United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 2016 *No. 99*

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 21, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GARRET GRAVES 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 would now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

Without a future, as a people, we are depressed and limited in creative imaging. Without a past, we are inexperienced and lost between success and failure.

Be as present to this Nation today as You were to our Founders. As the Creator and providential Lord, guide the Members of this people's House and all their efforts to uphold the Constitution and have it interface with present realities until true priorities arise as the Nation's agenda.

Stir within all Americans a solidarity that will always unite and never divide us. Renew in us a spirit that will enable this country to be a righteous leader into a bold future, shaping a new culture of collaboration and understanding for the 21st century.

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 gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. TORRES 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.

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY CELEBRATES 200 YEARS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 200th anniversary of the American Bible Society, an organization that works to make the Bible available to every person in a language and format each can understand and afford so all people may experience its life-changing message.

Our forefathers knew well the value of casting our burdens on God and prayer and that, above all, this Nation needed a moral and spiritual foundation in order to survive and thrive. It is why some of them were also the first leaders of the American Bible Society, including Elias Boudinot, the first president of the Continental Congress; and John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

From its beginnings distributing Bibles to members of the military to publishing the first Bible in braille to recently launching a library of digital Bible translations, the American Bible Society has changed lives by sharing God's word.

Congratulations on this important milestone.

NBA CHAMPIONS CLEVELAND CAVALIERS

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, as I stand in my wine and gold and black today, I quote the words of LeBron James, in Cleveland, ''nothing is given. Everything is earned.''

I rise today to congratulate our 2016 NBA champions, the Cleveland Cavaliers. They earned it.

Facing a 3–1 series deficit, the Cavaliers beat all the odds. Led by LeBron James, the team quieted all doubters and brought home the Larry O'Brien Trophy.

It was historic, something that had never been done in the history of the NBA. Cleveland's victory ended the

Printed on recycled paper.

city's 52-year championship drought, the longest in professional sports history.

No city has witnessed as many heartbreaking moments in sports. But not this time, Mr. Speaker. This time, it was our time. Over those 52 years, our fans never wavered, never lost hope. We always believed.

Mr. Speaker, the wait is over. Victory is ours. Congratulations to the NBA world champion Cleveland Cavaliers.

ISLAMIC TERRORIST GLOBAL THREAT

(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, the Associated Press reported Friday the global reach of the Islamic State. This clearly clarifies we are in a global war on terrorism, confirming we must defeat Islamic terrorists overseas or they will murder here again, as they did in Orlando and San Bernardino.

The article reveals:

''The U.S. battle against the Islamic State has not yet curbed the group's global reach and as pressure mounts on the extremists in Iraq and Syria, they are expected to plot more attacks on the West and incite violence by lone wolves, CIA Director John Brennan told Congress.

''In a rare open hearing, Brennan gave the Senate Intelligence Committee an update on the threat from Islamic extremists . . . 'ISIL has a cadre of Western fighters who could potentially serve as operatives for attacks in the West' . . . 'Furthermore, as we have seen in Orlando, San Bernardino and elsewhere, ISIL is attempting to inspire attacks by sympathizers who have no direct links to the group.' . . . 'our efforts have not reduced the group's terrorism capability and global reach.' ''

In conclusion, God bless our troops and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

CLOSE A DANGEROUS LOOPHOLE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, Congress has no greater responsibility than acting to keep the American people safe. That is why House Democrats, focused on a strong and smart national security plan, have repeatedly made attempts to close a dangerous loophole that allows suspected terrorists to buy deadly weapons, weapons like those that we just saw used in the horrific mass shooting in Orlando.

Eighty percent of Americans, an overwhelming majority, support a law that would prevent people on the FBI's terrorist watch list from being able to buy guns. For the American people, it is common sense. It is a no-brainer.

Yet Republicans in Congress continue to do everything they can to stop us not just from acting, but to stop us from even having a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives as to whether this legislation ought to go forward. In the Senate, they have blocked efforts—they just did yesterday—to bring up this commonsense legislation.

Speaker RYAN and House Republicans continue to keep us from bringing up a bill authored by one of the Republican Members of this House that would prevent an individual on the terrorist watch list from buying a gun.

It is long past time. Congress needs to act.

HELPING MINNESOTA'S YOUTH

(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 address childhood obesity in the recent efforts in Minnesota, my home State, to address this concern for families throughout our State and across this country.

Over the past decade, as a nation, we have seen a great deal of time and energy dedicated to combatting childhood obesity, and thus far, we have seen great successes.

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation recently highlighted St. Cloud, the largest city in Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District, because of an impressive 24 percent decline in obesity for 12-year-olds over the past 7 years. This incredible shift in the health and well-being for Minnesota's youth could not have occurred without joint community effort.

As an example, in St. Cloud, we have been lucky enough to have the help of healthcare providers like CentraCare, who look past the boundaries of their hospitals and their clinics and bring their work into the communities where they live.

I applaud the efforts of great Minnesota companies and organizations like CentraCare, Coborn's, Bernick's, and many others who are dedicated to working together to improve the overall health in our Minnesota communities.

HUWALDT 80TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Harrison and Varedo Huwaldt of Randolph, Nebraska, celebrating their 80th wedding anniversary today, June 21, 2016. Yes, that is 80 years together. After meeting on a blind date in 1935, the Huwaldts married within a year and began their life together.

During their 80 years of marriage, they have visited all 50 States, operated their own filling station and a trucking business, and enjoyed water skiing, golfing, and taking cruises together. They have three children, six grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren.

They have also been active members in their community. Harrison served on the city council for more than 50 years, while Varedo served as church organist for 25 years.

Now, at the ages of 100 and 99, respectively, the Huwaldt's eight-decade commitment to each other inspires all who hear their love story. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Harrison and Varedo Huwaldt on their remarkable 80 years of marriage.

REPORT ON H.R. 5538, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. CALVERT from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–632) on the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

END TAXPAYER FUNDED CELL PHONES ACT OF 2016

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5525) to prohibit universal service support of commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service through the Lifeline program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5525

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 ''End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON LIFELINE SUPPORT FOR MOBILE SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on January 1, 2017, a provider of commercial mobile service or commercial mobile data service may not receive universal service support under sections 214(e) and 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 214(e); 254) for the provision of such service through the Lifeline program of the Federal Communications Commission.

(b) CONTRIBUTIONS.—For calendar year 2017, the amount that telecommunications carriers that provide interstate telecommunications services and other providers of interstate telecommunications are required to contribute under section 254(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 to Federal universal service support mechanisms shall be determined—

(1) without regard to subsection (a); and

(2) as if the same amount of support for the provision of commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service through the Lifeline program that is provided in calendar year 2016 is provided in calendar year 2017.

(c) EXCESS COLLECTIONS.—The amount collected pursuant to subsection (b)(2) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States, for the sole purpose of deficit reduction. No portion of such amount may be treated as a credit toward future contributions required under section 254(d) of the Communications Act of 1934.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMERCIAL MOBILE DATA SERVICE.—The term ''commercial mobile data service'' has the meaning given such term in section 6001 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1401).

(2) COMMERCIAL MOBILE SERVICE.—The term ''commercial mobile service'' has the meaning given such term in section 332 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5525, the End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act of 2016, which would prohibit universal service fund support through the Lifeline program to commercial mobile and data service carriers.

This legislation would restore the Lifeline program to its original intent of providing access to telecommunication services for eligible individuals via landline phones.

Many of us in this body and many of our constituents have witnessed tents and stands outside of our grocery stores or on the street corner giving away so-called free phones. At a time when everyday Americans are working harder and harder to make ends meet and when government spending is out of control, our constituents don't understand why this is still going on. And, Mr. Speaker, neither do I.

Before I go further, I want to be clear. These Americans who accept these free phones are not the ones who are taking advantage of this system. It is the carriers who stand to benefit from the system that are taking advantage of our citizens, and the program is systemically unable to stop the cycle of waste, fraud, and abuse.

When offered something for free with little or no verification and with little or no knowledge about who is paying for that item, I believe you would be hard pressed to find someone who wouldn't, at least, consider taking the item. The problem is that there is a financial incentive for the carriers to expand the number of Lifeline users, and there is far less incentive to diligently verify the eligibility of the individuals who apply.

The Lifeline program, created under President Reagan to serve a legitimate need, has largely gone unchecked and has ballooned since 2005, when it was expanded to include mobile phone services.

While the FCC has implemented reforms aimed at rooting out the waste, fraud, and abuse in the program, serious issues remain to this day. For example, the National Lifeline Accountability Database was created to help carriers prevent duplication of service. However, certain carriers use the independent economic household override to easily circumvent the one-phone-number-per-household rule by merely checking the box on a form without any supporting documentation.

Data recently obtained by the FCC reveals that between October of 2014 and April of 2016, carriers enrolled 4,291,647 duplicate subscribers to the Lifeline program by widespread use of this targeted exception to the program's one-person household rule. When skirting the rules is so easy, fraud becomes rampant.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, in April of this year, the FCC fined a carrier, Total Call Mobile, for overbilling the Lifeline program for millions of dollars by fraudulently enrolling duplicate and ineligible consumers. Again, the carrier, Total Call Mobile, was able to do this by circumventing the National Lifeline Accountability Database and manipulating customer information.

These reports come on the heels of the FCC's recent announcement to increase the so-called budget for Lifeline by $725 million, a tax increase on Americans which is neither subject to congressional oversight nor approval.

□ 1415

While the widespread fraud is not hindering eligible recipients from receiving phones, it is costing taxpaying Americans money. In order to increase the Lifeline budget, if you will, the FCC must increase the universal service fee. I bet most Americans don't know what fee I am talking about.

The universal service fee is a tax on the bottom of your phone bill right here. That so-called fee is what pays for the FCC's Universal Service Fund, which includes the Lifeline program.

When the costs of the Lifeline program go up because of waste, fraud, and abuse, you know who pays for it?

Everyday Americans, who are already struggling to make ends meet, get a tax increase on their phone bill.

The FCC is asking for Americans to shoulder the cost of this increase without fully addressing the fraud, waste, and abuse within the program. It is clear that this lack of accountability and rampant fraud is systemic to the Lifeline program, and the price of this continues to be paid by Americans across the country.

American taxpayers are already overburdened, Mr. Speaker, and should not be forced to pay for a program that is unquestionably riddled with waste, fraud, and abuse. It is simple good governance to rein in programs like Lifeline that have vastly expanded in scope and have done so with an ever-increasing share of Americans' hard-earned dollars. Congress must act to impose fiscal discipline to ensure increased costs are not shouldered by Americans.

I do not stand here today and say that there is not a need for Lifeline, nor do I deny the fact that there are a good number of people in this country who are eligible for this program. We should continue to ensure that the Lifeline program exists to provide those people with access to critical telecommunications services, but we should also remember the many people making just barely enough not to be eligible for assistance through Lifeline who would be hurt by any increase in the taxes on their phone bill: an increase caused by a government that won't deal with the crisis of waste, fraud, and abuse.

The original intent of the Lifeline program was pure: provide access to telecommunications services to consumers, including low-income consumers at reasonable and affordable rates. My legislation aims to restore that original intent. We can provide for people in need without taking from those who have nothing left to give.

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

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

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5525. A few weeks ago when Speaker RYAN presented his anti-poverty plan, many of us were skeptical and argued that his proposals would not actually help the poor. The Ryan plan was simply a rebranding of failed policies that congressional Republicans have been pushing for years.

Unfortunately, we are quickly finding out that our fears were justified, Mr. Speaker. Today, Speaker RYAN and the Republican majority are bringing a bill to the floor that would eliminate the successful Lifeline program that provides millions of low-income Americans access to basic communication services. It would leave people with no way to search for job postings, no way to schedule interviews, and no way to get a call back from a potential employer.

This goes far beyond jobs, Mr. Speaker. Cell phones are a necessity in modern, everyday life. Low-income Americans rely more heavily on mobile phones and mobile Internet service than the overall population. Children from low-income homes use Lifeline to help do their homework. Seniors use it to manage their health care and call their family and loved ones. Victims of domestic violence use it to find the help and support they need, and victims of assaults use their Lifeline phones to call 911 in an emergency, which makes me question how exactly this bill fits into Speaker RYAN's anti-poverty agenda.

The legislation is so extreme when you consider that congressional Republicans are looking to gut a Lifeline program created in the Reagan administration and expanded to include wireless service in the Bush administration. At least 9.8 million Americans depend on the Lifeline program to stay connected using mobile phones, and this bill would leave these people stranded.

Some claim that the program is fraught with government waste. I heard that from the gentleman from Georgia. But these claims ignore the fact that the Obama administration has eliminated nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars in waste, fraud, and abuse.

This bill will do absolutely nothing to help taxpayers. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill would essentially create a $1.2 billion tax. Specifically, the bill directs the FCC to continue collecting funds from the American people that had been used for the Lifeline program, but not pay any benefits out. Rather than cut taxes, this bill essentially creates a new one.

When it comes down to it, congressional Republicans already know there are significant problems with this bill. They don't want it to pass. That is the only way to explain why they came up with this cynical procedural move to ignore regular order and set up the bill to fail. They are bringing it up under a suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds majority. They think that the American people will not hold them accountable for their bad policies if they let Democrats kill the bill.

Worse, this maneuver comes from a committee that normally obsesses with process for the agencies in our jurisdiction. It seems those concerns apply only to others. Well, I think more highly of our constituents. I think they see through these kinds of ploys.

The American people know that if Republicans are really serious about battling poverty and shrinking the size of Lifeline, they would work with us to create more jobs for those who are unemployed or underemployed. The best way to lower the costs of the Lifeline program is to lift people up and not to take away their connection to a better life.

We should not be spending our time on bills like this. We could be looking at ways to take guns from terrorists instead of taking phones from Americans who are looking for jobs. We could be working together to increase the minimum wage and repair our crumbling infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, this bill abandons our most vulnerable, and I urge all of my colleagues to oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today we are on the floor for a very important question, and the question is: Will Congress ignore knowledge of some $476 million that is considered documented fraud that is taking place on behalf of taxpayers of the United States of America?

Mr. Speaker, a letter from Commissioner Pai at the Federal Communications Commission dated June 8, 2016—not even a month ago—goes to Mr. Chris Henderson, chief executive officer, Universal Service Administrative Company of the United States. It documents abuse in here, and I would read if I may:

''Thank you again for your May 25 letter, which contained detailed data on how wireless resellers have used the National Lifeline Accountability Database. My staff has concluded further analysis of that data, and I am now concerned that the abuse of the Universal Service Fund's Lifeline program is more widespread than I first thought.''

Mr. Speaker, Mr. SCOTT is here on the floor today to protect the taxpayers of this country and the integrity of the laws that we have passed and that we have oversight of by virtue of being Members of Congress. The $476 million is a problem because it is documented that it is duplicate use by organizations that have been fined over $50 million by the FCC.

In no way is Mr. SCOTT or this legislation attempting to take away Lifeline service that is very important to not only members particularly in rural areas, but other areas of the United States to provide them access to broadband that has been created by our American ingenuity. I would note, however, that what we are doing is that we do not believe the government has any business in funding the fraud that has been made available.

Mr. Speaker, I was on the original Labs team out of New Jersey that developed broadband in the mid-1980s. I was on the original team that brought forth this product to the American people, and it was done with great anticipation to help better people's lives, to allow all areas of the United States—and probably the world—to better connect itself for the new transitional world that we would live in.

I don't think it was ever envisioned that we would want it to be misused in such a way that it would cost taxpayers of this country $500 million a year in fraud. It is there as an advocate for people to gain jobs, to understand education better, and to use the avenues of technology to better their lives.

Where you have documented fraud, the United States Congress has a responsibility to stand up. I believe that is what we are saying today. By this suspension vote, we are expecting two-thirds of this body to recognize that where there is widespread fraud that the United States Congress, on behalf of the taxpayer who paid the bill for the fraud, that something responsible would be done about it.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter from Commissioner Pai. I would ask, more importantly, that this Congress be responsible about saying it is documented fraud that we are after, not Lifeline service.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, DC, June 8, 2016.

Mr. CHRIS HENDERSON,
Chief Executive Officer, Universal Service Administrative Company, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: Thank you again for your May 25 letter, which contained detailed data on how wireless resellers have used the National Lifeline Accountability Database (NLAD). My staff has concluded further analysis of that data, and I am now concerned that abuse of the Universal Service Fund's Lifeline program is more widespread than I first thought.

Before 2012, it was well known that duplicate subscribers (that is, individuals getting multiple subsidies) plagued the Lifeline program. In the 2012 Lifeline Reform Order, the Commission codified the one-per-household rule, which prohibits more than one Lifeline subscription from going to a single household. To curb the problem of duplicate subscriptions and enforce the one-per-household rule, the FCC established the NLAD. The NLAD is designed to help carriers identify and resolve duplicate claims for Lifeline service and prevent future duplicates from enrolling.

Although the NLAD rejects multiple subscribers at the same address, the FCC also instructed USAC to ''implement procedures to enable applicants to demonstrate at the outset that any other Lifeline recipients residing at their residential address are part of a separate household.'' USAC did so by allowing carriers to override NLAD's rejection of an applicant with the same address as another subscriber. As USAC's website explains, to carry out an independent economic household (IEH) override (as USAC calls it), an applicant must merely check a box on a form and need not provide any supporting documentation.

Unfortunately, this well-intentioned exception to the override process appears to be undermining the one-per-household rule. The NLAD is not preventing a large number of duplicate subscribers from claiming Lifeline subsidies.

We saw in the Total Call Mobile case how unscrupulous carriers could regularly register duplicate subscribers by fraudulently using the address of a local homeless shelter, altering a person's name, and using fake Social Security numbers to evade detection. As a result, USAC had to de-enroll 32,498 duplicates from Total Call Mobile's rolls.

But your May 25 letter reveals an even greater problem. Specifically, USAC's data reveal that Carriers enrolled 4,291,647 subscribers between October 2014 and April 2016 using the IEH override process. That's more than 35.3% of all subscribers enrolled in

NLAD-participating states during that period. Indeed, that's more people than live in the State of Oregon. And the price to the taxpayer is steep—just one year of service for these apparent duplicates costs taxpayers $476 million.

It is alarming that over one-third of subscribers—costing taxpayers almost half a billion dollars a year—were registered through an IEH override. Therefore, I respectfully request that you provide the following information to my office:

1. Of the 4,291,647 subscribers enrolled using an IEH override between October 2014 and April 2016, how many are still enrolled in the Lifeline program? To the extent these subscribers are no longer enrolled, please quantify (1) how many subscribers left the program of their own volition, (2) how many deenrolled as a result of a specific investigation, audit, or review, and (3) how many deenrolled as a result of annual verification checks.

2. Please explain the process USAC used to establish the current IEH override process. Specifically, please explain why carriers are not required to collect any documentation demonstrating that a subscriber is ''part of a separate household'' for purposes of an IEH override and why staff do not review either the certification form or any documentation before authorizing an IEH override.

3. Please describe the steps USAC has taken to verify the integrity of the IEH override process. Specifically, I am interested in understanding the steps taken to verify that subscribers enrolled with an IEH override are in fact economically independent from other Lifeline subscribers at the same address.

a. For example, one Total Call Mobile sales agent testified that he filled out applications, checking off the boxes he knew applicants needed to check to enroll. What process does USAC use to minimize and detect such behavior?

b. Does USAC contact existing subscribers at a particular address before enrolling a new subscriber at that address to verify economic independence?

c. Has USAC sampled a set of subscribers to determine whether subscribers can demonstrate economic independence through documentation (such as tax forms)?

d. Has USAC coordinated with federal or state agencies to determine whether subscribers have consistently represented themselves as economically independent?

4. According to the 2014 Lifeline Biennial Audit Plan, independent auditors were required to create a list of apparent duplicates for each carrier subject to the audit and verify for a sample of 30 apparent duplicates that ''at least one subscriber at each address [has] complete[d] a one-per-household worksheet.'' Were auditors required to verify whether such subscribers were actually economically independent from other Lifeline subscribers at the same address for a sample of apparent duplicates? If not, why not?

5. Please describe any investigations, audits, or reviews that USAC has conducted from October 2014 to the present to verify that subscribers enrolled with an IEH override are in fact economically independent from other Lifeline subscribers at their address. Please include any such reports drafted or issued by USAC or, in the case of no such report, a summary of USAC's findings.

6. Please describe any recommendations USAC has to improve the IEH override process to ensure that taxpayer funds are not wasted. Please identify any FCC rule changes that would be necessary to effectuate such improvements.

7. You reported in your May 2 letter that USAC also conducts Payment Quality Assurance (PQA) reviews and regularly analyzes the NLAD for ''anomalies, duplicates, or other errors that may signal improper payments of potentially fraudulent behavior.'' As a result of those reviews, USAC discovered and de-enrolled 373,911 duplicates from the NLAD between February and May 2015. Please describe any other investigations, audits, or reviews that USAC has conducted from October 2014 to the present to eliminate duplicate subscribers from the NLAD. Please include any such reports drafted or issued by USAC or, in the case of no such report, a summary of USAC's findings.

8. In the Total Call Mobile case, one sales agent alleged that he could enroll the same person multiple times in the NLAD so long as the applicant used different devices within a 15-minute timespan. Is this claim true? If so, what steps will USAC take to close this apparent loophole?

I appreciate USAC's continued work to protect the American taxpayer and safeguard the Universal Service Fund. I also appreciate that USAC often takes instruction from the FCC in fulfilling its role. Given the hundreds of millions in taxpayer funds apparently lost to unscrupulous behavior in the Lifeline program, I hope you will agree that USAC's paramount task must be to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse from the Lifeline program. I therefore ask that you respond with the requested information by July 28, 2016. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact my office.

Sincerely,

AJIT PAI,
Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the ranking member from New Jersey for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5525, a bill that undermines the Lifeline program and demonstrates the majority's continued indifference to the struggle of low-income Americans.

The Lifeline program helps 9.8 million people across this country access cell phone service which, as we all know, is a necessity for modern everyday life. For decades, helping struggling Americans access basic technology was a bipartisan initiative. It was started under President Reagan, and then expanded under President George W. Bush. I am surprised and disappointed that my Republican colleagues have chosen today to end that tradition of bipartisanship on behalf of struggling families.

Let's be clear, a vote for this bill is a vote to take critical devices away from people who need them the most. We are taking service away from older Americans who use it to manage their health care and call their loved ones. We are taking service away from students who use cell data to do their homework. We are taking service away from victims of domestic violence who use it to get help and support. We are taking service away from unemployed workers who use it to find a good-paying job. Most importantly, we are taking devices out of the hands of Americans who use Lifeline to call 911 during an emergency.

Why?

The majority says it will save consumers money, but the way that the bill is written, it will not save a dime for consumers or American taxpayers. We continue to collect the fees, but we do not provide Lifeline services. This legislation will do one thing and only one thing: Make it harder for low-income Americans to get back on their feet.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 5525.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SCOTT for allowing me time to speak on this.

Obviously, I rise today in support of H.R. 5525, the End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act of 2016.

