing the Challenges for Small Businesses in Rural America''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup H.R. 5942, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a demonstration program to provide integrated care for Medicare beneficiaries with end-stage renal disease, and for other purposes; and H.R. 954, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from the individual mandate certain individuals who had coverage under a terminated qualified health plan funded through the Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan (CO–OP) program. H.R. 954 and H.R. 5942 were ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

FEDERAL DEBT

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Federal debt, focusing on direction, drivers, and dangers, after receiving testimony from former Senator Judd Gregg, Campaign to Fix the Debt, and Alice M. Rivlin, Brookings Institution, both of Washington, D.C.; and Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr., Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

ENERGY POLICY MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2016

Conferees met to resolve the differences between the Senate and House adopted versions of S. 2012, to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, but did not complete action thereon.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''An Examination of Federal

Mental Health Parity Laws and Regulations'', 9 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Transportation and Public Assets, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Response to the Baton Rouge Flood Disaster'', 8:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, September 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of S. 2848, Water Resources Development Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on McConnell (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 4979, at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, September 9

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 5424—Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016. Consideration of the following measure under suspension of the rules: S. 2040—Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E1223
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1225
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1227
Comstock, Barbara, Va., E1224, E1227
Cook, Paul, Calif., E1226
Cooper, Jim, Tenn., E1230
Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E1229
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E1222
Duckworth, Tammy, Ill., E1230
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1222
Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E1229
Hice, Jody B., Ga., E1221
Hurt, Robert, Va., E1228
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1225
Jones, Walter B., N.C., E1226
Levin, Sander M., Mich., E1228
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1227
Miller, Candice S., Mich., E1221, E1224, E1229
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1228
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1221, E1222
Renacci, James B., Ohio, E1221
Rice, Tom, S.C., E1222
Richmond, Cedric L., La., E1223
Roskam, Peter J., Ill., E1223
Rothfus, Keith J., Pa., E1221
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1225
Sinema, Kyrsten, Ariz., E1224, E1227, E1229
Smith, Lamar, Tex., E1223
Torres, Norma J., Calif., E1225, E1227
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1227
Walberg, Tim, Mich., E1224
Zeldin, Lee M., N.Y., E1228

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.