This administration has continued to expand existing programs for their own political benefit, with one of the most glaring examples being the ''Obama phone,'' also known as the Lifeline program. This was created back in the 1980s. Lifeline brought telecommunication services to consumers, including those with low income.

While this program started with good intentions, like most programs do, the Lifeline program has spiraled out of control, and the budget for this program is growing astronomically.

In an effort to curb wasteful spending, I am proud to support my colleague from Georgia's legislation. It is a commonsense approach to reining in wasteful spending in Washington. Americans are tired of the Federal Government spending taxpayer money that is not accounted for, and this bill is a step in the right direction.

Americans watch their money, and Washington should too. This legislation restores the Lifeline program back to its original purpose and narrows its scope to cut fraud and abuse, which has been mentioned multiple times here this morning. We have to put an end to bloated bureaucracy one Federal program at a time.

□ 1430

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was a 911 dispatcher for 17½ years in Los Angeles. It used to be that, when we had land lines, you didn't have to be a subscriber to telephone service to be able to dial 911 for police emergencies, fire emergencies, or paramedic services. People could simply keep their phone plugged in and be able to dial 911.

That is no longer the case, as more and more phone companies are doing away with land lines. More and more people now have to subscribe to telephone service in order to be able to access 911 for paramedics, for a police emergency, or for a fire service emergency.

So we have created a system that is working against the poorest of the poor in our communities, and now the Republicans want to take that away from them.

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

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this. Allow the people in the United States to be able to access an ambulance, a police officer, or a firefighter for free. The poorest of the poor are depending on you to vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a couple of things that were said from the start.

First of all, this piece of legislation does not eliminate the Lifeline program. It does move it back to land lines and away from the cellular services.

I would also, respectfully, submit that multiple pieces of legislation have been introduced in an effort to address the waste, fraud, and abuse in this program. The number that I mentioned earlier—4,291,647—is cases where we believe there has been an abuse of the system. The phone companies get approximately $10 a month per phone that they hand out. That is a tremendous amount of waste, fraud, and abuse. It is almost $500 million.

So when we see that much waste, fraud, and abuse in the system, we as a Congress have a responsibility to put the integrity back into that system.

There have been a tremendous number of pieces of legislation that have been introduced. They have all not been able to come to the floor. I want to thank our leadership for putting a bill on the floor that does the one thing in attempting to eliminate that waste, fraud, and abuse of this system.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to address some of the points that the gentleman from Georgia made.

First of all, 85 percent of the program goes toward wireless service; mobile phones. So when the gentleman says that we are eliminating wireless and that it doesn't matter because we will go back to land lines, that is just simply not the case. That is what the gentlewoman from California just explained.

I am concerned that what I am really hearing from the gentleman from Georgia is the notion that somehow, if there are more than two lines at a given address, it is fraud. I just want to eliminate that notion because I think that criticism misses the point.

There is an exception in the Lifeline program that can permit more than one line per household. This exception is a critical feature that allows people without a long-term home address to take advantage of the program. These are the very people Lifeline was designed to help.

The system allows those living in a homeless shelter, without a stable address, to have access to a phone. It even allows veterans in a group home to access the Internet. So it is not fraud to allow these people access to phones because they happen to have the same address.

While this particular feature of the program may not be the cause of harm that has been alleged, Democrats are serious about eliminating the waste, fraud, and abuse from the Lifeline program. We stand ready to work with Republicans to make the program better.

When we had a hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee, one of the points we were making was, just cutting the program doesn't eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse. You understand, this bill simply says we are going to cut the funds. It doesn't say how that is going to eliminate the waste, fraud, and abuse.

I will tell you there never was a markup. It just came to the floor. We did have a hearing. There was no markup. So this is not regular order. But the bottom line is, we said over and over again, as Democrats: work with us to eliminate the fraud and abuse. The Obama administration has always done that.

This doesn't do that. This just cuts the program and goes back to what my two colleagues from California were saying: you now have all these people who are poor and working people, who don't have enough money to pay for these phones. They just don't have the phone anymore, and so they don't have access to a mobile phone in order to make those critical calls for some of the purposes that were mentioned.

As I said, during the Obama administration, the FCC has already reduced expenditures by nearly a billion dollars. In fact, the FCC recently took additional substantial steps to prevent potential abuses of the program. The FCC very recently created an independent, third-party National Lifeline Eligibility Verifier. So there is a singular, disinterested referee making Lifeline eligibility decisions.

So an effort is being made—a serious effort—that has already saved a lot of money to try to improve this program. But, again, the bill before us does nothing to target waste, fraud, or abuse. It just cuts off truly deserving low-income Americans from a program that can help them improve their lives.

So for that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

In closing, I don't want to keep repeating the same thing, but I think it is pretty clear where I and my colleagues on this side of the aisle stand. This bill would cut off millions of low-income persons from having wireless service and access to the Internet. If enacted, it would prohibit commercial wireless providers from receiving money from the Universal Service Fund Lifeline program, and that program subsidizes phones for low-income Americans. Without this program, millions of Americans will be left stranded, without any phones.

The bill is being brought to the floor under suspension of the rules, even though no committee has actually held a markup on the bill.

I urge Members to vote ''no,'' to protect low-income Americans' Lifeline wireless phone service.

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I, again, want to reiterate that this bill does not eliminate the Lifeline program. It takes it back to the original intent.

I appreciate the newfound commitment to deal with the waste, fraud, and abuse, and I look forward to working with you on that legislation, if this one should not pass. We have a responsibility to make sure that, when we are creating access to any program, we have integrity in this program. This is not in any way, shape, or form intended to do anything but to bring that integrity back.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is about eliminating approximately $500 million a year worth of waste, fraud, and abuse.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition of H.R. 5525, the End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act of 2016, because it will end an essential program that helps millions of elderly, low-income and poor people have access to cellphone service.

As the founder and chair of the Children's Caucus I am particularly focused on the needs of children and their families.

H.R. 5525 would deny the Universal Service Fund, the charge levied on land lines to help fund telecommunications services for low income people, the ability to use funds to help people purchase cell phones.

The Lifeline Program was first implemented in 1985 by President Reagan and expanded in 2005 by President George W. Bush to include commercial mobile service and commercial data service, the Lifeline program ensures that all Americans have the opportunities, assistance, and security that phone service brings.

Lifeline is a successful program, currently supporting over 12 million people who make up our nation's most vulnerable populations to call 911 and other emergency services, contact prospective and current employers, and connect with essential health, social, employment, and educational services.

According to one Lifeline provider, more than 80 percent of Lifeline subscribers in 2011 had an average household income below $15,000; more than 45 percent of Lifeline subscribers were Caucasian compared to 40 percent who were African American and 7 percent who were Hispanic.

In the 2016 Lifeline Modernization Order, the Commission included broadband as a support service in the Lifeline program.

The Commission also set out minimum service standards for Lifeline-supported services to ensure maximum value for the universal service dollar, and established a National Eligibility Verifier to make independent subscriber eligibility determinations.

Lifeline enables the most vulnerable among us to be participating members of our society; cutting wireless services could prevent individuals from being able to, among other things:

receive a communication about a child's illness at school while they are at work;

summon medical help in a car accident;

speak with their employers about additional work shifts while commuting by public transit; or

alert first-responders of public emergencies (such as a fast-moving fire, a flooded road, or a violent attack) that pose a threat to the larger community.

Today, 9.8 million Americans depend on the Lifeline program to stay connected using mobile phones.

The legislation comes on the heels of real enforcement by the FCC to crack down on carriers that have abused the program, including a $51 million fine against Total Call Mobile announced in April.

Even more, this shameful bill was not considered under regular order and has not been considered by any committee.

If the critics of the Lifeline program sincerely think the costs of the program are a problem, they should work with Democrats to address inequality, to close the gender pay gap, to raise the minimum wage, and to put more people to work through universal broadband infrastructure projects.

The Lifeline Program is working in my state of Texas.

Texans are eligible for lifeline cell phone service if they receive benefits from any of the following programs:

National School Lunch (free program only);

Federal Public Housing Assistance / Section 8;

Health Benefit Coverage under Children's Health Insurance Plan (CHIP);

Low Income Home Energy Assistance (LIHEAP)

Medicaid;

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (Food Stamps);

Supplemental Security Income (SSI);

Bureau of Indian Affairs General Assistance;

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families;

Tribally-Administered Temporary Assistance for Needy Families;

Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations;

You may also qualify for lifeline service in Texas if your Total Household Income is at or under 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Guidelines.

For these reasons I join the NAACP in strongly opposing H.R. 5525, because it will do real damage to our national effort to expand indispensable access to telephone and cellphone service.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 5525.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5525.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

AUTHORIZING USE OF PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES FROM ONE AIRPORT AT A PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED AIRPORT

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4369) to authorize the use of passenger facility charges at an airport previously associated with the airport at which the charges are collected.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4369

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

SECTION 1. USE OF PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES FROM ONE AIRPORT AT A PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED AIRPORT.

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

(1) On December 22, 2015, the Los Angeles City Council, the Los Angeles Board of Airport Commissioners, the Los Angeles World Airports, the Ontario City Council, and the Ontario International Airport Authority agreed to transfer ownership and control of Ontario International Airport from the city of Los Angeles and Los Angeles World Airports to the Ontario International Airport Authority, a local joint powers authority established by and between the county of San Bernardino and the city of Ontario.

(2) Pursuant to the agreement, the Ontario International Airport Authority intends to use between $70,000,000 and $120,000,000 in passenger facility charges collected at Ontario International Airport to finance eligible projects at Los Angeles International Airport, as compensation for passenger facility charges collected, consistent with section 40117(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, at Los Angeles International Airport for use at Ontario International Airport in the 1990s, when both airports were controlled by Los Angeles World Airports.

(3) The amendment made by subsection (b) applies exclusively to Ontario International Airport, allowing passenger facility charges to be used for eligible projects at Los Angeles International Airport while making no other changes to passenger facility charges eligibility requirements.

(4) No additional appropriations are required to implement the agreement described in paragraph (1) or the amendment made by subsection (b).

(b) PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES.—Section 40117(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) USE OF PFC REVENUES AT PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED AIRPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the requirements of paragraph (1) and subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may authorize use of a passenger facility charge to finance an eligible airport-related project if—

''(i) the eligible agency seeking to impose the new charge controls an airport where a $2 passenger facility charge became effective on January 1, 2013; and

''(ii) the airport described in clause (i) and the airport at which the project will be carried out were under the control of the same eligible agency on October 1, 2015.

''(B) LIMITATION.—Not more than $120,000,000 in passenger facility charges collected under subparagraph (A) may be used to carry out an eligible airport-related project described in that subparagraph.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4369.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4369, a bill that will provide regulatory relief to Los Angeles International Airport and Ontario International Airport and facilitate a transfer of Ontario International Airport to a new airport authority.

I want to thank Mr. CALVERT, the sponsor of the bill, for introducing this legislation and for his leadership on this issue.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4369.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4369, as you heard, is a bipartisan, narrowly tailored bill to address a time-sensitive issue in southern California that impacts the Ontario and Los Angeles International Airports, both of which serve my district in southern Nevada.

This bill has the support of my colleagues from southern California, and I appreciate them coming to the floor today to speak about its importance to their districts.

Mr. Speaker, when one airport authority takes ownership of an airport from another authority, there needs to be a process by which that new authority can repay the passenger facility charges that were collected up to that point. This bill would provide such a mechanism.

There is urgency in addressing this issue, as the current transfer authority between these two airports is set to expire at the end of this year. I support that, but I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the fact that, while we stand on the floor today discussing this urgent matter affecting our aviation system, we are mere weeks away from

the expiration of the third extension of the current FAA authorization bill.

Months ago, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee passed legislation which includes numerous time-sensitive and important provisions. Yet, because of a proposal to privatize our air traffic control system, I, along with my fellow Democrats on the committee, were forced to oppose the bill. Meanwhile, our Senate colleagues have passed a bipartisan FAA bill with overwhelming support.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am in favor of this legislation that we are considering today, but it is my sincere hope that we will see a similar urgency in addressing other aviation needs, like the needs of large airports like McCarran International Airport, in my district; the need to extend the authorization for the unmanned aerial test ranges; the need to develop a low-altitude air traffic management system for UAS operations; and the need to address a number of the important issues that are facing our Nation's airspace that are in the FAA reauthorization bill.

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

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, today is a good day for the Inland Empire region in southern California. For many years now, our region has advocated for restoring local control of Ontario International Airport and putting the future growth of air travel in our own hands.

My legislation that the House is considering today, H.R. 4369, is one of the final necessary steps that will facilitate the transfer of Ontario International Airport from the city of Los Angeles to the Ontario International Airport Authority.

Both the cities of Ontario and Los Angeles, as well as FAA staff, have put in hundreds of hours of effort to approve and prepare for the management transfer of this hub airport.

When both Ontario International Airport and Los Angeles International Airport were operated by the same agencies, passenger facility charges, or PFCs, collected at one airport could be used for the projects at the other one.

□ 1445

Going forward, H.R. 4369 will enable a certain amount of passenger facility charges collected at the now independent Ontario International Airport to be used for projects at Los Angeles International Airport as a way to pay back LAX for sharing its passenger facility charges in the past years. Since it is not possible under existing law today, we are fixing this glitch.

This legislation has broad bipartisan support and will not cost the taxpayers a penny. Furthermore, the bill does nothing to increase passenger facility charges or any other fees for airport passengers.

H.R. 4369 is supported by all stakeholders, including the FAA, the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles World Airports, the City of Ontario, and the Ontario International Airport Authority. The bill is supported by the entire bipartisan Inland Empire delegation, including Representative TORRES, Representative AGUILAR, Representative COOK, Representative ROYCE, Representative RUIZ, and Representative TAKANO.

Over in the Senate, Senator FEINSTEIN has introduced identical legislation, and I am hopeful the Senate can quickly approve this bill after we pass it here today.

There have been many people involved in this effort over the past few years. I want to specifically thank FAA Administrator Michael Huerta, Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti, Ontario Councilmen Alan Wapner and Jim Bowman, as well as the rest of the Ontario City Council and other elected officials from throughout the Inland Empire who have supported restoring local control of Ontario Airport.

I also want to thank Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY and Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman BILL SHUSTER for helping us move this important legislation to the House floor today.

The Inland Empire has and continues to be one of the fastest growing regions in California and in the Nation, and it is far past time that we control our own aviation future. I am confident, with local control restored, Ontario International Airport will be a significant contributor to future economic growth in our region.

I urge all my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), who is a cosponsor of this bill.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering today is a key step to finalizing the transfer of local control of the Ontario International Airport, a transfer which, after lengthy negotiations, was finally agreed to by all parties last year.

This transfer, Mr. Speaker, is long overdue. Ontario Airport, located in my congressional district, is a major economic driver for the Inland Empire region.

When Los Angeles World Airports began operating Ontario back in 1967, it was with the intention of attracting more airlines and service options to the Inland Empire. Well, circumstances have changed quite a bit since that time.

The Inland Empire isn't just the outskirts of Los Angeles anymore. It is a rapidly growing region, attracting more and more new residents and businesses with a strategic location along a major freight corridor that makes it a hub for manufactured and agricultural goods.

It also provides more convenient air travel options to residents of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties who, otherwise, would have to travel up to 2 or 3 hours to fly out of LAX.

Transferring control of the airport back to Ontario means that the people who are most affected and who most closely understand the needs of the region are the ones who are going to be shaping the airport's future. This transfer is not possible without the legislation we are considering today.

As part of the settlement agreement, $120 million of passenger facility revenue collected at Ontario will be used for FAA-qualified capital projects at LAX. $50 million of that will come from existing passenger facilities fees that are controlled by LAWA, but were collected at Ontario. The remaining $70 million will come from future passenger facility charges collected at Ontario within the next 10 years. These are funds that have always been intended to go to LAWA for projects at LAX.

Congress must now pass this one-time fix that will allow the transfer of funds from one airport authority to another. Otherwise, once control of Ontario Airport shifts to the Ontario International Airport Authority, there will be no mechanism to transfer the funds to LAWA as they have agreed. Without this bill, the agreement cannot move forward, and the FAA cannot approve the agreement and grant the Ontario International Airport Authority a certificate to operate.

Many of us have been calling for local control of Ontario Airport for quite a long time, and this agreement has been years in the making. All parties have agreed to the terms and are ready to move forward. As a frequent flier out of Ontario, I hope Congress does not stand in its way.

I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman CALVERT, for helping to bring this important bill to the floor, and the rest of the Inland Empire delegation for their support.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), another cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentlewoman from Nevada for the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Inland Empire should have control of its regional airport, and local residents should have access to affordable domestic and international flights.

With that in mind, I rise in support of H.R. 4369, which would facilitate the transfer of Ontario International Airport from the City of Los Angeles.

While the number of flights offered at Ontario Airport has decreased, the demand for those flights has not. Industry experts estimate that 2 million passengers a year are forced to drive to Los Angeles or other regional airports due to the lack of flights and connections offered at Ontario. The region is

losing up to 8,000 jobs and $400 million in yearly business activity.

As the Inland Empire continues to grow in population, it needs the Ontario International Airport to be under local control. It is a vital economic resource to our region, with the potential to serve 30 million passengers annually, and it is a conflict of interest for Los Angeles World Airports to control Ontario, a direct competitor.

On a personal note, I am ready to give up the long commute from Riverside to LAX. And in that spirit, 3 years ago I wrote a letter to Mayor Garcetti of Los Angeles outlining the need to transfer control of Ontario Airport to our region. I am happy that we are finally moving forward with this legislation to ensure an arrangement that is best for the Inland Empire.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Congressman KEN CALVERT and Congresswoman NORMA TORRES, and all the rest of our delegation from the Inland Empire of southern California, for their hard work on this issue. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation. I also extend my thanks to the gentlewoman from Nevada for her support.

I strongly urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have no further speakers. I just want to say that I support this legislation. I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I also admonish them to show the same degree of urgency when it comes to reauthorizing the FAA.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill of my colleague, Mr. CALVERT.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R 4369, ''A bill that authorizes the use of passenger facility charges at an airport previously associated with the airport at which the charges are collected.''

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I strongly support this commonsense measure to improve and sustain airport security.

Since its inception, Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs) have been used to improve safety, enhance security, and increase the capacity of airports to serve the traveling public.

A Passenger Facility Charge is a service fee and is also an additional fee charged to departing and connecting passengers at an airport.

H.R. 4369 clarifies and streamlines opportunities that will help ease travel through our nation's airports while improving our national security.

For example this bill will enable:

The preservation and protection of the nation's air transportation system;

Enhanced competition between and among air carriers;

Funding projects that benefit local communities; and

Meeting airline and passenger demands to accommodate future growth for our nation's economy.

In 2015, more than 700 million passengers and 400 million checked bags were screened by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA).

Each day, TSA processes an average of 1.7 million passengers at more than 450 airports across the nation.

In 2012, TSA screened 637,582,122 passengers.

The Bush International and the William P. Hobby Airports are essential hubs for domestic and international air travel for Houston and the region.

Nearly 40 million passengers traveled through Bush International Airport (IAH) and an additional 10 million traveled through William P. Hobby (HOU).

More than 650 daily departures occur at IAH.

IAH is the 11th busiest airport in the U.S. for total passenger traffic.

IAH has 12 all-cargo airlines and handled more than 419,205 metric tons of cargo in 2012.

Airlines and airports are expected to experience a significant increase in passenger traffic coming into the 2016 summer peak travel months across the nation's largest airports.

As a result of the Passenger Facility Charges airports will continue to receive the needed funds to modernize and keep up with the growing traffic demands and safety and security challenges of our nation's airports.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4369, which would allow for a local settlement agreement in Southern California between the City of Los Angeles and the new Ontario Airport Authority.

I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for bringing this bill to the House floor today, and I thank Congresswoman TITUS for managing the floor debate.

I would also like to thank my bipartisan colleagues from California, Rep. CALVERT and Rep. TORRES, for their leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, after 5 years of negotiations the City of Los Angeles has agreed to transfer its ownership of the Ontario Airport to a new airport authority created by the City of Ontario and San Bernardino County.

This deal has been supported by all stakeholders in order to give the people of the Inland Empire in Southern California control over their own airport.

The residents, businesses, and cities in my district in the San Gabriel Valley are also very supportive of this agreement. The Ontario Airport is only 15 miles from the center of my district, whereas Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is 40 miles from the center of my district, and there is constant traffic. San Gabriel Valley residents and businesses would much rather use Ontario Airport than LAX if it had better flight options to more locations, which this bill will help accomplish. Allowing for local control of the airport puts the best interest of our region first in improving and managing the airport. I am also appreciative that this agreement makes sure that airport workers will not lose their jobs during and after the transition.

The major point in this local agreement was providing for the repayment of passenger facility charge fees (PFCs) that Los Angeles had collected at LAX in the 1990s and used to construct a new terminal at Ontario Airport.

The settlement agreement requires Ontario Airport to pay back LAX with future PFCs collected at Ontario. The problem is that federal law only allows the transfer of PFCs from one airport to another airport if they are owned by the same airport authority. This is the current law that allowed LAX to transfer PFCs to Ontario.

Since the new agreement transfers control of Ontario Airport to a new airport authority, without our legislation the new Ontario Airport authority is prohibited from paying back the PFCs to LAX.

Mr. Speaker, our bill today is a narrow change in the use of PFCs to allow those collected at Ontario International Airport to be used for projects at LAX. This amendment was carefully written as to only apply to Ontario Airport and LAX. There are no federal funds used in this amendment, and it does not change any of the policy requirements of the use of PFCs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the support of my colleagues for H.R. 4369.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4369.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT FOR RAPID INNOVATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5388) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5388

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 ''Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

(a) CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 319. CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall support the research, development, testing, evaluation, and transition of cybersecurity technologies, including fundamental research to improve the sharing of information, analytics, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents, consistent with current law.

''(b) ACTIVITIES.—The research and development supported under subsection (a) shall serve the components of the Department and shall—

''(1) advance the development and accelerate the deployment of more secure information systems;

''(2) improve and create technologies for detecting attacks or intrusions, including real-time continuous diagnostics and real-time analytic technologies;

''(3) improve and create mitigation and recovery methodologies, including techniques and policies for real-time containment of attacks, and development of resilient networks and information systems;

''(4) support, in coordination with non-Federal entities, the review of source code that underpins critical infrastructure information systems;

''(5) develop and support infrastructure and tools to support cybersecurity research and development efforts, including modeling, testbeds, and data sets for assessment of new cybersecurity technologies;

''(6) assist the development and support of technologies to reduce vulnerabilities in industrial control systems; and

''(7) develop and support cyber forensics and attack attribution capabilities.

''(c) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall coordinate activities with—

''(1) the Under Secretary appointed pursuant to section 103(a)(1)(H);

''(2) the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate; and

''(3) industry and academia.

''(d) TRANSITION TO PRACTICE.—The Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall support projects carried out under this title through the full life cycle of such projects, including research, development, testing, evaluation, pilots, and transitions. The Under Secretary shall identify mature technologies that address existing or imminent cybersecurity gaps in public or private information systems and networks of information systems, identify and support necessary improvements identified during pilot programs and testing and evaluation activities, and introduce new cybersecurity technologies throughout the homeland security enterprise through partnerships and commercialization. The Under Secretary shall target federally funded cybersecurity research that demonstrates a high probability of successful transition to the commercial market within two years and that is expected to have a notable impact on the public or private information systems and networks of information systems.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CYBERSECURITY RISK.—The term 'cybersecurity risk' has the meaning given such term in section 227.

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

''(3) INCIDENT.—The term 'incident' has the meaning given such term in section 227.

''(4) INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The term 'information system' has the meaning given such term in section 3502(8) of title 44, United States Code.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 318 the following new item:

''Sec. 319. Cybersecurity research and development.''.

(b) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—Section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2020'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking the last sentence; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) PRIOR APPROVAL.—In any case in which the head of a component or office of the Department seeks to utilize the authority under this section, such head shall first receive prior approval from the Secretary by providing to the Secretary a proposal that includes the rationale for the utilization of such authority, the funds to be spent on the use of such authority, and the expected outcome for each project that is the subject of the use of such authority. In such a case, the authority for evaluating the proposal may not be delegated by the Secretary to anyone other than the Under Secretary for Management.'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2020''; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall annually submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report detailing the projects for which the authority granted by subsection (a) was utilized, the rationale for such utilizations, the funds spent utilizing such authority, the extent of cost-sharing for such projects among Federal and non-Federal sources, the extent to which utilization of such authority has addressed a homeland security capability gap or threat to the homeland identified by the Department, the total amount of payments, if any, that were received by the Federal Government as a result of the utilization of such authority during the period covered by each such report, the outcome of each project for which such authority was utilized, and the results of any audits of such projects.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall develop a training program for acquisitions staff on the utilization of the authority provided under subsection (a).''.

(c) PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as part of Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY's Innovation Initiative, I am very pleased to bring two important bills to the floor today that further the leader's efforts for ensuring that government can more effectively leverage cutting-edge cyber technologies.

As chairman of the Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies Subcommittee, my colleagues and I have been working diligently with technology innovators, including tech startups, to find solutions that will help spur innovation and break down bureaucratic barriers that are currently preventing government from leveraging the private sector's emerging technologies.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that the House is first considering H.R. 5388, the Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016, on the floor today. H.R. 5388 requires the Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Directorate, or S&T, to more effectively coordinate with industry and academia to support the research and development of cybersecurity technologies.

H.R. 5388 requires S&T to support the full lifecycle of cyber research and development projects and to identify mature technologies to address cybersecurity gaps. In doing so, S&T must target federally funded cybersecurity research that demonstrates a high probability of successful transition to the commercial market within 2 years.

This bill also extends the use of other transaction authority, or OTA, until the year 2020, which will improve DHS' ability to engage tech startups that are developing these cutting-edge technologies.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5388 also includes important accountability requirements to ensure that there will be proper oversight of the authority.

In December of last year, the House passed H.R. 3578, the Science and Technology Reform and Improvement Act. That bill included provisions similar to those in the bill that we are considering today.

Mr. Speaker, over the last several years, we have seen evolving cybersecurity threats from nation-states, including China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran, as well as cyber threats from criminal organizations and terrorist groups like ISIS. Cyber criminals continue to develop even more cutting-edge cyber capabilities.

In 2016, these hackers pose an even greater threat to the U.S. homeland and our critical infrastructure. The Federal Government desperately needs to keep pace with these evolving threats and more actively work with the private sector to find solutions.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security's Directorate of Science and Technology is the primary research and development arm of the Department and, because the Directorate manages basic and applied research and development, including cybersecurity R&D for the Department's operational components and first responders, ensuring that there are

mechanisms in place like S&T's cybersecurity research and development programs and OTA to support the dynamic nature of the cybersecurity research and development is both vital and essential for addressing Homeland Security capability gaps.

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker, for calling up this important bill today because I am convinced that it will have an incredibly positive impact on encouraging technology innovation across the Nation to address our evolving homeland security needs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2016.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 5388, the ''Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016,'' which your Committee reported on June 8, 2016.

H.R. 5388 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2016.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5388, the ''Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016.'' I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will not seek a sequential referral on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing a sequential referral of this bill at this time, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support a request by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

□ 1500

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5388, the Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5388, the Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016, directs the Department of Homeland Security to support advancements in cybersecurity research. Hackers, cyberterrorists, and other cybercriminals are constantly innovating. As such, it is a security imperative that the Federal Government—or, more specifically, DHS—innovate, too. To that end, H.R. 5388 directs DHS to support promising projects to, among other things, improve the detection of cyber attacks or intrusions and mitigation and recovery from such attacks.

This bill is based on two provisions contained in H.R. 3578, the DHS Science and Technology Reform and Improvement Act, which passed the House last December. Specifically, H.R. 5388 directs DHS' Under Secretary for Science and Technology to bolster research and development of cybersecurity technology to improve the sharing of information, analysis, and methodologies to address cybersecurity risk and incidents. Additionally, H.R. 5388 extends for 4 years the Department's authority to utilize other transaction authority instead of the Federal Acquisition Regulation to fund basic, applied, and advanced R&D projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) has put two bills before this House, two bills that are part of our broader Innovation Initiative that take the power of human discovery and apply it to national security.

We know that what protected us in the past isn't sufficient for today or the future. Oceans were our greatest defense for much of our history, but distance became less important in the age of jets and rockets. Radar was a revolutionary discovery that helped us see threats before they arrived, but radar can't help us find a potential terrorist being radicalized in our very own neighborhoods.

We can't rely today on what worked in the past. We need new weapons, new tools, and new defenses. We need more, and the government can't do it alone. The dangers are too pressing for Washington to find the best ways to protect the American people all by itself.

Across this country, there are innovators who are finding the answers, and we need to listen to them. The House knows this, and one of our bills directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to engage with private citizens who can join in the task of making our great country safe.

The second bill of the Innovation Initiative today focuses explicitly on cybersecurity: to update and improve detection of intrusions, improve recovery, and reduce vulnerabilities in the industrial systems we rely on.

We have seen, repeatedly, from the Office of Personnel Management to the IRS to businesses in the private sector that our cyber defenses are simply not up to the task. But we can do better. We always can and we always will.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the ideas being put forward for the Innovation Initiative so far. America has unprecedented potential, and through the focus of this initiative, we will discover new and better ways to keep America safe.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation faces growing, diverse, and increasingly sophisticated cybersecurity threats. These threats necessitate a Federal response that includes supporting innovative cybersecurity research and development, testing, and evaluation. This response is dependent on strong public and private collaboration. Such collaboration is essential to ensuring that promising technologies are introduced into the marketplace in a timely manner.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5388.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 5388, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5388, the "Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016," which amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for improved innovative research and development.

I support this bill because it would extend the Department of Homeland Security secretary's pilot program for research and development projects and prototype projects through 2020.

This bill would require the secretary to report annually to the House Homeland Security and Science committees and the Senate Homeland Security Committee on the dynamics of the projects undertaken.

Specifically, H.R. 5388 would amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to include fundamental improvements to facilitate information, analytics, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents, consistent with the current law.

In particular, it adds a new section to the Homeland Security Act, directing the Department of Homeland Security to support—whether within itself, other agencies, or in academia and private industry—the research and development of cybersecurity-related technologies.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee and Subcommittee on Crime Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I support this bill as it directs the Under Secretary for Science and Technology to bolster research and development, along

with the testing and evaluation of cybersecurity technology to improve the sharing of information, analysis, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents.

The Rapid Innovation Act is a smart bill that will enable the Department of Homeland Security to establish and improve technologies for detecting attacks or intrusions.

The ''Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016'' will equip the Department of Homeland Security with vital tools and resources to prevent and remove attacks and threats implemented by those who target our nation.

Mr. Speaker, we face growing cybersecurity threats, which demands that we increase research and development, along with the testing and evaluation of cybersecurity technology to expand the sharing of information, analysis, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents.

This is a comprehensive bill that will help protect all Americans in every corner of this nation.

I urge all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 5388.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5388.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

LEVERAGING EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES ACT OF 2016

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5389) to encourage engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5389

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 ''Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. INNOVATION ENGAGEMENT.

(a) INNOVATION ENGAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security—

(A) shall engage with innovative and emerging technology developers and firms, including technology-based small businesses and startup ventures, to address homeland security needs; and

(B) may identify geographic areas in the United States with high concentrations of such innovative and emerging technology developers and firms, and may establish personnel and office space in such areas, as appropriate.

(2) ENGAGEMENT.—Engagement under paragraph (1) may include innovative and emerging technology developers or firms with proven technologies, supported with outside investment, with potential applications for the Department of Homeland Security.

(3) CO-LOCATION.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that it is appropriate to establish personnel and office space in a specific geographic area in the United States pursuant to paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall co-locate such personnel and office space with other existing assets of—

(A) the Department of Homeland Security, where possible; or

(B) Federal facilities, where appropriate.

(4) OVERSIGHT.—Not later than 30 days after establishing personnel and office space in a specific geographic area in the United States pursuant to paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall inform Congress about the rationale for such establishment, the anticipated costs associated with such establishment, and the specific goals for such establishment.

(b) STRATEGIC PLAN.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop, implement, and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a Department of Homeland Security-wide strategy to proactively engage with innovative and emerging technology developers and firms, including technology-based small businesses and startup ventures, in accordance with subsection (a). Such strategy shall—

(1) focus on sustainable methods and guidance to build relationships, including with such innovative and emerging technology developers and firms in geographic areas in the United States with high concentrations of such innovative and emerging technology developers and firms, and in geographic areas outside such areas, to establish, develop, and enhance departmental capabilities to address homeland security needs;

(2) include efforts to—

(A) ensure proven innovative and emerging technologies can be included in existing and future acquisition contracts;

(B) coordinate with organizations that provide venture capital to businesses, particularly small businesses and startup ventures, as appropriate, to assist the commercialization of innovative and emerging technologies that are expected to be ready for commercialization in the near term and within 36 months; and

(C) address barriers to the utilization of innovative and emerging technologies and the engagement of small businesses and startup ventures in the acquisition process;

(3) include a description of how the Department plans to leverage proven innovative and emerging technologies to address homeland security needs; and

(4) include the criteria the Secretary plans to use to determine an innovative or technology is proven.

(c) PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support and I am very pleased that the House is considering H.R. 5389, the Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016. H.R. 5389 encourages engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, including tech startups.

This important bill requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to proactively engage with innovative and emerging technology developers and firms to address homeland security needs. More specifically, H.R. 5389 provides the Secretary authority to identify geographic areas in the United States where high concentrations of innovative and emerging technology developers and firms exist and to establish personnel and office space in these areas to more effectively collaborate with these technology hubs.

The Federal Government needs to do a better job working with the private sector, and this bill will support that goal by requiring the Secretary to develop and implement a targeted strategy to proactively engage innovative and emerging technology developers and firms. The Secretary must use this strategic plan to address and to reduce barriers to leveraging innovative and emerging technologies and the small business and startup ventures that create those technologies by incorporating them into the Department's acquisition process.

In order to keep pace, the Department of Homeland Security recently established an office in Silicon Valley to encourage engagement and communication with the innovative technology developers in that area. Although a vital technology hub, Silicon Valley is not the only technology hub in the United States. For that reason, the Department should not be limited to a single geographic area from which to identify emerging and innovative technologies.

Mr. Speaker, we are all learning that cybersecurity is national security. The Nation is under constant cyber attack from nation-states, from criminal groups, and from terrorist organizations, and, with each passing day, the attacks and tools that they are using are becoming more sophisticated. Requiring the Department to consider strategically how it will engage these technology developers will strengthen the Department's ability to access innovative and emerging technologies in order to combat these evolving threats.

I am happy to support this measure today and believe it will move us toward further addressing homeland security needs by supporting technology innovation.

Before I close, I include in the RECORD an exchange between the chairman of the Committee on Science,

Space, and Technology and the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2016.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 5389, the ''Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016,'' which your Committee reported on June 8, 2016.

H.R. 5389 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2016.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your interest in H.R. 5389, the ''Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016.'' I appreciate your cooperation in allowing this legislation to move expeditiously before the House of Representatives on June 21, 2016. I understand that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, to the extent it may have a jurisdictional claim, will not seek a sequential referral on the bill; and therefore, there has been no formal determination as to its jurisdiction by the Parliamentarian. While we are not prepared to recognize the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology over this bill, we do appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that the absence of a decision on this bill at this time does not prejudice any claim the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology may have held or may have on similar legislation in the future.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5389, the Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 5389, a bipartisan bill that directs the Department of Homeland Security to engage, in an unprecedented fashion, with developers of innovative and emerging technologies.

When it comes to tackling vexing homeland security challenges, Washington does not have the monopoly on groundbreaking, forward-thinking ideas. H.R. 5389 specifically directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to engage with innovative and emerging technology developers to help tackle the rapidly expanding list of homeland security technology needs.

To encourage such engagement, the bill authorizes DHS to establish personnel and office space in diverse geographical areas around the United States that have high concentrations of technology developers and firms to nurture relationships.

In April 2015, the Department announced that it was establishing a Silicon Valley office to cultivate relationships with technology innovators, particularly nontraditional performers, such as small startups, investors, incubators, and accelerators. The establishment of this office is in furtherance of DHS' homeland security innovation program, whose goal is to generate innovation in hubs around the Nation and the world to solve DHS' most difficult technology challenges.

Over the past year, through these programs, DHS has reached out to technology innovators and other stakeholders at regional events held in Boston, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, New Orleans, Chicago, Louisville, and Austin.

To ensure that DHS pursues outreach to innovators and related stakeholders in a thoughtful manner, H.R. 5389 also directs DHS, within 6 months, to develop and submit to Congress a Department-wide strategy for such engagement. Importantly, the bill specifically calls for DHS to include ways to effectively engage with technology-based small businesses and startup ventures in the strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. H.R. 5389 was unanimously approved by the Committee on Homeland Security on June 8. It recognizes that DHS depends on technology to carry out its missions and for the Department to effectively identify, support, and procure innovative technology. DHS must nurture and maintain robust and direct relationships with technology developers.

Two features of the strategy required under this act that I would like to highlight are that it directs DHS to give attention to fostering engagement with developers that may be located outside a recognized regional technology hub, and coordinate with venture capital organizations to help emerging technology developers, including small businesses and startup ventures, commercialize technologies that address a rapidly growing list of homeland security needs.

I also join my colleague from Texas in supporting this legislation. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 5389.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for cosponsoring this bill and for his leadership in this area.

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5389.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in support of H.R. 5389, the "Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016," which requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to engage with innovative and emerging technology developers, including technology-based small businesses and startup ventures that can help tackle the rapidly expanding list of homeland security technology needs.

H.R. 5389 helps to protect America's computer and communications networks, which security experts believe represent the nation's most critical national security challenge, including internet functions and connected critical infrastructure such as air traffic control, the U.S. electrical grid, and nuclear power plants.

H.R. 5389 authorizes DHS to establish personnel and office space in diverse geographic areas around the United States that have high concentrations of technology developers and firms.

The bill also directs DHS, within 6 months, to develop and submit to Congress a Department-wide strategy to engage with innovative and emerging technology companies.

Importantly, the bill specifically requires the Secretary to include in that strategy ways to effectively integrate technology-based small businesses and startup ventures.

Importantly, the bill also requires the DHS Secretary to coordinate with those in the venture capital industry to assist in the development of technologies that are ready for commercialization and use in the Homeland Security Enterprise.

Since its founding, the Department of Homeland Security has overcome many challenges as an organization but much more progress must be made regarding effective inter-operable communication between the federal, state, and local agencies.

Although not a panacea, H.R. 5389 is a step in the right direction because it will help improve DHS' overall functions so that it can more effectively protect our people.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5389.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

THOROUGHLY INVESTIGATING RETALIATION AGAINST WHISTLEBLOWERS ACT

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4639) to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide modifications to authorities relating to the Office of Special Counsel, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4639

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 ''Thoroughly Investigating Retaliation Against Whistleblowers Act''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(a)(2) of the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 (5 U.S.C. 5509 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) $24,119,000 for fiscal year 2016 and $25,735,000 for each of fiscal years 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020 to carry out subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 5, United States Code (as amended by this Act).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be deemed to apply beginning on October 1, 2015.

SEC. 3. ACCESS TO AGENCY INFORMATION.

Section 1212(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5)(A) In carrying out this subchapter, the Special Counsel is authorized to—

''(i) have access to any record or other information (including a report, audit, review, document, recommendation, or other material) of any agency under the jurisdiction of the Office of Special Counsel, consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (C); and

''(ii) require any employee of such an agency to provide to the Office any record or other information during an investigation, review, or inquiry of any agency under the jurisdiction of the Office.

''(B) With respect to any record or other information made available by an agency under this subchapter, the Office shall apply a level of confidentiality to such record or information at the level of confidentiality applied to the record by the agency.

''(C) With respect to any record or other information described under subparagraph (A), the Attorney General or an Inspector General may withhold access to any such record or other information if the disclosure could reasonably be expected to interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, but only if the Attorney General or applicable agency head submits a written report to the Office of Special Counsel describing the record or other information withheld and the reason for the withholding.''.

SEC. 4. WHISTLEBLOWER PROVISIONS.

Section 1213 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''15 days'' and inserting ''45 days'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking ''such as'' and inserting ''including''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) if any disclosure referred to an agency head under subsection (c) is substantiated in whole or in part by the agency head, a detailed explanation of the failure to take any action described under paragraph (5).''; and

(3) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:

''(5) If an agency head submits a report to the Special Counsel under subsection (d) that includes a description of any agency action proposed to be taken as a result of the investigation, the agency head shall, not later than 180 days after the date of such submission, submit a supplemental report to the Special Counsel stating whether any proposed action has been taken, and if the action has not been taken, the reason why it has not been taken.''.

SEC. 5. TERMINATION OF CERTAIN OSC INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1214(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6)(A) Within 30 days of receiving an allegation from a person under paragraph (1), the Special Counsel may terminate an investigation under such paragraph with respect to the allegation, without further inquiry or an opportunity for the person to respond, if the Special Counsel determines that—

''(i) the same allegation, based on the same set of facts and circumstances—

''(I) had previously been made by the person and previously investigated by the Special Counsel; or

''(II) had previously been filed by the person with the Merit Systems Protection Board;

''(ii) the Office of Special Counsel does not have jurisdiction to investigate the allegation; or

''(iii) the person knew or should have known of the alleged prohibited personnel practice earlier than the date that is 3 years before the date Special Counsel received the allegation.

''(B) If the Special Counsel terminates an investigation under subparagraph (A), not later than 30 days after the date of such termination the Special Counsel shall provide a written notification stating the basis for the termination to the person who made the allegation. Paragraph (1)(D) shall not apply to any termination under such subparagraph.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking ''The Special Counsel'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (6), the Special Counsel''; and

(2) in subsection (a)(1)(C), in the matter before clause (i), by inserting ''or paragraph (6)'' after ''paragraph (2)''.

SEC. 6. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) OSC ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 1218 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1218. Annual report

''(a) The Special Counsel shall submit an annual report to Congress on the activities of the Special Counsel. Any such report shall include—

''(1) the number, types, and disposition of allegations of prohibited personnel practices filed with the Special Counsel, and the cost of allegations so disposed of;

''(2) the number of investigations conducted by the Special Counsel;

''(3) the number of stays or disciplinary actions negotiated by the Special Counsel with agencies;

''(4) the number of cases in which the Special Counsel did not make a determination whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that a prohibited personnel practice has occurred, exists, or is to be taken within the 240-day period specified in section 1214(b)(2)(A)(i);

''(5) a description of the recommendations and reports made by the Special Counsel to other agencies pursuant to this subchapter, and the actions taken by the agencies as a result of the reports or recommendations;

''(6) the number of—

''(A) actions initiated before the Merit Systems Protection Board, including the number of corrective action petitions and disciplinary action complaints so initiated; and

''(B) stays and stay extensions obtained from the Board; and

''(7) the number of prohibited personnel practice complaints that result in—

''(A) a favorable action for the complainant, categorized by actions with respect to whistleblower reprisal cases and all other cases; and

''(B) a favorable outcome for the complainant, categorized by outcomes with respect to whistleblower reprisal cases and all other cases.

''(b) The report required by subsection (a) shall include whatever recommendations for legislation or other action by Congress the Special Counsel may consider appropriate.''.

(b) OSC PUBLIC INFORMATION.—Section 1219(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(1) a list of any noncriminal matter referred to an agency head under section 1213(c), together with—

''(A) the applicable transmittal of the matter to the agency head under section 1213(c)(1);

''(B) any report from agency head under section 1213(c)(1)(B) relating to such matter;

''(C) if appropriate, not otherwise prohibited by law, and with the consent of the complainant, any comments from the complainant under section 1213(e)(1) relating to the matter; and

''(D) the Special Counsel's comments or recommendations under section 1213(e)(3) or (4) relating to the matter;''.

SEC. 7. ESTABLISHMENT OF SURVEY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Special Counsel shall design and establish a survey pilot program under which the Office shall conduct, with respect to fiscal years 2017 and 2018, a survey of individuals who have filed a complaint or disclosure with the Office. The survey shall be designed to gather responses from the individuals for the purpose of collecting information and improving customer service at various stages of the review or investigative process. The results of the survey shall be published in the annual report of the Office.

(b) SUSPENSION OF OTHER SURVEYS.—During fiscal years 2017 and 2018, section 13 of Public Law 103–424 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 8. PENALTIES UNDER THE HATCH ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7326 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 7326. Penalties

''An employee or individual who violates section 7323 or 7324 shall be subject to—

''(1) disciplinary action consisting of removal, reduction in grade, debarment from Federal employment for a period not to exceed 5 years, suspension, or reprimand;

''(2) an assessment of a civil penalty not to exceed $1,000; or

''(3) any combination of the penalties described in paragraph (1) or (2).''.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to any violation of section 7323 or 7324 of title 5, United States

Code, occurring after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 9. REGULATIONS.

Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Special Counsel shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to perform the functions of the Special Counsel under subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 5, United States Code, including regulations necessary to carry out sections 1213, 1214, and 1215 of such title, and any functions required due to the amendments made by this Act. Such regulations shall be published in the Federal Register.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 4639, the Thoroughly Investigating Retaliation Against Whistleblowers Act.

This is a bill to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, or OSC, over the next 5 years. The bipartisan legislation was passed unanimously out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. It also has the support of the whistleblower community.

Mr. Speaker, OSC is tasked with a variety of responsibilities, including policing whistleblower retaliation across the entire executive branch, an immense responsibility.

OSC's last reauthorization expired in 2007, so this bill is long overdue.

In addition to reauthorizing the agency, this bill aims to give OSC the tools it needs to continue the good work it is already doing. For example, this legislation would ensure that OSC has the access to agency records that it needs. Agencies should not be able to stonewall OSC to stop the Special Counsel from investigating retaliation within their agency.

Like inspectors general, OSC must have access to agency information in order to properly conduct the duties they are charged with by Congress. OSC is part of the executive branch, just the same as the agencies that Special Counsel oversees, so those agencies should not be able to invoke legal privileges to withhold information. Take the attorney-client privilege as an example. These agencies all represent the same client—the Federal Government—which works for the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also allows OSC to use a simplified process to close out duplicate complaints so it can focus its resources on new whistleblower allegations. It puts a statute of limitations on whistleblower retaliation cases of 3 years, after which documents and witness recollections can be hard to obtain. These steps will help to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of OSC operations.

Mr. Speaker, OSC has an immensely important role to play in protecting whistleblowers, helping to root out waste, fraud, and abuse. I believe this bill will be good for the agency and good for the whistleblowers that they are charged to protect.

I urge that we pass it here in the House of Representatives.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4639, a bill to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel.

I thank Ranking Member CUMMINGS and Representatives CONNOLLY, BLUM, and MEADOWS for their leadership in crafting this bipartisan bill.

While the Office of Special Counsel plays a vital role in the Federal Government, the Office of Special Counsel, or OSC, protects Federal employees, especially whistleblowers, from prohibited personnel practices, such as discrimination, retaliation, and improper hiring practices.

OSC also serves as a safe place for Federal whistleblowers to disclose wrongdoings. The agency also safeguards the preference and employment rights of veterans, guardsmen, and reservists to ensure that they are not disadvantaged or discriminated against because of their service.

Reauthorization of OSC is long overdue. The last statutory authorization for the agency expired in fiscal year 2007. This bill will authorize nearly $26 million in annual funding for OSC for the fiscal years 2017 through 2020.

I commend current Special Counsel, Carolyn Lerner, for her leadership and work in making the OSC a more effective investigative body.

This bill would make changes that would help OSC conduct investigations and hold agencies accountable when wrongdoing is identified. For example, the bill would provide OSC with clear authority to obtain information from agencies during an investigation. Providing this authority to OSC would make clear that agencies must cooperate in the same way Congress expects agencies to cooperate with the inspectors general and GAO.

If disclosing certain information could interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, this measure would allow the attorney general or an inspector general to withhold access to such information.

This bill would also increase agency accountability when allegations of misconduct are substantiated. Agencies that fail to implement a recommendation made by OSC will be required to explain why they have failed to take such actions.

This legislation is critically important for ensuring that Federal employees have a venue for seeking redress against prohibited personnel practices.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel. I thank Representatives BLUM, CONNOLLY, and MEADOWS, as well as Chairman CHAFFETZ, for working with me in such a bipartisan way on this legislation.

As my colleagues know, one of my top priorities as Ranking Member of the Oversight Committee is the protection of federal employees from discrimination and retaliation.

The Office of Special Counsel plays an especially important role in ensuring that the work environment of federal employees is free of such prohibited personnel practices. OSC's last reauthorization ended in 2007. It is unacceptable that OSC still hasn't been authorized nearly ten years later.

This legislation would reauthorize OSC through 2020, and it would make changes to help OSC be more effective. For example, it would make clear that OSC is entitled to access agency information in its investigations.

This bill would also allow OSC to hold agencies more accountable for whistleblower retaliation. Under the bill, if an agency substantiates a whistleblower disclosure from OSC but fails to take a recommended corrective action, the agency must explain why it failed to take the action. This legislation would strengthen the tools available to OSC for addressing and correcting retaliation and discrimination in the federal workplace.

I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting passage of H.R. 4639.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4639, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY ELEANORA McCOY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5028) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10721 E. Jefferson Ave in Detroit, Michigan, as the ''Mary Eleanora McCoy Post Office Building'', as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5028

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

SECTION 1. MARY E. MCCOY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10721

E Jefferson Ave in Detroit, Michigan, shall be known and designated as the ''Mary E. McCoy Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Mary E. McCoy Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5028, introduced by my colleague on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Representative BRENDA LAWRENCE of Michigan.

The bill designates a post office in Detroit, Michigan, as the Mary Eleanora McCoy Post Office Building.

Born in an underground railroad station, Mrs. McCoy was a dedicated advocate for women's and civil rights in the 19th century.

I look forward to learning more about Mrs. McCoy from the sponsor of this bill and a fellow member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Representative LAWRENCE.

I urge Members to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to sponsor H.R. 5028, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10721 East Jefferson Avenue in Detroit, Michigan, as the Mary Eleanora McCoy Post Office Building.

It brings me great pride that my first bill considered before the House surrounds the United States Postal Service and Mary McCoy, an activist who was able to provide housing, education, health care, and economic support to women and children during the Jim Crow era. I spent almost 30 years in the Postal Service and saw firsthand the importance of these government agencies to communities throughout the country. They are central to every American city and provide a vital service to senior citizens on a daily basis.

Today I stand in recognition of Mary McCoy, a woman who organized and provided essential services to African Americans and other minorities who lacked access to adequate medical care, housing options, and education, all at a time when women lacked basic voting rights.

The daughter of two escaped slaves, Mary McCoy was born in an underground railroad station in 1846. Mary rose to become a philanthropist and leader of the African American and female populations in Michigan, bringing these diverse communities together in a time of great divide.

Through the establishment of organizations and group homes, Mary was able to provide support, safety, and community for women and children throughout Michigan.

The wife of the renowned innovator, Elijah McCoy, Mary forever changed the cultural landscape in the United States for African Americans and women, developing innovative methods to support both communities. Mary established scholarships for children of former slaves and gave shelter to orphans and senior citizens throughout Michigan.

Mary was able to provide these essential services by founding and supporting some of Michigan's most prominent women's clubs and organizations. These groups include, but are not limited to, the Michigan State Association of Colored Women, the McCoy Home for Colored Children, and the Phyllis Wheatley Home for Aged Colored Women.

Mary McCoy worked her entire life to alleviate the racism, sexism, and ageism that plagued our Nation. She lived to see a cultural shift in America that went far beyond the 15th and 19th amendments.

Dying at the age of 77 from injuries sustained in a car crash, Mary McCoy will always be remembered as a hero for her work in sheltering the homeless, healing the sick, and supporting many of Michigan's most charitable endeavors.

I urge the passage of H.R. 5028.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5028, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10721 E Jefferson Ave in Detroit, Michigan, as the 'Mary E. McCoy Post Office Building' ''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ED PASTOR POST OFFICE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4010) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 522 North Central Avenue in Phoenix, Arizona, as the ''Ed Pastor Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4010

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

SECTION 1. ED PASTOR POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 522 North Central Avenue in Phoenix, Arizona, shall be known and designated as the ''Ed Pastor Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Ed Pastor Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 4010, introduced by Representative RUBEN GALLEGO of Arizona. The bill designates a post office in Phoenix, Arizona, as the Ed Pastor Post Office. Former Representative Ed Pastor served in the House of Representatives for 24 years, from 1991 until last year.

I look forward to hearing more about Representative Pastor from the bill's sponsor and my distinguished colleague, Representative GALLEGO. For now, I urge Members to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 4010, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service in Phoenix, Arizona, as the Ed Pastor Post Office.

Ed Pastor dedicated his life to public service. After working for Arizona Governor Raul Castro and after having served three terms on the County Board of Supervisors, Ed Pastor was elected to this very Chamber in 1991. Congressman Pastor was a founding member of the Progressive Caucus, was chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus in the 104th Congress, and served as the deputy whip of the Democratic Caucus. Congressman Pastor retired following his 12th term in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to recognize the many years Ed Pastor

spent in advocating on behalf of his constituents and in working to improve the lives of all Americans. I urge the passage of H.R. 4010.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a bill that, in a small but significant way, honors the legacy of a Latino trailblazer and a great Arizonan, Congressman Ed Pastor.

Congressman Pastor dedicated his life to fighting for working families. Renaming a post office in the district he represented with distinction for 12 terms is the very least we can do to recognize his more than three decades of outstanding public service.

I thank my colleagues in the Arizona delegation for their enthusiastic support of this bill. I am also grateful to Chairman CHAFFETZ and to Ranking Member CUMMINGS for enabling this bill to come to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman Ed Pastor's life embodies the American Dream. Throughout his time in Congress, Mr. Pastor fought to make the dream accessible to everyone, including to the most vulnerable in our society. As Leader PELOSI once wrote: Ed Pastor never forgot his roots and always worked to build a brighter future for the children of our Nation.

The son of a miner, Mr. Pastor was the first member of his family to go to college and receive his bachelor's degree from Arizona State University in 1966. After graduation, he taught at North High School in Phoenix before returning to ASU in 1971 to earn his law degree. Mr. Pastor subsequently worked on the staff of Arizona's first Latino Governor, Raul Castro—a job that cemented his lifelong commitment to public service. Mr. Pastor later served three terms on the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors before being elected to the 102nd Congress in a special election in 1991. Congressman Pastor spent 24 years in this body and earned a reputation as a tireless advocate for the people of Arizona.

I am proud to say that Mr. Pastor was the first Latino to be elected to Congress from our great State. He was also one of the founding members of the Progressive Caucus and chaired the Congressional Hispanic Caucus in the 104th Congress. In addition, he served on the House Appropriations Committee and as chief deputy whip of the Democratic Caucus.

Throughout his career, Congressman Pastor was a passionate advocate for fixing our broken immigration system, for investing in our Nation's transportation infrastructure, and for protecting the civil rights of every American. Perhaps, even more importantly, as President Obama noted, Congressman Pastor served as a mentor and as a role model to young Latinos and Latinas throughout Arizona and our country. He was supported in this groundbreaking work by his loving wife, Verma. Congressman Pastor retired in 2014, and he remains a beloved and respected figure in the city of Phoenix.

I am incredibly proud to follow in his footsteps as the Seventh Congressional District's Representative here in Washington. The Ed Pastor Post Office will join the Ed Pastor Elementary School and the Ed Pastor Center for Politics and Public Service at ASU as monuments to his outstanding service to our Nation. Congressman Pastor's legacy lives on, not just in these buildings, but in the transportation projects he championed, in the legislation he authored, in the working families he helped, and in the young people he inspired.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request the support of every Member in recognizing a legendary Arizonan, Congressman Ed Pastor.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4010, a bill "To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 522 North Central Avenue in Phoenix, Arizona, as the 'Ed Pastor Post Office' ".

I support this bill because it honors the service of Ed Pastor, the first Latino congressman from Arizona.

During Congressman Pastor's 12 terms in Congress, he committed himself to serving thousands of constituents from the 2nd, 4th, and 7th districts in Arizona and all across the country.

As a dedicated and active member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Pastor served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the International Conservation Caucus, and the Sportsmen's Caucus.

Congressman Pastor is also known for his influence in promoting American arts, for protecting nature, and for protecting the civil rights of Americans.

As members of Congress, it is vital that we continue to fight for the rights of our constituents and for all Americans as we actively conserve our precious land and indigenous cultures.

As I am a strong advocate of protecting human and civil rights, I fully support the designation of the United States Postal Service facility as the "Ed Pastor Post Office" in honor of his services to both his country and to his constituents.

I urge all members to join me in passing H.R. 4010 as it rightfully commemorates Ed Pastor's outstanding service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4010.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARRY G. MILLER POST OFFICE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4372) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 Rochester Street, Bergen, New York, as the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4372

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

SECTION 1. BARRY G. MILLER POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 Rochester Street, Bergen, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Barry G. Miller Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Barry G. Miller Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 4372, introduced by Representative CHRIS COLLINS of New York. This bill designates a post office located in Bergen, New York, as the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

Mr. Miller was assistant chief of Emergency Medical Services, a member of the Bergen Volunteer Fire Department, and a Genesee County coroner. He was tragically killed in the line of duty during an emergency response.

I look forward to hearing more about Barry Miller from the sponsor of the bill, my colleague, Representative COLLINS.

I urge Members to support this bill.

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

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

I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 4372, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service in Bergen, New York, as the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

Along with his love of outdoor activities, including snowmobiling, boating, water-skiing, and camping, Barry exhibited a love for community service. While working as a Genesee County coroner, Barry also served as the chief of Emergency Medical Services at the Bergen Fire Department. As a 31-year veteran of the fire department, Barry is remembered for his generosity and for his dedication to protecting and improving the lives of those in his community.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to recognize Barry Miller's life of public service and to honor the many contributions he made to his community. I urge the passage of H.R. 4372.

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

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

Mr. COLLINS of New York. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I come before you in support of H.R. 4372, a bill to designate the Bergen Post Office as the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

It is a great honor to introduce legislation that designates a post office in my district after someone who dedicated his entire life to public service in western New York.

Barry Miller was a lifelong Bergen resident and served as a member of the Bergen Volunteer Fire Department for 31 years, including 10 as the assistant EMS chief. Barry was also the Genesee County coroner, a business owner, and a member of the Bergen Town Board.

Barry was dedicated to helping fellow New Yorkers, and he made numerous lasting contributions to the Bergen and Genesee County communities. Unfortunately, Barry was tragically killed in the line of duty, during an emergency response, on November 23, 2015.

In order to honor his service and memory, the post office will be named the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4372.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMELIA BOYNTON ROBINSON POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4777) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1301 Alabama Avenue in Selma, Alabama as the ''Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4777

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

SECTION 1. AMELIA BOYNTON ROBINSON POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1301 Alabama Avenue in Selma, Alabama, shall be known and designated as the ''Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 4777, introduced by Representative TERRI SEWELL of Alabama. The bill designates a post office in Selma, Alabama, as the Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building.

□ 1545

Mrs. Boynton Robinson was a civil rights leader who marched on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma and fought to ensure equality for all.

I look forward to learning more about Amelia Boynton Robinson's life from my colleague and the sponsor of this bill, Representative SEWELL.

I urge Members to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 4777, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Selma, Alabama, as the Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building.

Known as the matriarch of the civil rights movement, Amelia Boynton Robinson began her activism as a child, along with her mother, on horse-and-buggy trips to pass out women's suffrage pamphlets prior to the 1910s. By 1930, Amelia was helping register southern African American voters.

In 1964, she became the first African American woman to run for Congress in Alabama. Although she lost the Democratic primary, her campaign drew increased interest to the issue of voting rights.

Having participated in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference since meeting Dr. Martin Luther King in 1954, Amelia helped organize the march from Selma to Montgomery.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to make sure that a place in history that was changed by this woman's leadership commemorates her and her tireless efforts on behalf of civil and voting rights in our country.

I urge the passage of H.R. 4777.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to rise in strong support of H.R. 4777, to designate the United States Post Office at 1301 Alabama Avenue in Selma, Alabama, as the Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building.

Mrs. Amelia Boynton Robinson was known as the matriarch of the voting rights movement. Her life and legacy epitomized strength, resiliency, perseverance, and courage, the same characteristics that embody the city of Selma, Alabama, my hometown, where she made such a significant impact.

Amelia Boynton Robinson was named the only female lieutenant to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., during the civil rights movement. In this role, she would travel alongside Dr. King and often appear in his stead for numerous events and gatherings.

Amelia Boynton Robinson was also well known for braving the frontline of the Selma march on the Edmund Pettus Bridge, where she was brutally attacked and left for dead on Bloody Sunday, on March 7, 1965. It was the picture of a bloody and beaten Amelia Boynton that appeared on the front page of The New York Times and showed the world the brutality of racism in the fight for voter equality.

During the violent attacks, this heroine never gave up hope, hope in an ideal that is all America. It is democracy. She believed so fervently that all Americans should have the right to vote, and she was willing to die for it.

It was the direct involvement of Amelia Boynton Robinson and the foot soldiers who dared to march from Selma to Montgomery that led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. She was such a valued part of this process that some of the contents of the voting rights bill were drafted at her kitchen table in Selma.

A courageous trailblazer even before Bloody Sunday, Amelia Boynton Robinson, on May 5, 1964, broke all barriers as the first Black woman in the State of Alabama to run for Congress. She ran to represent the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, the seat I am so honored to hold today. She garnered 10.7 percent of the vote during a

time when very few Blacks were registered to vote. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the journey that I now take as Alabama's first Black Congresswoman was only made possible because of the courage, tenacity, and faith of Amelia Boynton Robinson.

Last year, before Mrs. Boynton passed, I was honored to have her as my special guest at the State of the Union. It was incredibly moving to see Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle and members of the President's Cabinet line up to greet her and to take pictures with her. Everyone thanked her for her service to this country. Even President Obama came to talk and thank Mrs. Boynton before he gave his address at the State of the Union.

This picture documents that very time when she got to meet the President of the United States for the first time. The memory of that moment will stand as one of the highlights of my time here in Congress. The symbolism of this picture is not lost on any of us. It was truly because of her bravery and the bravery of other foot soldiers who dared to march, like our very own colleague, JOHN LEWIS, that paved the way for the election of this country's first Black President.

Just a few months later, on March 6, 2015, she joined hands with our own President Barack Obama again, to retrace the path that she took across the Edmund Pettus Bridge on the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, when she and our colleague, JOHN LEWIS, were beaten over 50 years ago. Amelia Boynton Robinson passed away just a few months later on August 26, 2015, at the age of 104.

She was featured prominently in the movie ''Selma'' for her tenacity and her bravery. She truly embodied what they were fighting for as foot soldiers. I was so glad that before her death she was able to cross that bridge one more time, and this time with two Presidents: President Barack Obama and President George Bush. So many of my colleagues joined us that day, and we continue to honor her legacy by supporting this legislation and naming the Selma Post Office in her honor.

As a daughter of Selma, I am honored to sponsor this legislation, and I can think of no one more deserving to have their name on a post office in Selma, Alabama, than Amelia Boynton Robinson. She truly represents the heart, spirit, and essence of Selma, Alabama, and the voting rights movement.

In closing, I am reminded of the words that Amelia Boynton Robinson said during her visit to this Capitol at the State of the Union in 2015. As Members of Congress and Cabinet members took pictures with her in the Halls of this Capitol, they said to Mrs. Robinson: ''I stand on your shoulders. I wouldn't be here if it weren't for you.''

Ms. Boynton finally, after the fifth person said that to her, ''I stand on your shoulders,'' she looked up, as only a person of 104 would, and said, ''Get off my shoulders.'' She said: ''Do your own work. There is plenty of work to be done.''

Mr. Speaker, this august body still has work to do to fully restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which was gutted by the Supreme Court in the Shelby v. Holder decision of 2013. I ask my Republican colleagues to join the 180 members of the Democratic Caucus who have sponsored the Voting Rights Advancement Act. It is this bill that will give back the enforcement arm of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and it is up to Congress to restore the Voting Rights Act.

In memory of Amelia Boynton Robinson, I urge my colleagues to not only support the naming of this post office in H.R. 4777, but they can honor the memory of her and so many of the foot soldiers' bravery by passing the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015. The right to vote is a sacred right, Mr. Speaker, and no American should be denied access to the ballot box.

Ms. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Alabama has 11½ minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for this bill. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Alabama for her good and great work on this bill.

Amelia Boynton Robinson was a daughter of Georgia who moved to Alabama to study at Tuskegee Institute. After graduating, she began working for the United States Department of Agriculture in Dallas County, Alabama, where Selma is the county seat. This is where Mrs. Boynton met her husband, Samuel Boynton. They raised their sons—Bill, Jr., and Bruce Carver—on the front lines of the fight for equality and civil rights.

I remember going to Selma, Alabama, for the first time in 1963, at the age of 23, to help African Americans gain the right to vote. Mrs. Boynton was one of the first individuals I met. She worked tirelessly. She organized. She mobilized. She spoke. She led. She was fearless.

Mrs. Boynton was one of the very first African Americans to register to vote in Dallas County. The county had an African American majority, but only about 2.1 percent of African Americans of voting age were registered to vote. People had to stand in lines. On occasion, they were asked to count the number of bubbles on a bar of soap, the number of jelly beans in a jar. Occasionally, people had to pass a so-called literacy test.

Time after time, she stood up to brutality and injustice. I remember her very well on Bloody Sunday. Mrs. Boynton was knocked down by Alabama State Troopers and trampled by horses and tear-gassed, but she never gave up. She kept her faith. She kept her eyes on the prize. Mrs. Boynton's vision, determination, and commitment helped to pave the way for the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Last year, when she passed away, at the age of 104, I mourned with the rest of the Nation. I was happy that during her long life she had an opportunity to see the impact of her work.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, it is so fitting for a post office to be named in her honor. Her work has changed not just Selma, but the entire State of Alabama, the South, our Nation, and inspired people all around our world. I hope that all of my colleagues will support this important bill.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers to bring forth today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 4777, which designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1301 Alabama Avenue in Selma, Alabama as the ''Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building.''

I support this legislation, because it commemorates Amelia Boynton Robinson's historic role during the Civil Rights Movement.

Not only was Amelia a courageous activist in Selma, Alabama during the height of the Civil Rights Movement, she also taught in Georgia before starting with the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Selma as the home demonstration agent for Dallas County.

She educated the county's largely rural population about food production and processing, nutrition, healthcare, and other subjects related to agriculture and homemaking.

We celebrate Amelia for her invaluable contributions to her community and her country.

Amelia worked for the promotion of civil rights for all and protested the continued segregation and disenfranchisement of African Americans.

Amelia registered to vote, which was extremely difficult for African Americans to accomplish in Alabama due to discriminatory practices under the state's reactionary constitution passed at the turn of the century.

Amelia Boynton Robinson made her home and office in Selma a center for strategy sessions for Selma's civil rights battles, including its voting rights campaign.

In 1964, Amelia ran for the Congress from Alabama, with the intent to encourage African Americans to register and vote.

This made Amelia the first female African American to run for office in Alabama and the first woman of any race to run for office as a candidate of the Democratic party in the state of Alabama.

Amelia is also known for her role in Selma to Montgomery marches, where she worked alongside Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Coretta Scott King, our beloved colleague Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and other monumental figures in the epochal struggle to secure the right to vote for all Americans.

Amelia helped organize a march to the state capital of Montgomery, which became known

as "Bloody Sunday" when county and state police stopped the march and beat demonstrators.

Amelia was beaten unconscious and a newspaper of her lying bloody and beaten drew national attention to the cause.

Men and women like Amelia marched because they believed that all persons have dignity and the right to equal treatment under the law, and in the making of the laws, which is the fundamental essence of the right to vote.

Bloody Sunday led to the passage of the landmark Voting Rights Act of 1965, which was signed by President Lyndon Johnson on August 6, 1965, in the presence of Amelia Boynton Robinson, with Boynton attending as the landmark event's guest of honor.

Amelia was awarded the Martin Luther King Jr. Medal of Freedom and toured the United States on behalf of the Schiller Institute until 2009.

Mr. Speaker, naming the post office in honor of Amelia Boynton Robinson is a special and deserved commemoration of her life of service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4777.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHAEL GARVER OXLEY MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4925) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 229 West Main Cross Street, in Findlay, Ohio, as the ''Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4925

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

SECTION 1. MICHAEL GARVER OXLEY MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 229 West Main Cross Street, in Findlay, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the ''Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 4925, introduced by Representative ROBERT LATTA of Ohio. The bill designates a post office in Findlay, Ohio, as the Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building.

Former Representative Oxley served in the House of Representatives from 1981 until 2007, including as chairman of the House Financial Services Committee.

□ 1600

I look forward to hearing more about former Representative Oxley from my colleague and the bill's sponsor, Representative LATTA. For now, I urge Members to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 4925, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Findlay, Ohio, as the Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building.

Mr. Oxley was elected to the Ohio State House of Representatives at the age of 28 and won a special election to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1981. Serving as the chair of the Committee on Financial Services, Congressman Oxley devoted himself to corporate oversight and insurance protection issues. He also led efforts to investigate Enron and other corporate scandals, and is perhaps most well known for the new accounting requirements and financial regulations enacted by the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.

Congressman Oxley retired after 25 years in the House and passed away in December of 2015, following a battle with lung cancer.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to honor Congressman Oxley's public service and commemorate his many congressional accomplishments.

I urge the passage of H.R. 4925.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4925, my legislation which designates the facility of the United States Postal Service at 229 West Main Cross Street in Findlay, Ohio, as the Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building.

This bipartisan legislation will honor a great legislator, friend, and former Congressman Mike Oxley for his many years of dedicated public service.

Mike received his undergraduate degree from Miami University, which he was always very proud of, and he was always very proud of the fact that is where my youngest daughter just received her undergraduate degree this past May. He received his JD from the Ohio State University Moritz College of Law, and after that, he began his career in public service as a special agent for the FBI in 1969.

After serving with the FBI for 3 years, Mike was elected to the Ohio House of Representatives in 1972. That is when I first met Mike, out on the campaign trail. Mike served admirably in the House until 1981, when he won a special election after the death of Congressman Tennyson Guyer, also of Findlay. As was noted, Mike served then from 1981 until his retirement in 2007 here in the United States House of Representatives, which he loved.

In the 107th, 108th, and 109th Congresses, Mike was elected to serve as the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, and he had many, many friends, but Mike personified what a true public servant was and is. He served his constituents from Ohio well and served the United States well.

When you talk about what a public servant is, my dad always told me that a public servant is a person who sees how much they can always give of themselves to the people they represent, and Mike did that.

Aside from his government service, Mike also served and was dedicated to helping others through his charitable works. As a team captain for the annual congressional baseball game—in one of them he got his leg broken—Mike and his colleagues helped raise thousands of dollars for the Washington Literacy Center, the Washington Nationals Dream Foundation, and the Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Washington.

Mike was also very active back home not only with Miami University, but also with the University of Findlay; and he was also active in helping raise funds for the greater Findlay area.

I would like to thank Chairman CHAFFETZ and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for their work in advancing this bill through the committee and to the House floor. I would also like to thank the entire Ohio delegation and other Members for supporting this legislation as cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to join me in honoring the memory of Mike Oxley by passing H.R. 4925.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I just wanted to take an opportunity, especially from this side of the aisle, to hear from someone who worked with Mike, who had great admiration for him, and that is myself.

When I was a young man, elected at 36 years of age back in 1998, one of the first people I met on the other side of

the aisle—not from my home State—was Mike Oxley. He had great admiration for my predecessor as well, and they were good friends, Tom Manton.

Mike was also my chairman. I served on the House Committee on Financial Services after the attacks of 9/11, and one of the great tributes I think I can give to Mike Oxley is he was, in large part, responsible for the passing of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, also known as TRIA, something that was desperately needed after the events of 9/11 to shore up the financial services industry and industry all around the country and real estate. In so many, many ways, he understood the ramifications that not having that backstop could potentially have for our country. He saw to it that a bipartisan bill was agreed to.

So I have nothing but fond memories of Mike. I was very saddened when I heard of Michael's illness. I know he is missed by his family. On a lighter note, this week we will play the annual congressional baseball game. I am sure that if my colleagues were here on the floor, Coach Doyle in particular would be pointing out that he and Mike had a good friendship.

Mike was also a good basketball player. He had a wicked 3-point shot. Maybe if the 3-point play had been in place when he was in high school, he might have been somebody, you never know.

But Mike Oxley certainly was someone and a treasure to this institution, this body. He was a real Member's Member. I think if you can leave this House and have a tribute by someone from this side in a personal way speak about you, as I am today, I think that speaks highly of Michael Oxley. He is missed. What a great thing to do to honor him by naming this post office in his honor.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make Congresswoman LAWRENCE aware that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM), my colleague, that I have no further speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4925.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KENNETH M. CHRISTY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4960) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 N Broadway in Aurora, Illinois, as the ''Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4960

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

SECTION 1. KENNETH M. CHRISTY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 N Broadway in Aurora, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the ''Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 4960, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER). The bill designates a post office in Aurora, Illinois, as the Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building.

Mr. Christy was a dedicated employee of the United States Postal Service and a devoted advocate for postal employees. I look forward to hearing more about Mr. Christy from my colleague and the sponsor of this bill, Representative FOSTER. For now, I urge Members to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 4960, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Aurora, Illinois, as the Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building.

It is only fitting that we name a post office after Ken Christy, a man who dedicated his career to the Postal Service and its workforce. Joining the Aurora Post Office in 1977, Ken worked as a letter carrier for over 30 years. Ken also served 25 years as the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers Branch 219, receiving multiple awards for his dedication, leadership, and community service.

In 2004, he joined the Illinois State Association of Letter Carriers. Ken was awarded honorary membership in numerous postal facilities outside of Aurora and was inducted into the Illinois Letter Carriers Hall of Fame in 2012.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken about my illustrious career in the United States Postal Service, one of 30 years. I started that career as a letter carrier, so it is with great honor that I stand here today strongly suggesting and saying that we should pass this bill to honor Ken Christy's life of public service and his tireless dedication to the Postal Service. I urge the passage of H.R. 4960.

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

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan, and I also thank the entire Illinois delegation on both sides of the aisle for cosponsoring this legislation.

On March 26, 2016, the State of Illinois and the city of Aurora lost a consummate public servant. On the day he died, Ken Christy was the sitting Aurora township clerk, the president of the Illinois State Association of Letter Carriers, and a dear friend of mine.

Ken was a family man, and he left behind three daughters and his wife, Bonnie, his high school sweetheart to whom he was married for 52 years. I rise today to honor Ken's legacy and his lifetime of public service.

Ken and his wife, Bonnie, settled in Aurora in 1977, when Ken took a job as a letter carrier with the United States Postal Service, a career that would last more than 30 years. Ken took on a leadership role within the Postal Service. He quickly became the Aurora NALC Branch 219 president and served in that role for 25 years.

During that time, Branch 219 was recognized for its charitable contributions and received several awards from the Muscular Dystrophy Association. Under Ken's leadership, Branch 219 was recognized nationally with an NALC Branch Service Award and its Humanitarian Award. Ken spent countless hours as a volunteer at the letter carriers' annual Stamp Out Hunger Food Drive and made deliveries for the Northern Illinois Food Bank.

In 2000, Ken was personally awarded the Dave Bybee award for leadership and dedication by the Illinois Association of Letter Carriers.

In 2004, he was recognized for his leadership skills and civic engagement by becoming its legislative liaison.

Just 3 years later, he was elected president of the Illinois State Association of Letter Carriers, a position he held until the end of his life.

□ 1615

As president of the Illinois Association of Letter Carriers, Ken made sure

that the voices of his members were heard by public officials on both sides of the aisle at both the State and Federal level.

In 2012, Ken was nominated to the Illinois Letter Carriers Hall of Fame. In 2013, Ken Christy was elected Clerk of Aurora Township.

Ken was a public servant in the truest sense of the word. Ken was always working for others, whether it was in his 30-year career delivering mail in his community, his dedication to charity work, or his devotion to his family as a husband, father, and grandfather.

So I think it is only appropriate that we honor his life and his legacy and pass this bill today to name the post office where Ken spent his entire career the Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing this man, who was a pillar of his community, by voting ''yes.''

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4960.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANSION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AVAILABILITY PAY TO EMPLOYEES OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION'S AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4902) to amend title 5, United States Code, to expand law enforcement availability pay to employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Operations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4902

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

SECTION 1. LAW ENFORCEMENT AVAILABILITY PAY FOR EMPLOYEES OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION'S AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5545a(i) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''apply to a pilot employed by the United States Customs Service'' and inserting ''apply to any employee of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Operations, or any successor organization,''; and

(2) by striking ''such pilot'' and inserting ''such employee''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after the date that is 14 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 4902.

Those who serve along our Nation's borders make countless sacrifices protecting the homeland in the most literal of ways by stopping bad guys from entering our country and harming Americans.

The Customs and Border Protection officers and agents who serve in my district, which covers over 800 miles of the Texas-Mexico border, have an increasingly challenging job. Not only do they keep us safe from terrorists and drug cartels, but they also apprehend illegal contraband and rescue victims of human trafficking.

CBP's Air and Marine Operations, or AMO, patrols our Nation's borders by aircraft and vessels, specifically. AMO is made up of over 1,200 Federal agents, 250 aircraft, and over 280 marine vessels, operating from 91 locations throughout the United States and Puerto Rico.

These brave agents are often required to work long, unpredictable hours and are compensated through various confusing and inconsistent pay systems, causing an administrative nightmare for the folks who work overtime protecting our Nation.

Because of the number of overtime systems applicable to AMO agents, in many cases, even those working side by side on a mission were often compensated differently. The confusion and inconsistency not only makes it harder for the agency to plan shifts for agents and to prepare a budget, but the uncertainty impacts those who serve.

H.R. 4902 addresses these problems by standardizing premium pay for AMO. Under the provisions of this bill, all law enforcement agents at AMO will be covered under the Law Enforcement Availability Pay, otherwise known as LEAP, the LEAP premium pay system.

To ensure pay is standardized quickly, the legislation would require this change to come into force on the first day of the pay period that begins at least 14 days after the date of enactment.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that implementing a uniform pay system for all CBP officers would result in a cost savings of approximately $2 million annually. More importantly, it would save many hard-working AMO officers from unfair and aggravating overtime pay discrepancies. This will save Customs and Border Protection valuable time and operational bandwidth, while ensuring taxpayer dollars are spent responsibly.

I include in the RECORD a letter from the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association in support of this bill.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2016.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ELIJAH CUMMINGS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ AND RANKING MEMBER CUMMINGS: On behalf of membership of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA)—the nation's largest professional, non-profit association representing 26,000 federal law enforcement officers from 65 agencies—I am writing to advise you of our continued strong support for H.R. 4902, legislation to expand Law Enforcement Availability Pay (LEAP) to the law enforcement officers of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Operations division. FLEOA greatly appreciates the Committee's efforts to expeditiously approve this important legislation, and we urge its passage by the House of Representatives this week.

Currently, within the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), law enforcement officers of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's (CBP) Air and Maritime Operation (AMO) division are compensated through multiple premium pay mechanisms for their overtime: Administratively Uncontrollable Overtime (AUO), Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), Law Enforcement Availability Pay (LEAP) and Title 5 overtime (FEPA). This proposal would harmonize premium pay across the organization by making all AMO law enforcement officers eligible for LEAP. CBP estimates that shifting overtime compensation to LEAP will help the agency save approximately $1.6 million in premium pay in the first year alone.

Prior to the creation of the DHS, all U.S. Customs Service air personnel were included in the LEAP statute. Legacy U.S. Customs Service responsibilities have been retained, but today's AMO functions encompass a broader scope of authorities. Implementing LEAP for all AMO law enforcement officers would enhance CBP operational efficiencies and monetary savings by providing an efficient, effective, and uniform system of compensation for the unique work conditions and substantial hours commonly required of AMO agents.

FLEOA appreciates your efforts to advance this legislation. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can provide any additional information or assistance.

Respectfully,

DOMINICK L. STOKES,
FLEOA Vice President for Legislative Affairs.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4902, a bipartisan bill sponsored by

some of my colleagues on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Representatives HURD, CONNOLLY, and LUJAN GRISHAM. I thank them for their good work on this important legislation.

This legislation would establish a uniform pay system for law enforcement officers of the Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Operations, who are currently paid overtime pay under three different systems; and it will make it more efficient for the agency to administer staff overtime.

The bill will convert the pay system for AMO officers to Law Enforcement Availability Pay, a system used by many other Federal agencies, including the FBI, DEA, and the U.S. Marshals Service.

As stated by my colleague, Mr. HURD, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this legislation will reduce AMO's costs by $2 million a year.

I would also like to note that the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association supports this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4902.

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

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge the immediate adoption of this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4902.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRAUD REDUCTION AND DATA ANALYTICS ACT OF 2015

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2133) to improve Federal agency financial and administrative controls and procedures to assess and mitigate fraud risks, and to improve Federal agencies' development and use of data analytics for the purpose of identifying, preventing, and responding to fraud, including improper payments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2133

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 ''Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) the term ''improper payment'' has the meaning given the term in section 2(g) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note).

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS RELATING TO FRAUD AND IMPROPER PAYMENTS.

(a) GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States, shall establish guidelines for agencies to establish financial and administrative controls to identify and assess fraud risks and design and implement control activities in order to prevent, detect, and respond to fraud, including improper payments.

(2) CONTENTS.—The guidelines described in paragraph (1) shall incorporate the leading practices identified in the report published by the Government Accountability Office on July 28, 2015, entitled ''Framework for Managing Fraud Risks in Federal Programs''.

(3) MODIFICATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States, may periodically modify the guidelines described in paragraph (1) as the Director and Comptroller General may determine necessary.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR CONTROLS.—The financial and administrative controls required to be established by agencies under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) conducting an evaluation of fraud risks and using a risk-based approach to design and implement financial and administrative control activities to mitigate identified fraud risks;

(2) collecting and analyzing data from reporting mechanisms on detected fraud to monitor fraud trends and using that data and information to continuously improve fraud prevention controls; and

(3) using the results of monitoring, evaluation, audits, and investigations to improve fraud prevention, detection, and response.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), for each of the first 3 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency shall submit to Congress, as part of the annual financial report of the agency, a report on the progress of the agency in—

(A) implementing—

(i) the financial and administrative controls required to be established under subsection (a);

(ii) the fraud risk principle in the Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government; and

(iii) Office of Management and Budget Circular A–123 with respect to the leading practices for managing fraud risk;

(B) identifying risks and vulnerabilities to fraud, including with respect to payroll, beneficiary payments, grants, large contracts, and purchase and travel cards; and

(C) establishing strategies, procedures, and other steps to curb fraud.

(2) FIRST REPORT.—If the date of enactment of this Act is less than 180 days before the date on which an agency is required to submit the annual financial report of the agency, the agency may submit the report required under paragraph (1) as part of the following annual financial report of the agency.

SEC. 4. WORKING GROUP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Office of Management and Budget shall establish a working group to improve—

(1) the sharing of financial and administrative controls established under section 3(a) and other best practices and techniques for detecting, preventing, and responding to fraud, including improper payments; and

(2) the sharing and development of data analytics techniques.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The working group established under subsection (a) shall be composed of—

(1) the Controller of the Office of Management and Budget, who shall serve as Chairperson;

(2) the Chief Financial Officer of each agency; and

(3) any other party determined to be appropriate by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, which may include the Chief Information Officer, the Chief Procurement Officer, or the Chief Operating Officer of each agency.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The working group established under subsection (a) shall consult with Offices of Inspectors General and Federal and non-Federal experts on fraud risk assessments, financial controls, and other relevant matters.

(d) MEETINGS.—The working group established under subsection (a) shall hold not fewer than 4 meetings per year.

(e) PLAN.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the working group established under subsection (a) shall submit to Congress a plan for the establishment and use of a Federal interagency library of data analytics and data sets, which can incorporate or improve upon existing Federal resources and capacities, for use by agencies and Offices of Inspectors General to facilitate the detection, prevention, and recovery of fraud, including improper payments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2133, the Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act of 2015, introduced by Senator THOMAS CARPER of Delaware.

S. 2133 is a bipartisan bill that will strengthen and enhance the antifraud prevention and detection measures used by Federal agencies. Current antifraud prevention and detection measures are reliant on after-the-fact reviews of transactions. This system is not perfect.

A significant portion of the Federal Government's $124 billion in overpayments in fiscal year 2014—$19 billion more than fiscal year 2013—were fraud-related.

The current reactive antifraud measures require agencies to spend time and resources on efforts to track and recover these fraud-related overpayments. S. 2133 will help to prevent

these fraudulent payments from being made in the first place.

The Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act of 2015 will help protect taxpayer dollars by requiring the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, and Federal agencies to adopt proactive fraud detection controls and preventative measures.

The bill will require the OMB to create a set of guidelines for antifraud measures, which agencies must utilize when establishing their proactive antifraud control and detection procedures. The bill will also require agencies to better collaborate on developing best practices for combating fraud.

S. 2133 also requires that agencies create an interagency working group in order to share best practices and crucial fraud prevention data, such as the Social Security Administration's data to prevent payments to deceased individuals.

Mr. Speaker, passing S. 2133 and requiring agencies to adopt a proactive antifraud approach will not only serve to protect taxpayer dollars, but increase public confidence in the administration of government programs, especially benefit programs.

I would like to thank Senator CARPER and Senator THOM TILLIS for introducing this good government legislation, and I would like to thank the Subcommittee on Government Operations chairman MARK MEADOWS for championing this bill in the House.

I urge Members to support this bipartisan bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act is designed to strengthen Federal agency efforts to combat financial fraud. Congress has passed a number of bills in the past few years aimed at curbing improper payments. Fraud in this area is especially harmful. It stems not from innocent mistakes, but from the willful intent to steal or misuse taxpayer dollars.

Fraud reduction strategies help reduce these crimes, and the Government Accountability Office and the inspector general have recommended that agencies implement such strategies.

The bill before us will require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to consult with GAO to develop antifraud guidance for Federal agencies and then monitor the implementation of this guidance.

The bill will also require the establishment of a working group of agency chief financial officers to share best practices and help disseminate new antifraud techniques. The working group would also be required to develop a plan for establishing an interagency library of analytical tools and datasets for agencies and IGs to use in fighting fraud.

In developing this plan, I believe the working group should look to the model of the Recovery Operations Center, which was developed to monitor spending under the Recovery Act of 2009, and which has, unfortunately, ceased operations.

These are commonsense steps toward solving a serious problem that everyone should support. I urge members to support S. 2133.

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

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. MEADOWS. I thank Chairman HURD for his leadership not only on this, but on so many important topics here in this body. He certainly is looking after transparency and oversight on behalf of the American people. I just would like to applaud his leadership there.

□ 1630

I am proud today, Mr. Speaker, to rise in support of S. 2133, the Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act of 2015. S. 2133 is a bipartisan bill that will provide agencies a critically important measure for defeating fraud and protecting taxpayer dollars.

In fiscal year 2014, the GAO reported that a significant portion of the $124 billion in improper payments were related to fraud. To make matters worse, all the improper payments increased by a total of $19 billion—that is billion with a B—from the previous fiscal year.

Given the cost of these improper payments to agencies and, as a result, to the taxpayers, something must be done to block the flow of these fraudulent and improper payments. S. 2133 will provide the necessary framework around which agencies can build a strong antifraud defense system.

Currently, agencies have been overreliant on an after-the-fact antifraud detection measure which requires the agency to review payments after they have been made and then make an attempt to recoup them. S. 2113 actually would require these agencies to develop proactive measures to identify risk, to analyze known cases of fraud, and then to develop strategies to prevent future fraud. It will also protect the American taxpayer dollars from fraud by requiring agencies to better share data that can be used to fight fraud.

This bill will create a working group of agencies where best practices and fraud detection and prevention strategies can be shared throughout the government. By combating fraud, agencies will not only protect taxpayer dollars, but also increase the trust and confidence in the administration of government programs.

I would like to thank Senator CARPER and Senator TILLIS for introducing this important, good-government legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill and help better protect the American taxpayer dollars by voting in favor of S. 2133.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2133.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEANNE AND JULES MANFORD POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2607) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7802 37th Avenue in Jackson Heights, New York, as the ''Jeanne and Jules Manford Post Office Building.''

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2607

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

SECTION 1. JEANNE AND JULES MANFORD POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7802 37th Avenue in Jackson Heights, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Jeanne and Jules Manford Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Jeanne and Jules Manford Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 2607, introduced by Representative JOSEPH CROWLEY of New York. The bill designates a post office in Jackson Heights, New York, as the Jeanne and Jules Manford Post Office Building.

Jeanne and Jules Manford were activists in the community and loving parents. I look forward to hearing more about Mr. and Mrs. Manford from my

colleague and the sponsor of this bill, Representative CROWLEY. For now, I urge Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 2607, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Jackson Heights, New York, as the Jeanne and Jules Manford Post Office Building.

Parents of gay activist Morty Manford, Jeanne and Jules Manford quickly became activists themselves, following their son's beating at a Gay Activists Alliance demonstration in 1972. Morty had been kicked and beaten, yet police did not intercede on his behalf. Jeanne wrote a letter, published in the New York Post, highlighting her outrage and drawing public attention to violence being perpetrated against the LGBT community.

A year later, in 1973, Jeanne and Jules Manford decided to organize a support group for parents of gay children. By the 1980s, their group was formally established as Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays. PFLAG is now an international group made up of over 200,000 members advocating for support, understanding, and equal rights for gay, lesbian, transgender, and bisexual individuals.

In 1993, almost a year after losing Morty to complications of AIDS, Jeanne Manford served as the grand marshal of the New York Gay Pride Parade. Following her death in 2013, Jeanne was awarded the Nation's second highest civilian award, the Presidential Citizens Medal, by President Barack Obama.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to recognize Jeanne and Jules Manford's tireless devotion to the LGBT equal rights movement and their advocacy on its behalf.

Mr. Speaker, it is also a very sad time in our history where we are witnessing, unfortunately, violence and hate being perpetrated on members of our country, the citizens and people who have identified themselves as gay or lesbian.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 2607, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my colleague from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Before I begin, I want to thank my colleague, Ranking Member LAWRENCE, for her support on the Interior Subcommittee as well as the full committee, Ranking Member CUMMINGS and Chairman CHAFFETZ of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee for working with us to bring this bill to the floor.

I am so pleased to have this chance to honor Jeanne and Jules Manford and their history of community engagement by naming the Jackson Heights Post Office, which is situated in Queens, New York, which is squarely in the middle of my congressional district.

I also want to thank Suzanne Swan, Jeanne and Jules' daughter, and PFLAG for collaborating with me on this legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, the timing of this bill, as my colleague from Michigan just said, could not be a more opportune moment. It comes in the wake of last Sunday's terrible attack on the LGBT community in Orlando, an attack that was motivated by hate.

We stand here today to honor two individuals who, when faced with a hateful act of violence themselves against their son, were inspired to start a movement couched in acceptance and support.

Jeanne and Jules Manford were your typical middle class Queens, New Yorkers, who worked hard to make a better life for themselves, their families, and for their community. Jeanne was a public schoolteacher in Flushing, Queens. Jules was a dentist. The couple worked with a number of local community groups helping to make Queens a better place to live.

And they raised two children, Suzanne and Morty, in whom they instilled the values of hard work, compassion, and public service. Morty was lucky to have two loving parents who accepted him for who he was at a time when the acceptance of LGBT people was, unfortunately, the exception rather than the rule.

While a student at Columbia and Cardozo Law School and throughout his career, Morty stood up for the rights of the LGBT community and, like his parents, sought to make life better for those around him. He was one of those many present at the Stonewall riots in Greenwich Village in 1969, and he continued to organize protests in order to draw attention to issues affecting the LGBT community.

Following one of those protests in April of 1972, Morty was severely beaten. In a trial following the beating, witnesses testified that they saw Morty thrown down an escalator and then kicked and stomped on. Thankfully, those injuries were not fatal. Morty did recover. But his parents, Jeanne and Jules, were galvanized to take their own actions to counter hate and to counter discrimination.

The following June, in the Christopher Street Liberation Day Parade, the predecessor to New York's Pride Parade, Jeanne Manford carried a now-famous sign that read: ''Parents of Gays Unite in Support for Our Children.'' The image of Jeanne and her defiance and call to action in the face of bigotry and violence became a celebrated artifact in the history of the gay rights movement.

This is an iconic photo in the gay rights movement. It shows the face of a proud mother who refuses to accept that her child should be mistreated because of who he is. More importantly, this picture, and this particular sign, document the inception of a new approach to achieving equality, an effort by parents and families to stand up for their LGBT children. In that moment, now 44 years, almost to this day, Jeanne embodied the spirit that has now come to guide a national organization known as PFLAG.

In the wake of Morty Manford's harrowing beating, Jeanne and Jules realized that, even as LGBT people continue to fight for justice and acceptance, their work can be amplified through the support of their allies. And who better to be an ally than one's own supportive family?

It was with this in mind that Jeanne and Jules founded an organization known as Parents of Gays. With their spirit of community involvement, Jeanne and Jules wanted to help others like them, friends and neighbors and colleagues, to help understand and support their LGBT children. They held their first support group meeting in 1973 in the Church of the Village, a uniquely accepting and progressive Methodist Church in Greenwich Village, and it is still active today.

At a time when attitudes toward sexual orientation were only just beginning to change, the founding of an organization designed to bring in, educate, and support those closest to the LGBT individuals, their parents, was critical in advancing acceptance and equal rights.

Over the next few years, similar organizations were started all around the country, and their representatives were finally brought together following the 1979 National March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights. A couple of years later, following important work establishing themselves as the source of information and support, various chapters decided to launch a national organization called Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, now known as PFLAG. And from there, the organization's efforts took off.

PFLAG began work on national policy issues, such as stopping the military from discharging lesbian servicemembers. And it worked to help establish hundreds of chapters in rural communities where LGBT individuals and their families had a more difficult time finding and coordinating with others like them. Today, PFLAG counts over 350 chapters and more than 200,000 members in all 50 States, and similar organizations have been established around the world.

Jeanne and Jules continued to work in their community, helping to found a PFLAG chapter in Queens, alongside the LGBT equal rights activist and my good friend, Danny Dromm, now a member of the New York City Council. Jeanne went on to become an advocate for people with HIV and AIDS, following Morty's death from the disease in 1992 at the young age of just 41.

For her many years of work in support of the LGBT community, Jeanne was honored as the first Grand Marshal of the Queens Pride Parade, which began in 1993, the year after Morty's death. The parade runs through the heart of my district in Queens and passes a reviewing stand situated directly in front of the post office we are renaming today in Jackson Heights. In fact, the street corner next to this post office was itself renamed for someone we lost to a senseless act of hate. Julio Rivera, a young man, was killed in 1990 at the age of 29, targeted because he, himself, was gay.

Jackson Heights is a thriving neighborhood with a growing LGBT community, and our community will be honored to have our local post office bear the names of Jeanne and Jules Manford. These symbols remind us of how far we have come.

After Jules Manford passed away, Jeanne, having lost her husband and son, eventually went to live with her daughter, Suzanne, in California.

□ 1645

In January of 2013, just a few months before the Supreme Court's landmark decision overturning the Defense of Marriage Act, Jeanne passed away at the age of 92. That same year, Jeanne was honored posthumously with the Presidential Citizens Medal for her efforts.

It is difficult to imagine how we could have achieved so much progress toward attaining more equal rights for LGBT Americans without the work of Jeanne and Jules Manford more than 40 years ago.

Though the LGBT community itself had already begun to organize and demand action, it was the Manfords' work to bring families and allies into the fold that helped push these issues to the fore.

Many attribute the shift in public opinion on the issue of marriage equality to the simple fact that gay and lesbian people are able to be more open about who they are. As a result, more and more straight Americans know someone who is gay or lesbian or bisexual or transgender and want their friends and family to be treated equally.

This is thanks, in no small part, to the supportive work of the PFLAG and its chapters throughout the years, and to the movement by parents and families who proudly choose to love their children for who they are. So as we celebrate Pride Month, I am glad we have this opportunity to reflect upon and honor those who helped get us to where we are today.

As we mourn in the wake of the tragic shooting at the Pulse LGBT nightclub in Orlando last week, I hope we all can emulate the way Jeanne and Jules Manford responded to their son's beating. The Manfords recognized that violent acts of hate don't show strength. Far from it. They show weakness in the soul of the offender.

Instead of recoiling in fear, the Manfords reacted with a sign of love, support, and solidarity. I have been heartened to see millions of Americans do the same over this past week. It has shown our strength as a society and as a nation in spite of an attack meant to shake us.

So I am particularly glad that we are able to consider this legislation today to honor Jeanne and Jules Manford for all they have done for Queens, for New York, and for America, and I look forward to seeing this become law.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of you who are responsible for bringing this bill to the floor today for its consideration. I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, as we close out the naming of our post offices, I want to take this time to just awaken this body and America on how the naming of post offices take the legacy of American citizens and allow us to celebrate them, remember them, and to create a sense of history in the communities where they live and serve.

Just to sum up the post offices that we have named today: Mary E. McCoy, an activist for women and African Americans; Ed Pastor, who was a Congressman; Barry Miller, an emergency responder; Amelia Robinson, a civil rights activist; Michael Oxley, a Member of Congress; Kenneth Christy, a letter carrier; and Jeanne and Jules Manford, LGBT activists.

Again, today, we have shown America that we recognize the service of those who on their own desire, will, and passion have served our country.

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

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2607.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSPECTOR GENERAL EMPOWERMENT ACT OF 2016

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2395) to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2395

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2016''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. FULL AND PROMPT ACCESS TO ALL DOCUMENTS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 6 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a)(1) to read as follows:

''(1)(A) notwithstanding any other provision of law, except any provision of law enacted by Congress that expressly refers to an Inspector General and expressly limits the right of access by that Inspector General, to have timely access to all records, reports, audits, reviews, documents, papers, recommendations, or other materials available to the applicable establishment which relate to programs and operations with respect to which that Inspector General has responsibilities under this Act; and

''(B) except as provided in subsection (i), with regard to Federal grand jury materials protected from disclosure pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e), to have timely access to such information if the Attorney General grants the request in accordance with subsection (g);''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(g) REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO REQUEST FOR FEDERAL GRAND JURY MATERIALS.—

''(1) TRANSMISSION OF REQUEST TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—If the Inspector General of an establishment submits a request to the head of the establishment for Federal grand jury materials pursuant to subsection (a)(1), the head of the establishment shall immediately notify the Attorney General of such request.

''(2) ATTORNEY GENERAL DETERMINATION.—Not later than 15 days after the date on which a request is submitted to the Attorney General under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall determine whether to grant or deny the request for Federal grand jury materials and shall immediately notify the head of the establishment of such determination. The Attorney General shall grant the request unless the Attorney General determines that granting access to the Federal grand jury materials would be likely to—

''(A) interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution;

''(B) interfere with an undercover operation;

''(C) result in disclosure of the identity of a confidential source, including a protected witness;

''(D) pose a serious threat to national security; or

''(E) result in significant impairment of the trade or economic interests of the United States.

''(3) TRANSMITTAL OF DETERMINATION TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

''(A) NOTIFICATION OF ATTORNEY GENERAL DETERMINATION.—The head of the establishment shall inform the Inspector General of the establishment of the determination made by the Attorney General with respect to the request for Federal grand jury materials.

''(B) COMMENTS BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the establishment described under subparagraph (A) may submit comments on the determination submitted pursuant to such subparagraph to the committees listed under paragraph (4) that the Inspector General considers appropriate.

''(4) SUBMISSION OF DENIALS TO CONGRESS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after notifying the head of an establishment of a denial pursuant to paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall submit a statement that the request for Federal grand jury materials by the Inspector General was denied and the reason for the denial to each of the following:

''(A) The Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Judiciary of the Senate.

''(B) The Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

''(C) Other appropriate committees and subcommittees of Congress.

''(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as authorizing an Inspector General to publicly disclose information otherwise prohibited from disclosure by law.

''(i) EXCEPTION.—Subsections (a)(1)(B) and (g) shall not apply to requests from the Inspector General of the Department of Justice.''.

(b) SPECIAL PROVISIONS CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—Section 8E(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and insert ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

''(6) shall have access under section 6(a)(1)(A) to information available to the Department of Justice under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e).''.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY PROVISIONS FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL.

(a) SUBPOENA AUTHORITY FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL TO REQUIRE TESTIMONY OF CERTAIN PERSONS.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting after section 6 the following new section:

''SEC. 6A. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.

''(a) TESTIMONIAL SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.—In addition to the authority otherwise provided by this Act and in accordance with the requirements of this section, each Inspector General, in carrying out the provisions of this Act (or in the case of an Inspector General or Special Inspector General not established under this Act, the provisions of the authorizing statute), is authorized to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses as necessary in the performance of the functions assigned to the Inspector General by this Act (or in the case of an Inspector General or Special Inspector General not established under this Act, the functions assigned by the authorizing statute), in the case of contumacy or refusal to obey, shall be enforceable by order of any appropriate United States district court. An Inspector General may not require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of any current Federal employees, but may use other authorized procedures.

''(b) NONDELEGATION.—The authority to issue a subpoena under subsection (a) may not be delegated.

''(c) PANEL REVIEW BEFORE ISSUANCE.—

''(1) APPROVAL REQUIRED.—

''(A) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL BY SUBPOENA PANEL.—Before the issuance of a subpoena described in subsection (a), an Inspector General shall submit a request for approval to issue a subpoena to a panel (in this section, referred to as the 'Subpoena Panel'), which shall be comprised of three Inspectors General of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, who shall be designated by the Inspector General serving as Chairperson of the Council.

''(B) PROTECTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—The information contained in the request submitted by an Inspector General under subparagraph (A) and the identification of a witness shall be protected from disclosure to the extent permitted by law. Any request for disclosure of such information shall be submitted to the Inspector General requesting the subpoena.

''(2) TIME TO RESPOND.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Subpoena Panel shall approve or deny a request for approval to issue a subpoena not later than 10 days after the submission of such request.

''(B) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR PANEL.—If the Subpoena Panel determines that additional information is necessary to approve or deny such request, the Subpoena Panel shall request such information and shall approve or deny such request not later than 20 days after the submission of such request.

''(3) DENIAL BY PANEL.—If a majority of the Subpoena Panel denies the approval of a subpoena, that subpoena may not be issued.

''(d) NOTICE TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Subpoena Panel approves a subpoena under subsection (c), the Inspector General shall notify the Attorney General that the Inspector General intends to issue the subpoena.

''(2) DENIAL FOR INTERFERENCE WITH AN ONGOING INVESTIGATION.—Not later than 10 days after the date on which the Attorney General is notified pursuant to paragraph (1), the Attorney General may object to the issuance of the subpoena because the subpoena will interfere with an ongoing investigation and the subpoena may not be issued.

''(3) ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA APPROVED.—If the Attorney General does not object to the issuance of the subpoena during the ten-day period described in paragraph (2), the Inspector General may issue the subpoena.

''(e) REGULATIONS.—The Chairperson of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this section.

''(f) INSPECTOR GENERAL DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'Inspector General' includes each Inspector General established under this Act and each Inspector General or Special Inspector General not established under this Act.

''(g) APPLICABILITY.—The provisions of this section shall not affect the exercise of authority by an Inspector General of testimonial subpoena authority established under another provision of law.'';

(2) in section 5(a)—

(A) in paragraph (15), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (16), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

''(17) a description of the use of subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of certain witnesses authorized under section 6A.''; and

(3) in section 8G(g)(1), by inserting ''6A,'' before ''and 7''.

(b) MATCHING PROGRAM AND PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT EXCEPTION FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL.—Section 6 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 2(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j)(1) In this subsection, the terms 'agency', 'matching program', 'record', and 'system of records' have the meanings given those terms in section 552a(a) of title 5, United States Code.

''(2) For purposes of section 552a of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law, a computerized comparison of 2 or more automated Federal systems of records, or a computerized comparison of a Federal system of records with other records or non-Federal records, performed by an Inspector General or by an agency in coordination with an Inspector General in conducting an audit, investigation, inspection, evaluation, or other review authorized under this Act shall not be considered a matching program.

''(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impede the exercise by an Inspector General of any matching program authority established under any other provision of law.

''(h) Subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to the collection of information during the conduct of an audit, investigation, inspection, evaluation, or other review conducted by the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency or any Office of Inspector General, including any Office of Special Inspector General.''.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COUNCIL OF THE INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY.

(a) FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF COUNCIL.—Section 11(c)(1) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (H) as subparagraph (I); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following new subparagraph:

''(H) except for any investigation, inspection, audit, or review conducted under section 103H of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033), receive, review, and mediate any disputes submitted in writing to the Council by an Office of Inspector General regarding an audit, investigation, inspection, evaluation, or project that involves the jurisdiction of more than one Federal agency or entity; and''.

(b) INTEGRITY COMMITTEE.—Section 11(d) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by inserting at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) not later than 60 days after the date on which an allegation of wrongdoing is received by the Integrity Committee, make a determination whether the Integrity Committee will initiate an investigation of such allegation under this subsection.'';

(2) in paragraph (6)(B)(i), by striking ''may provide resources'' and inserting ''shall provide assistance''; and

(3) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(i)—

(i) in subclause (III), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in subclause (IV), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by inserting at the end the following new subclauses:

''(V) creating a regular rotation of Inspectors General assigned to investigate complaints through the Integrity Committee; and

''(VI) creating procedures to avoid conflicts of interest for Integrity Committee investigations.'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (E); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraphs:

''(C) COMPLETION OF INVESTIGATION.—If a determination is made under paragraph (5) to initiate an investigation, the Integrity Committee—

''(i) shall complete the investigation not later than six months after the date on which the Integrity Committee made such determination;

''(ii) if the investigation cannot be completed within such six-month period, shall—

''(I) promptly notify the congressional committees listed in paragraph (8)(A)(iii); and

''(II) to the maximum extent practicable, complete the investigation not later than 3 months after the expiration of the six-month period; and

''(iii) if the investigation cannot be completed within such nine-month period, shall brief the congressional committees listed in paragraph (8)(A)(iii) every thirty days until the investigation is complete.

''(D) CONCURRENT INVESTIGATION.—If an investigation of an allegation of wrongdoing against an Inspector General or a staff member of an Office of Inspector General described under paragraph (4)(C) is initiated by a governmental entity other than the Integrity Committee, the Integrity Committee may conduct any related investigation for which a determination to initiate an investigation was made under paragraph (5) concurrently with the other government entity.''.

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTION; DESIGNEE AUTHORITY.—Section 11 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(B) by striking ''Office of the Director of National Intelligence'' and inserting ''Intelligence Community''; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''or the designee of the Special Counsel'' before the period at the end; and

(B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting ''or the designee of the Director'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 5. AMENDMENTS TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978 AND THE INSPECTOR GENERAL REFORM ACT OF 2008.

(a) INCORPORATION OF PROVISIONS FROM THE INSPECTOR GENERAL REFORM ACT OF 2008 INTO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 11(d) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(12) ALLEGATIONS OF WRONGDOING AGAINST SPECIAL COUNSEL OR DEPUTY SPECIAL COUNSEL.—

''(A) SPECIAL COUNSEL DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'Special Counsel' means the Special Counsel appointed under section 1211(b) of title 5, United States Code.

''(B) AUTHORITY OF INTEGRITY COMMITTEE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An allegation of wrongdoing against the Special Counsel or the Deputy Special Counsel may be received, reviewed, and referred for investigation by the Integrity Committee to the same extent and in the same manner as in the case of an allegation against an Inspector General (or a member of the staff of an Office of Inspector General), subject to the requirement that the Special Counsel recuse himself or herself from the consideration of any allegation brought under this paragraph.

''(ii) COORDINATION WITH EXISTING PROVISIONS OF LAW.—This paragraph does not eliminate access to the Merit Systems Protection Board for review under section 7701 of title 5, United States Code. To the extent that an allegation brought under this subsection involves section 2302(b)(8) of that title, a failure to obtain corrective action within 120 days after the date on which that allegation is received by the Integrity Committee shall, for purposes of section 1221 of such title, be considered to satisfy section 1214(a)(3)(B) of that title.

''(C) REGULATIONS.—The Integrity Committee may prescribe any rules or regulations necessary to carry out this paragraph, subject to such consultation or other requirements as might otherwise apply.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7(b) of the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–409; 122 Stat. 4312; 5 U.S.C. 1211 note) is repealed.

(b) AGENCY APPLICABILITY.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 3(a), is further amended—

(A) in section 8M—

(i) in subsection (a)(1)—

(I) by striking ''agency'' the first place it appears and inserting ''Federal agency and designated Federal entity''; and

(II) by striking ''agency'' the second and third place it appears and inserting ''Federal agency or designated Federal entity''; and

(ii) in subsection (b)—

(I) in paragraph (1), by striking ''agency'' and inserting ''Federal agency and designated Federal entity''; and

(II) in paragraph (2)—

(aa) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''agency'' and inserting ''Federal agency and designated Federal entity''; and

(bb) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''agency'' and inserting ''Federal agency and designated Federal entity''; and

(B) in section 11(c)(3)(A)(ii), by striking ''department, agency, or entity of the executive branch'' and inserting ''Federal agency or designated Federal entity''.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head and the Inspector General of each Federal agency and each designated Federal entity (as such terms are defined in sections 12 and 8G of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), respectively) shall implement the amendments made by this subsection.

(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL WEBSITES.—Section 8M(b)(1) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''report or audit (or portion of any report or audit)'' and inserting ''audit report, inspection report, or evaluation report (or portion of any such report)''; and

(2) by striking ''report or audit (or portion of that report or audit)'' and inserting ''report (or portion of that report)'', each place it appears.

(d) CORRECTIONS.—

(1) EXECUTIVE ORDER NUMBER.—Section 7(c)(2) of the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–409; 122 Stat. 4313; 31 U.S.C. 501 note) is amended by striking ''12933'' and inserting ''12993''.

(2) PUNCTUATION AND CROSS-REFERENCES.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 3(a) and subsection (b), is further amended—

(A) in section 4(b)(2)—

(i) by striking ''8F(a)(2)'' and inserting ''8G(a)(2)'', each place it appears; and

(ii) by striking ''8F(a)(1)'' and inserting ''8G(a)(1)'';

(B) in section 6(a)(4), by striking ''information, as well as any tangible thing)'' and inserting ''information), as well as any tangible thing'';

(C) in section 8G(g)(3), by striking ''8C'' and inserting ''8D''; and

(D) in section 5(a)(13), by striking ''05(b)'' and inserting ''804(b)''.

(3) SPELLING.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 3(a), subsection (b), and paragraph (2), is further amended—

(A) in section 3(a), by striking ''subpena'' and inserting ''subpoena'';

(B) in section 6(a)(4), by striking ''subpena'' and ''subpenas'' and inserting ''subpoena'' and ''subpoenas'', respectively;

(C) in section 8D(a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subpenas'' and inserting ''subpoenas''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''subpena'' and inserting ''subpoena'', each place it appears;

(D) in section 8E(a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subpenas'' and inserting ''subpoenas''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''subpena'' and inserting ''subpoena'', each place it appears; and

(E) in section 8G(d), by striking ''subpena'' and inserting ''subpoena''.

(e) REPEAL.—Section 744 of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2009 (division D of Public Law 111–8; 123 Stat. 693) is repealed.

SEC. 6. REPORTS REQUIRED.

(a) REPORT ON VACANCIES IN THE OFFICES OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

(1) GAO STUDY REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study of prolonged vacancies in the Offices of Inspector General, during which a temporary appointee has served as the head of the office that includes—

(A) the number and duration of Inspector General vacancies;

(B) an examination of the extent to which the number and duration of such vacancies has changed over time;

(C) an evaluation of the impact such vacancies have had on the ability of the relevant Office of the Inspector General to effectively carry out statutory requirements; and

(D) recommendations to minimize the duration of such vacancies.

(2) COMMITTEE BRIEFING REQUIRED.—Not later than nine months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall present a briefing on the findings of the study described in subsection (a) to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than fifteen months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report on the findings of the study described in subsection (a) to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(b) REPORT ON ISSUES INVOLVING MULTIPLE OFFICES OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

(1) EXAMINATION REQUIRED.—The Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency shall conduct an analysis of critical issues that involve the jurisdiction of more than one individual Federal agency or entity to identify—

(A) each such issue that could be better addressed through greater coordination among, and cooperation between, individual Offices of Inspector General;

(B) the best practices that can be employed by the Offices of Inspector General to increase coordination and cooperation on each issue identified; and

(C) any recommended statutory changes that would facilitate coordination and cooperation among Offices of Inspector General on critical issues.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency shall submit

a report on the findings of the analysis described in subsection (a) to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 7. PUBLIC RELEASE OF MISCONDUCT REPORT.

(a) PUBLIC RELEASE BY INSPECTORS GENERAL OF REPORT OF MISCONDUCT.—Section 4(a) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) to make publicly available a final report on any administrative investigation that confirms misconduct, including any violation of Federal law and any significant violation of Federal agency policy, by any senior Government employee (as such term is defined under section 5(f)), not later than 60 days after issuance of the final report, ensuring that information protected under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act'), section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Privacy Act of 1974'), and section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is not disclosed.''.

(b) REPORTS OF MISCONDUCT IN SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.—Section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 2(a)(2), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (16), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (17), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by inserting at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(18) statistical tables showing—

''(A) the total number of investigative reports issued during that reporting period;

''(B) the total number of persons referred to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution during that reporting period;

''(C) the total number of persons referred to State and local prosecutive authorities for criminal prosecution during that reporting period; and

''(D) the total number of indictments and criminal informations during that reporting period that have resulted from any prior referral to prosecutive authorities;

''(19) a description of the metrics used for developing the data for the statistical tables under paragraph (18);

''(20) detailed descriptions of each investigation conducted by the Office involving a senior Government employee where allegations of misconduct were substantiated, including a detailed description of—

''(A) the facts and circumstances of the investigation; and

''(B) the status and disposition of the matter, including—

''(i) if the matter was referred to the Department of Justice, the date of the referral; and

''(ii) if the Department of Justice declined the referral, the date of the declination; and

''(21) a list and summary of the particular circumstances of each—

''(A) inspection, evaluation, and audit conducted by the Office that is closed and was not disclosed to the public; and

''(B) investigation conducted by the Office that is closed and was not disclosed to the public involving a senior Government employee.''; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) the term 'senior Government employee' means—

''(A) an officer or employee in the executive branch (including a special Government employee as defined in section 202 of title 18, United States Code) who occupies a position classified at or above GS–15 of the General Schedule or, in the case of positions not under the General Schedule, for which the rate of basic pay is equal to or greater than 120 percent of the minimum rate of basic pay payable for GS–15 of the General Schedule; and

''(B) any commissioned officer in the Armed Forces in pay grades O–6 and above.''.

SEC. 8. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 2395, the Inspector General Empowerment Act.

Indeed, the inspectors general play a key role in improving our government's efficiency. They conduct investigations and audits to prevent and detect waste, fraud, and mismanagement in their agencies' programs. The IGs help Congress to shape legislation and to target our oversight and investigative activities.

The IGs have proven to be one of Congress' best investments. In the last fiscal year, the IG community used their $2.6 billion budget to identify potential cost savings to the taxpayers, totaling $46.5 billion. That means that for every dollar in the total IG's budget, they identified approximately $18 in savings.

In light of this return on investment, we want the IGs to have every access to the records that they need to do their jobs. But that hasn't always been the case, Mr. Speaker. For example, at the Justice Department, the inspector general could not access grand jury documents or national security-related documents without the approval of the Deputy Attorney General or the Federal courts.

At the EPA, several offices, including the EPA's Office of Homeland Security, intentionally interfered with the IG's investigations. At the Chemical Safety Board—which the EPA OIG also oversees—the IG was denied access to certain documents based on a phony attorney-client privilege claim. And the Peace Corps refused to provide its inspector general access to information related to sexual assaults on the Peace Corps volunteers absent a memorandum of understanding.

In all of these instances, the agencies had clear guidance from section 6(a) of the IG Act to provide the IG with access to all records, but that guidance, indeed, was ignored.

The IG Empowerment Act makes clear that section 6(a) means exactly what it says: Every inspector general shall have access to all records, reports, audits, reviews, documents, papers, recommendations, or other materials.

When agencies refuse or limit IGs' access to agency records, it undermines the intent of Congress and frustrates our mutual interest in government transparency and efficiency. Furthermore, the negotiations between agencies and their IGs are wasteful. Both sides commit time and resources—which sometimes include hiring outside lawyers—so that those resources could be better used elsewhere.

These are some of the problems that we are trying to address with the Inspector General Empowerment Act. The bill we are considering today will make the IGs even more effective by allowing them to follow the facts where they lead. For years, the IGs have asked us to extend to them the authority to issue subpoenas to get answers from government contractors and former Federal employees.

Independent sources, including the DOJ's National Procurement Task Force and the Project on Government Oversight, have also urged Congress to expand the testimonial subpoena authority.

This bill provides the expanded authority that the IGs have asked for, but with safeguards in place to make sure that they protect against the possibility that an IG's investigation would interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation, or do other harm.

This bill represents several years of bipartisan work, and it reflects input from stakeholders. I would urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2395, the Inspector General Empowerment Act. This bill, introduced by Oversight and Government Reform Committee Chairman JASON CHAFFETZ and Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS, was approved by the committee with strong bipartisan support.

There is a reason why this bill has so much support: it strengthens the inspectors general, who are the first line

of defense against waste, fraud, and abuse in Federal programs. In fiscal year 2014 alone, IGs made recommendations to improve the economy and efficiency of Federal programs that could save $46.5 billion. As my colleague, Mr. MEADOWS, stated, this is a return of about $18 for every $1 invested in IG budgets.

The bill would make a number of improvements to the Inspector General Act. It will guarantee IG access to agency information. Unfettered access to agency information is a cornerstone of the IG's ability to conduct their missions effectively. The bill would also grant IGs the authority to issue subpoenas to compel testimony after careful review and with the concurrence of the Department of Justice. IGs would also be granted expedited authority to match Federal records across agencies under this bill, which would facilitate audits and help identify fraud and waste in Federal programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the Inspector General Empowerment Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank Chairman CHAFFETZ for his vision and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for working in a bipartisan way to not only empower our IGs, but give them the tools necessary to do what they do best; that is, to work on behalf of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to let Congresswoman LAWRENCE know that I have no further speakers at this point and am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I, again, give my support to this bill. I want to note that this is bipartisan. So often we have many disagreements on either side of the aisle about policy. It is a good day in Congress when we work together in a bipartisan way to empower our Federal agencies while saving money and creating efficiencies.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), my good friend. She well notes that not only is this a bipartisan bill, but it is one that is widely supported. I would also like to thank our respective staffs for the hard work that they have put in on crafting this particular piece of legislation. I think it becomes a powerful tool.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Inspector General Empowerment Act.

Inspectors General play a crucial role in making the federal government more effective and efficient. The bill we are considering today will help the IGs do their jobs even better. I appreciate the time and effort that Oversight Committee Chairman JASON CHAFFETZ and his staff put into making this bill a truly bipartisan product. I also want to thank Representative MARK MEADOWS for his work on this bill.

This bill would make crystal clear that Inspectors General have the right to access any information available to the agency the IG oversees. An agency could not deny an IG access to information unless Congress expressly limits the rights of an IG to access the information in a statute.

The bill includes special provisions for grand jury information held by the Department of Justice. Under the bill, the IG for DOJ would have unfettered access to grand jury information, but the Attorney General could limit access to grand jury information for other agency IGs under certain exceptions. This language was painstakingly worked out with feedback from DOJ and the Inspectors General.

The Inspector General Empowerment Act would also give Inspectors General the ability to subpoena witnesses. This would be a significant new authority.

I believe most IGs would act responsibly and use this authority only when absolutely necessary. There is a potential for abuse, however, so the bill includes several safeguards. The bill would require an IG, before issuing a subpoena, to go through two reviews.

The first review would be conducted by the Council of Inspectors General for Integrity and Efficiency. A panel of three Inspectors General would approve or deny any request by an IG to issue a subpoena for witness testimony. The second review would be conducted by the Attorney General, who would have the opportunity to object if the subpoena would interfere with an ongoing investigation. I believe the bill strikes a careful balance in granting IGs the authority to interview witnesses outside of the government while also providing these important checks against potential abuse.

The Inspector General Empowerment Act would also make needed reforms to the process used for investigating allegations of wrongdoing by Inspectors General. The current process can be agonizingly slow. The bill also contains several other reforms aimed at helping IGs perform independent audits and investigations.

This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2395, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEMALE VETERAN SUICIDE PREVENTION ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2487) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to identify mental health care and suicide prevention programs and metrics that are effective in treating women veterans as part of the evaluation of such programs by the Secretary, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2487

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 ''Female Veteran Suicide Prevention Act''.

SEC. 2. SPECIFIC CONSIDERATION OF WOMEN VETERANS IN EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MENTAL HEALTH CARE AND SUICIDE PREVENTION PROGRAMS.

Section 1709B(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', including metrics applicable specifically to women'';

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(F) identify the mental health care and suicide prevention programs conducted by the Secretary that are most effective for women veterans and such programs with the highest satisfaction rates among women veterans.''.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1700

FISCAL YEAR 2016 DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS SEISMIC SAFETY AND CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4590) to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain major medical facility projects for which appropriations are being made for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4590

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 ''Fiscal Year 2016 Department of Veterans Affairs Seismic Safety and Construction Authorization Act''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the following major medical facility projects, with each project to be carried out in an amount not to exceed the amount specified for that project:

(1) Seismic corrections to buildings, including retrofitting and replacement of high-risk buildings, in San Francisco, California, in an amount not to exceed $175,880,000.

(2) Seismic corrections to facilities, including facilities to support homeless veterans,

at the medical center in West Los Angeles, California, in an amount not to exceed $100,250,000.

(3) Seismic corrections to the mental health and community living center in Long Beach, California, in an amount not to exceed $282,100,000.

(4) Construction of an outpatient clinic, administrative space, cemetery, and columbarium in Alameda, California, in an amount not to exceed $83,782,000.

(5) Realignment of medical facilities in Livermore, California, in an amount not to exceed $188,650,000.

(6) Construction of a replacement community living center in Perry Point, Maryland, in an amount not to exceed $92,700,000.

(7) Seismic corrections and other renovations to several buildings and construction of a specialty care building in American Lake, Washington, in an amount not to exceed $13,830,000.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2016 or the year in which funds are appropriated for the Construction, Major Projects, account, $937,192,000 for the projects authorized in subsection (a).

(c) LIMITATION.—The projects authorized in subsection (a) may only be carried out using—

(1) funds appropriated for fiscal year 2016 pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (b);

(2) funds available for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2016 that remain available for obligation;

(3) funds available for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2016 that remain available for obligation;

(4) funds appropriated for Construction, Major Projects, for fiscal year 2016 for a category of activity not specific to a project;

(5) funds appropriated for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2016 for a category of activity not specific to a project; and

(6) funds appropriated for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2016 for a category of activity not specific to a project.

SEC. 3. SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, for each project authorized in section 2(a), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate the following information:

(1) A line item accounting of expenditures relating to construction management carried out by the Department of Veterans Affairs for such project.

(2) The future amounts that are budgeted to be obligated for construction management carried out by the Department for such project.

(3) A justification for the expenditures described in paragraph (1) and the future amounts described in paragraph (2).

(4) Any agreement entered into by the Secretary regarding the Army Corps of Engineers providing services relating to such project, including reimbursement agreements and the costs to the Department of Veterans Affairs for such services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4590, as amended, the Fiscal Year 2016 Department of Veterans Affairs Seismic Safety and Construction Authorization Act.

This bill, which I have sponsored, would authorize seven major medical facility projects in San Francisco, California; West Los Angeles, California; Long Beach, California; Alameda, California; Livermore, California; Perry Point, Maryland; and American Lake, Washington.

These projects will correct seismic safety issues in high-risk VA medical facilities, provide housing and support services for homeless veterans, increase the availability of outpatient care, and replace outdated buildings with modern ones that are better suited to providing the high-quality care that our veterans deserve. Each of these projects was requested in the President's budget submission for fiscal year 2016, and funds have already been appropriated for them.

Many in this Chamber are well aware of the debacle that characterized VA's management of the Denver replacement hospital facility construction project. Cost overruns and extensive delays had become the status quo for mostly all VA major construction projects. In the case of Denver, the price tag more than doubled from the initial estimate. As a result of that, for all projects costing over $100 million going forward, we now call them ''super construction'' projects. A non-VA entity will assume project management responsibilities.

Of the seven projects to be authorized in this bill, six of them meet the super construction criteria. The Army Corps of Engineers will be managing those six projects. In light of that, I have reduced the total authorization for these projects slightly, since VA should no longer require funds that have been built into the projects for VA construction management.

With little transparency into what is actually required for VA to manage these projects supposedly in support of the Army Corps of Engineers, I hesitate to authorize any additional management funding without a full accounting of what is essential to completely execute these projects. This bill would require that VA would provide a full accounting of management expenditures for these projects, going forward.

Mr. Speaker, before we conclude debate on the VA construction bill, I feel obliged to discuss the absence of one particular project—the new replacement medical facility in Louisville, Kentucky.

First, the proposed construction project in Louisville has been criticized by local stakeholders who have expressed concerns regarding the parcel of land that VA has proposed constructing this new facility on. Those concerns were validated by the committee following an on-site investigation last year, and, as a result, VA has initiated an environmental impact study that is ongoing today. The EIS will take a year or more to complete and could very well result in a determination that VA pursue a different approach to ensuring that Louisville area veterans are provided the high-quality care they earned and deserve.

Given that, I believe it would be untimely and inappropriate for Congress to authorize this project before the EIS is complete. That conclusion is shared by VA construction officials, who stated themselves, in a briefing with committee staff earlier this year, that it would be premature to authorize the Louisville project at this time since the EIS is in progress and the way ahead for the project is uncertain.

Finally, VA has a disastrous history of building VA hospitals on time and on budget. The Denver construction project is $1 billion—$1 billion—over budget.

After opening the new Orlando hospital years late and hundreds of millions over budget, VA quietly settled with the Orlando hospital contractor for an additional $213 million over the budget. And the New Orleans hospital is $100 million over budget right now. In light of this track record, the strictest of scrutiny needs to be applied to major hospital projects going forward, and that must begin with Louisville.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4590, the Fiscal Year 2016 Department of Veterans Affairs Seismic Safety and Construction Authorization Act.

The major duty of this committee is to make sure that our veterans have access to the best care they can receive, and authorizing construction or ensuring that existing facilities are structurally sound is very important.

All the facilities included in this bill—San Francisco, Los Angeles, Long Beach, Alameda, Livermore in California; Perry Point, Maryland; and American Lake, Washington—are all in need of major renovations to make them safe.

I am glad we are passing this bill today, and I look forward to breaking ground on these projects sooner rather

than later. I urge all Members to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 4590, a bill to authorize funding for numerous Department of Veterans Affairs construction projects throughout the Nation.

Funding for many of these projects was already appropriated in fiscal year 2016 but needs authorization, and this is what the bill does.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member BROWN for their work and commitment to our Nation's veterans and for bringing this bill to the floor.

The VA is currently challenged by a growing backlog in construction projects and old infrastructure. The VA manages over 6,000 buildings and nearly 34,000 acres of land. Additionally, more than 4,000 critical infrastructure gaps remain, which are estimated to cost between $56 billion and $68 billion to close. A growing backlog in construction projects and infrastructure is leading veterans to have to wait too long to receive the care they need and deserve.

This list of construction projects is also one of the reasons I have introduced H.R. 4129, the Jumpstart VA Construction Act. This bill provides for public-private partnerships at the VA to expedite construction opportunities at the VA. H.R. 4129 will help maximize partnerships between Federal and non-Federal entities and ensure that we avoid the systemic problems that have plagued the VA in the past, projects like Denver and Orlando.

Meanwhile, H.R. 4590 also includes funding for the Livermore realignment project, as was mentioned by the chairman and ranking member. This is a project that is very important to the veterans of the Central Valley of California, including my district.

This funding would provide for the construction of a 158,000-square-foot community-based outpatient clinic in French Camp, California. While vets have been waiting for years, I fought for this project for at least 8 years. The French Camp community-based outpatient clinic will serve 87,000 veterans across a wide geographic area that includes San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Calaveras, Tuolumne, and Alameda Counties, among others. California's Central Valley veterans confront many obstacles accessing the care they need from the VA.

I want to tell you a little story. In Stockton, California, it is about a 3-hour commute to the nearest VA center, which is in Palo Alto. The commute takes long because it is a distance and because there is tremendous traffic. I took the ride along with one of our veterans a couple of years ago, and it took all day to go in for a half-hour appointment.

Now, not every elderly gentleman can sit in a car for 3 hours one way and then 3 hours back. This is a real hardship. Not only can they not sit in a car for that long, but they may not even have that kind of transportation. So this is very important. I am sure that all of these projects have that kind of a story.

We need more facilities. We need this authorization. Congress approved the Central Valley community-based outpatient clinic and community center in 2004 as part of the VA's Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services initiatives. In 2010, Congress appropriated $55 million for land acquisition and to fund construction and planning. The project is ready to begin construction, and our Central Valley veterans are eager to see progress on a project that was promised to them in 2004.

The French Camp outpatient clinic would offer an array of services: primary care, mental health care, radiology, audiology, physical and occupational therapy, dental, and other specialty services throughout the telehealth system.

Veterans have sacrificed so much to protect our freedom and democracy. They deserve access to state-of-the-art healthcare facilities closer to home. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4590.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4590.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MILLER, Ms. BROWN, and Mr. MCNERNEY for their work on this bill.

I encourage all Members to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4590, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABIE ABRAHAM VA CLINIC

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5317) to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs health care center in Center Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the ''Abie Abraham VA Clinic'', as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5317

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Abie Abraham of Lyndora, Pennsylvania, was stationed during World War II with the 18th Infantry in New York; three years with the 14th Infantry in Panama; 15th Infantry, unassigned in China, while the U.S.S. Panay was sunk; 30th Infantry, Presidio, San Francisco; and the 31st Infantry, Manila, Philippines, for nine years.

(2) During World War II, Abraham fought, was captured, endured the Bataan Death March and as a prisoner of war for three and a half years, was beaten, stabbed, shot, survived malaria and starvation to be rescued by the 6th Rangers.

(3) Abraham stayed behind at the request of General Douglas MacArthur for two and a half more years disinterring the bodies of his fallen comrades from the Bataan Death March and the prison camps, helping to identify their bodies and see that they were properly laid to rest.

(4) After his promotion in 1945, Abraham came back to the United States where he served as a recruiter and then also served two years in Germany until his retirement with 30 years of service as a Master Sergeant.

(5) Abraham received numerous medals for his service, including the Purple Heart, and had several documentaries on the Discovery Channel and History Channel.

(6) Abraham wrote the books ''Ghost of Bataan Speaks'' in 1971 and ''Oh, God, Where Are You'' in 1977 to help the public better understand what our brave men endured at the hands of the Imperial Japanese Army as prisoners of war.

(7) Abraham was a life member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Purple Heart Combat/Infantry Organization, the American Ex-POWs, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Defenders of Bataan.

(8) Abraham was a volunteer at Veterans Affairs Butler Healthcare for 23 years from 1988 to 2011 and had 36,851 service hours caring for our veterans.

SEC. 2. ABIE ABRAHAM VA CLINIC.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Department of Veterans Affairs health care center in Center Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the ''Abie Abraham VA Clinic''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the health care center referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Abie Abraham VA Clinic''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5317, a bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs VA healthcare center in Center Township,

Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the Abie Abraham VA Clinic.

This bill is sponsored by Congressman MIKE KELLY from Pennsylvania. I am grateful to him for his work to introduce this legislation to honor a true American hero.

Master Sergeant Abraham lived a truly remarkable life. Born in Lyndora, Pennsylvania, as 1 of 11 children, he set a world record as a young teenager for sitting in a tree for 3½ months—that is rather amazing, I might add—according to his obituary in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

In 1932, at the age of just 19, he enlisted in the United States Navy. Two years later, he enlisted in the United States Army. Over the course of a 30-year military career, he served in the Philippines, China, Germany, Panama, and earned a number of well-deserved accolades, including the Purple Heart.

During World War II, he survived the Bataan Death March. Over the course of 3½ years in captivity, Master Sergeant Abraham was beaten, stabbed, shot, and starved. At one point, he contracted malaria. Instead of returning immediately to the United States following his rescue, Master Sergeant Abraham agreed to stay behind at the request of General Douglas MacArthur. For 2½ years, he worked to recover the remains of his fallen comrades and to ensure they received the respect they were certainly due.

Following his service, Abie Abraham devoted his time to caring for his fellow brothers and sisters in arms. He was a lifelong member of several veterans service organizations. He also volunteered at the VA Butler Healthcare Center, where, over the course of 23 years, he would spend almost 40,000 hours tending to veteran patients there.

□ 1715

According to his obituary, Master Sergeant Abraham would arrive at the Butler VA facility at 6:45 in the morning, 5 days a week, and spend hours in greeting veteran patients, in helping them where they needed to go, in answering their questions, in bringing them coffee, and in generally making their experiences at the VA easier and better. In his spare time, he authored two books about his experiences in the military; he made public appearances at schools and community centers; and he participated in documentary films that have aired on the Discovery and History channels.

I must mention as well that, in addition to his being a hero on the battlefield and at the VA afterwards, an accomplished author, and an inspirational mentor, he was also a lightweight boxing champion and trainer.

In 2012, Master Sergeant Abraham died at the age of 98. Given his long and full life—a life that was characterized by service to others both in uniform and out—it is only fitting and appropriate that we honor Master Sergeant Abraham by naming the VA healthcare center in Butler County, Pennsylvania, after him.

This legislation satisfies all of the committee's naming criteria and is supported by the Pennsylvania congressional delegation as well as by many VSOs.

Once again, I thank my colleague, Congressman MIKE KELLY, for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5317, a bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs healthcare center in Center Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the Abie Abraham VA Clinic.

Born in 1913, Abie Abraham was a decorated World War II veteran who served in both the United States Navy and the United States Army and served in the Philippines, China, Germany, and Panama. As the text of the bill states, he was captured by the Japanese in the Philippines and survived the Bataan Death March and 3½ years as a prisoner of war. Not only did he survive that ordeal, but when General MacArthur asked him to stay and help identify the remains of his fallen comrades, he did so for almost 3 more years, making sure those who died in the Philippines received proper military funerals.

He wrote his first book, ''Ghost of Bataan Speaks,'' in 1971 and wrote his second book, ''Oh, God. Where Are You?'' in 1997. His intent was to help the public better understand what took place with regard to our brave men being POWs at the hands of the Japanese.

Abie Abraham had received numerous medals for his service, including the Purple Heart. He was a life member of the VFW, the American Legion, the Purple Heart Combat/Infantry organization, the Ex-Prisoners of War organization, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Defenders of Bataan. He had been a volunteer at the VA Butler Healthcare Center since 1988 and had volunteered over 38,000 hours. One of his favorite pastimes was helping other veterans.

For all that Mr. Abraham did during and after the war, I rise in support of this legislation to name this VA facility after him—a true American.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 5317. This is the designation of the Department of Veterans Affairs healthcare center in Center Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the Abie Abraham VA Clinic, as amended, and I urge its adoption.

I never called him ''Abie.'' I always called him ''Sergeant'' or ''Mr. Abraham.'' I knew him, and he was not a very big man. If you were to see him, his stature, he was, probably, 5 feet, 5 inches or 5 feet, 6 inches. When I met him, it was a little bit later in life, and he never, ever bragged about his service. He never talked about it. I just knew him as a guy who lived in my hometown, as a guy who was a veteran, as a guy who was a prisoner of war; but then things started to unfold about what Mr. Abraham had endured. Now, I want you to think about this.

Once the Japanese attacked the Philippines and were able to take the peninsula at Bataan, Mr. Abraham survived the Bataan Death March. That was 6 days and 7 nights of endless marching without food, without water, without any type of medical care. He had been 3½ years interned in a Japanese prison camp. You heard what the doctor said and what Ms. BROWN said. This guy went through incredible pain and suffering to get there, but for as long as I knew him, he never bragged about it. He never said, ''This is what I did.'' I never knew until he wrote the book about the ghost of Bataan.

I sat down with him one night, and I said: Mr. Abraham, you never told me about this.

He said: Well, you didn't need to know about this. It is just something we all did.

Every American came forward and did what he could do during World War II and continued to do it. There are 1.4 million Americans in uniform who have given their lives so that this county could survive, so that our country could survive.

If you knew Abie Abraham the way I knew Abie Abraham and the way the people in my town knew Abie Abraham, he was totally selfless. His whole mission in life was to serve veterans. In 1988, he visited somebody in the VA hospital, and he decided, after that, to stay. He stayed and he stayed and he stayed—almost 37,000 hours of volunteer service.

When you look at his gravestone—and I was there when he was interred in Arlington—it reads: ''Born July 31, 1913. Died March 22, 2011.'' Yet they don't talk about the days in between. They don't talk about the minutes in between or about the hours in between or about the years in between—those 98 years he spent in service and, especially, the last years of his life.

If you were to have gone to the VA center in Butler, you would have seen he was there every morning at a quarter to 7. He was there to help people—to greet veterans, to let them know that they were appreciated. He used to tell people all the time, especially young people: When you meet a veteran, grab his or her hand and thank him for his service to America.

This is the type of America that I grew up in. I don't think it was unlike any other towns in America, and I don't think Mr. Abraham was different than any other citizen of America. They were just those types of people.

So now, for that veteran center to be named after Sergeant Abraham, I can't tell you the sense of pride it brings not only to the Abraham family and to my community in Butler, Pennsylvania, but to all of us, and to know that there are people out there who were willing to do these things, who were willing to sacrifice themselves. After being rescued—12,000 Americans were captured; he was 1 of 513 who survived. There were 12,000 who were captured, and 513 survived. The loss of life, the loss of future, the loss of enjoying a family—everything that life has to offer was taken from those people.

General MacArthur asked him: Abie, would you please stay and find those remains and dig them up so that you can bring some peace and comfort to those who died? Mrs. Abraham said Mr. Abraham would pray every night that the Lord would give him the strength to go out the next day because it was so horrible. He was digging up the remains, not of some people he didn't know, but of people who had actually been captured, of people he had marched with, of people he had tried to help get through this horrible time who had passed. His whole purpose in life was to bring peace to families, to bring peace to veterans, and to let them know how much he cared for them.

As a grateful country, we now have the opportunity to name a healthcare center after Sergeant Abie Abraham. He is truly somebody who befits the often said statement that there is only one office higher in our country than President, and that is that of patriot—not Republican, not Democrat, not Libertarian—patriot, American patriot. He was a man who loved peace and deplored the horrors of war but who never, ever tired in his service to his fellow servicemen, and he never, ever gave up. I can tell you, to his last day, Mr. Abraham thought about one thing every day, and that was about our men and women in uniform who gave their lives that this country—our country—could survive.

Do you know what? I know Mr. Abraham is looking down right now, and he is so happy that this facility is being named after him so that, for all time, he will be remembered.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5317.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a fellow veteran, I can't think of anything that I would rather be doing this afternoon than naming this VA center for this incredible American hero. Once again, I encourage all of the Members to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5317, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERAN ENGAGEMENT TEAMS ACT

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3936) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary carries out Veteran Engagement Team events where veterans can complete claims for disability compensation and pension under the laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3936

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 ''Veteran Engagement Teams Act'' or ''VET Act''.

SEC. 2. PILOT PROGRAM ON DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS VETERAN ENGAGEMENT TEAM EVENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) PILOT PROGRAM.—Beginning not later than October 1, 2016, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a three-year pilot program under which the Secretary shall carry out events, to be known as ''Veteran Engagement Team events''. The Secretary shall ensure that such events are carried out—

(A) during the first year during which the Secretary carries out the pilot program, at least once a month in a location within the jurisdiction of each of 10 regional offices of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including at least two regional offices in each of the five districts of the Veterans Benefits Administration under the organization of such Administration in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) during each of the second and third years during which the Secretary carries out the pilot program, at least once a month in a location within the jurisdiction of each of 15 regional offices of the Department, including at least three regional offices in each such district.

(2) VETERAN ENGAGEMENT TEAM EVENTS.—During each Veteran Engagement Team event, the Secretary shall provide assistance to veterans in completing and adjudicating claims for disability compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, and for pension under chapter 15 of such title. The Secretary shall ensure that—

(A) all Veteran Engagement Team events occur during the normal business hours of the sponsoring regional office;

(B) the events are carried out at different locations within the jurisdiction of each regional office and at least 50 miles from any regional office;

(C) a sufficient number of physicians (to be available for opinions only), veteran service representatives and rating veteran service representatives, and other personnel are available at the events to initiate, update, and finalize the completion and adjudication of claims;

(D) veterans service organizations have access to the events for purposes of providing assistance to veterans; and

(E) a veteran who is unable to complete and adjudicate a claim at an event is informed of what additional information or actions are needed to finalize the claim.

(b) LOCATION.—In selecting locations for Veteran Engagement Team events under this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) coordinate with veteran service organizations and State and local veterans agencies; and

(2) seek to select locations that are community-based and easily accessible.

(c) TRANSFER OF PERSONNEL.—

(1) PHYSICIANS.—The Secretary may not permanently transfer any physician employed by the Veterans Health Administration for the purpose of staffing a Veteran Engagement Team event.

(2) PAYMENT OF SALARIES.—Any amount payable to an employee of the Department for work performed at a Veteran Engagement Team event is payable only from amounts otherwise available for the payment of the salary of the employee. No additional amounts are authorized to be appropriated under this section for the payment of salaries for Department employee.

(d) OTHER AUTHORITIES.—In carrying out the pilot program under this section, the Secretary may—

(1) coordinate with States, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and private sector entities to use facilities to host Veteran Engagement Team events for no or minimal costs; and

(2) accept, on a without compensation basis, services provided by non-Department physicians in rendering medical opinions relating to claims for compensation and pension.

(e) CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEYS.—In carrying out the pilot program under this section, the Secretary shall collect and analyze information about the customer satisfaction of veterans who have received assistance at an Veteran Engagement Team event.

(f) REPORTS.—Not later than April 30, 2017, and annually thereafter beginning on October 1, 2017, for the duration of the program, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation and effectiveness of the events. Such report shall include—

(1) the number and types of claims completed and adjudicated at the events;

(2) the number and types of claims for which assistance was sought at the events that were not completed or adjudicated at the events and the reasons such claims were not completed or adjudicated; and

(3) an analysis of the customer satisfaction of veterans who have received assistance at an event based on the information collected under subsection (e).

SEC. 3. MODIFICATION TO LIMITATION ON AWARDS AND BONUSES.

Section 705 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146; 38 U.S.C. 703 note) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 705. LIMITATION ON AWARDS AND BONUSES PAID TO EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

''The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the aggregate amount of awards and bonuses paid by the Secretary in a fiscal year under chapter 45 or 53 of title 5, United States Code, or any other awards or bonuses authorized under such title or title 38, United States Code, does not exceed the following amounts:

''(1) With respect to fiscal year 2017, $250,000,000.

''(2) With respect to each of fiscal years 2018 through 2024, $360,000,000.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material on H.R. 3936, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise and urge all Members to support H.R. 3936, as amended. H.R. 3936 would authorize a 3-year pilot program for Veteran Engagement Teams.

Veteran Engagement Teams allow the Department of Veterans Affairs' employees to meet one on one with veterans to help facilitate the claims process. Veteran Engagement Teams bring veterans and VA claims processors and physicians to help facilitate the claims process. The VA is currently testing a similar program that has proven to be both popular and successful. Allowing veterans to talk with VA employees face-to-face helps to reduce confusion and frustration with the VA's complicated claims process.

H.R. 3936, as amended, would require the VA to continue to provide this personal service to many veterans, which would reduce their frustration and confusion with the VA's complicated claims process.

I thank Mr. COSTELLO, a member of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, for introducing this bill and for being an advocate for our veterans and their families.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3936, as amended.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of Mr. COSTELLO's bill, H.R. 3936, that would establish a 3-year pilot program to assist veterans in receiving timely decisions on their claims.

Under this administration, the VA has nearly eliminated the claims backlog. At the height of the backlog in 2013, there were more than 600,000 claims. Today, that number has been reduced to fewer than 75,000. The VA has made incredible strides on claims, and I applaud its hardworking staff who has made this happen. However, we also owe it to our veterans to look at and test new methods to improve services and continue refining the VA claims process. This legislation is a step in that direction.

However, I must note that the VA's success in the timely processing of claims has come at the cost of a new backlog—appeals. There is an appeals inventory of 450,000. The average wait for a veteran to have his appeal resolved is almost 5 years.

□ 1730

We need to address this in our closing legislative days. If we do not act now, the VA predicts veterans will have to wait 10 years for a decision on their appeal. Now, I know we all agree that that simply is unacceptable. I look forward to working in a bipartisan fashion to fix this issue immediately.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), my friend and fellow member of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support my legislation, H.R. 3936, the VET Act, also known as the Veteran Engagement Teams Act.

I would first like to thank Congressman MIKE FITZPATRICK from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, and our staffers—Congressman FITZPATRICK's staffer Justin Rusk, and my senior legislative aide, Katharine Bruce—for all their hard work on the VET Act. I am proud to have introduced this legislation with them, and we would not be here today were it not for their important collaboration in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, the VET Act is a solution for the veteran who needs assistance navigating the Department of Veterans Affairs claims process. Many veterans struggle to navigate the VA's bureaucracy to submit their disability compensation or pension claims and to receive the benefits that they have earned.

The VET Act aims to solve this problem and, in the process, reduce wait times, possible miscommunications, and lost paperwork by taking VA employees out of the office and placing them in the community where they can provide area veterans with one-on-one assistance at Veteran Engagement Team events. The events would be carried out at least 50 miles from any regional office, and the Secretary would ensure that a sufficient number of physicians, veterans service representatives, and other personnel are present to initiate, update and finalize the completion and adjudication of claims. Pro bono services can also be provided at these events to help offer assistance to veterans from veteran service organizations. And the VA is instructed to coordinate with States, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and private-sector entities to secure community facilities at little or no cost, creating a so-called one-stop shop for veterans.

And this is the gist of the bill, Mr. Speaker: if a veteran is unable to complete their claim at a VET event, the legislation directs VA employees to provide clear next steps for the veteran. Many veterans express frustration about the lack of clarity from the VA, and subsequently we find ourselves, as the ranking member mentioned, with a claims backlog often due to remands. And veterans get bounced back and forth, perhaps not even knowing that they did not submit information that they have in their records but have not yet been told by the VA. This aims to eliminate that.

That is why under this legislation VA staff would be required to file reports that explain why claims were not completed, the number and types of claims that were completed, and customer satisfaction. Each of these steps is part of the solution to perfecting a claim, expediting its review, and avoiding unnecessary remands which clog up the claims docket. The goal is a more efficient system, Mr. Speaker. Transparency, timeliness, and accountability are the guiding principles of this bill.

The VET Act's method is already assisting veterans. American Legion Veterans Benefits Centers and regional VA claims clinics have tested VET events and found success, proving this legislation can restore trust between veterans and the VA.

It is also important to note the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Paralyzed Veterans of America have all voiced their support for this bill.

With over 45,000 veterans in my district, nearly 1 million in Pennsylvania and almost 22 million veterans in the United States, this legislation is a forward-looking solution that has the potential to assist many veterans across our country. Our veterans have earned their benefits, and this bill aims to make it easier for vets to file their claim and receive their benefits.

Finally, I would like to thank Chairman MILLER, the ranking member, and the House Veterans' Affairs Committee staff for their support and assistance and for ensuring this bill moved through the House this session.

Our veterans have waited long enough and House passage today puts us one step closer to this bill becoming law. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3936, the VET Act.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3936.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member BROWN, and the members of the committee for all these bills we have passed this afternoon.

I encourage all Members to support H.R. 3936, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3936, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIPS TO PAY FOR RESULTS ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5170) to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private sectors to improve our Nation's social programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5170

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 ''Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act''.

SEC. 2. SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIPS TO PAY FOR RESULTS ACT.

Section 403 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) SOCIAL IMPACT DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—

''(1) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this subsection are the following:

''(A) To improve the lives of families and individuals in need in the United States by funding social programs that achieve real results.

''(B) To redirect funds away from programs that, based on objective data, are ineffective, and into programs that achieve demonstrable, measurable results.

''(C) To ensure Federal funds are used effectively on social services to produce positive outcomes for both service recipients and taxpayers.

''(D) To establish the use of social impact partnerships to address some of our Nation's most pressing problems.

''(E) To facilitate the creation of public-private partnerships that bundle philanthropic or other private resources with existing public spending to scale up effective social interventions already being implemented by private organizations, nonprofits, charitable organizations, and State and local governments across the country.

''(F) To bring pay-for-performance to the social sector, allowing the United States to improve the impact and effectiveness of vital social services programs while redirecting inefficient or duplicative spending.

''(G) To incorporate outcomes measurement and randomized controlled trials or other rigorous methodologies for assessing program impact.

''(2) SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIP APPLICATION.—

''(A) NOTICE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships, shall publish in the Federal Register a request for proposals from States or local government for social impact partnership projects in accordance with this paragraph.

''(B) REQUIRED OUTCOMES FOR SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIP PROJECT.—To qualify as a social impact partnership project under this subsection, a project must produce 1 or more measurable, clearly defined outcomes that result in social benefit and Federal savings through any of the following:

''(i) Increasing work and earnings by individuals who have been unemployed in the United States for more than 6 consecutive months.

''(ii) Increasing employment and earnings of individuals who have attained 16 years of age but not 25 years of age.

''(iii) Increasing employment among individuals receiving Federal disability benefits.

''(iv) Reducing the dependence of low-income families on Federal means-tested benefits.

''(v) Improving rates of high school graduation.

''(vi) Reducing teen and unplanned pregnancies.

''(vii) Improving birth outcomes and early childhood health and development among low-income families and individuals.

''(viii) Reducing rates of asthma, diabetes, or other preventable diseases among low-income families and individuals to reduce the utilization of emergency and other high-cost care.

''(ix) Increasing the proportion of children living in 2-parent families.

''(x) Reducing incidences and adverse consequences of child abuse and neglect.

''(xi) Reducing the number of youth in foster care by increasing adoptions, permanent guardianship arrangements, reunification, or placement with a fit and willing relative, or by avoiding placing children in foster care by ensuring they can be cared for safely in their own homes.

''(xii) Reducing the number of children and youth in foster care residing in group homes, child care institutions, agency-operated foster homes, or other non-family foster homes, unless it is determined that it is in the interest of the child's long-term health, safety, or psychological well-being to not be placed in a family foster home.

''(xiii) Reducing the number of children returning to foster care.

''(xiv) Reducing recidivism among juveniles, individuals released from prison, or other high-risk populations.

''(xv) Reducing the rate of homelessness among our most vulnerable populations.

''(xvi) Improving the health and well-being of those with mental, emotional, and behavioral health needs.

''(xvii) Improving the educational outcomes of special-needs or low-income children.

''(xviii) Improving the employment and well-being of returning United States military members.

''(xix) Increasing the financial stability of low-income families.

''(xx) Increasing the independence and employability of individuals who are physically or mentally disabled.

''(xxi) Other measurable outcomes defined by the State or local government that result in positive social outcomes and Federal savings.

''(C) APPLICATION REQUIRED.—The notice described in subparagraph (A) shall require a State or local government to submit an application for the social impact partnership project that addresses the following:

''(i) The outcome goals of the project.

''(ii) A description of each intervention in the project and anticipated outcomes of the intervention.

''(iii) Rigorous evidence demonstrating that the intervention can be expected to produce the desired outcomes.

''(iv) The target population that will be served by the project.

''(v) The expected social benefits to participants who receive the intervention and others who may be impacted.

''(vi) Projected Federal, State, and local government costs and other costs to conduct the project.

''(vii) Projected Federal, State, and local government savings and other savings, including an estimate of the savings to the Federal Government, on a program-by-program basis and in the aggregate, if the project is implemented and the outcomes are achieved.

''(viii) If savings resulting from the successful completion of the project are estimated to accrue to the State or local government, the likelihood of the State or local government to realize those savings.

''(ix) A plan for delivering the intervention through a social impact partnership model.

''(x) A description of the expertise of each service provider that will administer the intervention, including a summary of the experience of the service provider in delivering the proposed intervention or a similar intervention, or demonstrating that the service provider has the expertise necessary to deliver the proposed intervention.

''(xi) An explanation of the experience of the State or local government, the intermediary, or the service provider in raising private and philanthropic capital to fund social service investments.

''(xii) The detailed roles and responsibilities of each entity involved in the project, including any State or local government entity, intermediary, service provider, independent evaluator, investor, or other stakeholder.

''(xiii) A summary of the experience of the service provider delivering the proposed intervention or a similar intervention, or a summary demonstrating the service provider has the expertise necessary to deliver the proposed intervention.

''(xiv) A summary of the unmet need in the area where the intervention will be delivered or among the target population who will receive the intervention.

''(xv) The proposed payment terms, the methodology used to calculate outcome payments, the payment schedule, and performance thresholds.

''(xvi) The project budget.

''(xvii) The project timeline.

''(xviii) The criteria used to determine the eligibility of an individual for the project, including how selected populations will be identified, how they will be referred to the project, and how they will be enrolled in the project.

''(xix) The evaluation design.

''(xx) The metrics that will be used to determine whether the outcomes have been achieved and how the metrics will be measured.

''(xxi) An explanation of how the metrics used to determine whether the outcomes have been achieved are independent, objective indicators of impact and are not subject to manipulation by the service provider, intermediary, or investor.

''(xxii) A summary explaining the independence of the evaluator from the other entities involved in the project and the evaluator's experience in conducting rigorous evaluations of program effectiveness including, where available, well-implemented randomized controlled trials on the intervention or similar interventions.

''(xxiii) The capacity of the service provider to deliver the intervention to the number of participants the State or local government proposes to serve in the project.

''(D) PROJECT INTERMEDIARY INFORMATION REQUIRED.—The application described in subparagraph (C) shall also contain the following information about any intermediary for the social impact partnership project (whether an intermediary is a service provider or other entity):

''(i) Experience and capacity for providing or facilitating the provision of the type of intervention proposed.

''(ii) The mission and goals.

''(iii) Information on whether the intermediary is already working with service providers that provide this intervention or an

explanation of the capacity of the intermediary to begin working with service providers to provide the intervention.

''(iv) Experience working in a collaborative environment across government and nongovernmental entities.

''(v) Previous experience collaborating with public or private entities to implement evidence-based programs.

''(vi) Ability to raise or provide funding to cover operating costs (if applicable to the project).

''(vii) Capacity and infrastructure to track outcomes and measure results, including—

''(I) capacity to track and analyze program performance and assess program impact; and

''(II) experience with performance-based awards or performance-based contracting and achieving project milestones and targets.

''(viii) Role in delivering the intervention.

''(ix) How the intermediary would monitor program success, including a description of the interim benchmarks and outcome measures.

''(E) FEASIBILITY STUDIES FUNDED THROUGH OTHER SOURCES.—The notice described in subparagraph (A) shall permit a State or local government to submit an application for social impact partnership funding that contains information from a feasibility study developed for purposes other than applying for funding under this subsection.

''(3) AWARDING SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—

''(A) TIMELINE IN AWARDING AGREEMENT.—Not later than 6 months after receiving an application in accordance with paragraph (2), the Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships, shall determine whether to enter into an agreement for a social impact partnership project with a State or local government.

''(B) CONSIDERATIONS IN AWARDING AGREEMENT.—In determining whether to enter into an agreement for a social impact partnership project (the application for which was submitted under paragraph (2)) the Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships (established by paragraph (6)) and the head of any Federal agency administering a similar intervention or serving a population similar to that served by the project, shall consider each of the following:

''(i) The recommendations made by the Commission on Social Impact Partnerships.

''(ii) The value to the Federal Government of the outcomes expected to be achieved if the outcomes specified in the agreement are achieved.

''(iii) The likelihood, based on evidence provided in the application and other evidence, that the State or local government in collaboration with the intermediary and the service providers will achieve the outcomes.

''(iv) The savings to the Federal Government if the outcomes specified in the agreement are achieved.

''(v) The savings to the State and local governments if the outcomes specified in the agreement are achieved.

''(vi) The expected quality of the evaluation that would be conducted with respect to the agreement.

''(C) AGREEMENT AUTHORITY.—

''(i) AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS.—In accordance with this paragraph, the Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships and the head of any Federal agency administering a similar intervention or serving a population similar to that served by the project, may enter into an agreement for a social impact partnership project with a State or local government if the Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships, determines that each of the following requirements are met:

''(I) The State or local government agrees to achieve 1 or more outcomes specified in the agreement in order to receive payment.

''(II) The Federal payment to the State or local government for each outcome specified is less than or equal to the value of the outcome to the Federal Government over a period not to exceed 10 years, as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the State or local government.

''(III) The duration of the project does not exceed 10 years.

''(IV) The State or local government has demonstrated, through the application submitted under paragraph (2), that, based on prior rigorous experimental evaluations or rigorous quasi-experimental studies, the intervention can be expected to achieve each outcome specified in the agreement.

''(V) The State, local government, intermediary, or service provider has experience raising private or philanthropic capital to fund social service investments (if applicable to the project).

''(VI) The State or local government has shown that each service provider has experience delivering the intervention, a similar intervention, or has otherwise demonstrated the expertise necessary to deliver the intervention.

''(ii) PAYMENT.—The Secretary shall pay the State or local government only if the independent evaluator described in paragraph (5) determines that the social impact partnership project has met the requirements specified in the agreement and achieved an outcome specified in the agreement.

''(D) NOTICE OF AGREEMENT AWARD.—Not later than 30 days after entering into an agreement under this paragraph, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register that includes, with regard to the agreement, the following:

''(i) The outcome goals of the social impact partnership project.

''(ii) A description of each intervention in the project.

''(iii) The target population that will be served by the project.

''(iv) The expected social benefits to participants who receive the intervention and others who may be impacted.

''(v) The detailed roles, responsibilities, and purposes of each Federal, State, or local government entity, intermediary, service provider, independent evaluator, investor, or other stakeholder.

''(vi) The payment terms, the methodology used to calculate outcome payments, the payment schedule, and performance thresholds.

''(vii) The project budget.

''(viii) The project timeline.

''(ix) The project eligibility criteria.

''(x) The evaluation design.

''(xi) The metrics that will be used to determine whether the outcomes have been achieved and how these metrics will be measured.

''(xii) The estimate of the savings to the Federal, State, and local government, on a program-by-program basis and in the aggregate, if the agreement is entered into and implemented and the outcomes are achieved.

''(E) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER ADMINISTRATION OF AGREEMENT.—The Secretary may transfer to the head of another Federal agency the authority to administer (including making payments under) an agreement entered into under subparagraph (C), and any funds necessary to do so.

''(F) REQUIREMENT ON FUNDING USED TO BENEFIT CHILDREN.—Not less than 50 percent of all Federal payments made to carry out agreements under this paragraph shall be used for initiatives that directly benefit children.

''(4) FEASIBILITY STUDY FUNDING.—

''(A) REQUESTS FOR FUNDING FOR FEASIBILITY STUDIES.—The Secretary shall reserve a portion of the amount reserved to carry out this subsection to assist States or local governments in developing feasibility studies to apply for social impact partnership funding under paragraph (2). To be eligible to receive funding to assist with completing a feasibility study, a State or local government shall submit an application for feasibility study funding addressing the following:

''(i) A description of the outcome goals of the social impact partnership project.

''(ii) A description of the intervention, including anticipated program design, target population, an estimate regarding the number of individuals to be served, and setting for the intervention.

''(iii) Evidence to support the likelihood that the intervention will produce the desired outcomes.

''(iv) A description of the potential metrics to be used.

''(v) The expected social benefits to participants who receive the intervention and others who may be impacted.

''(vi) Estimated costs to conduct the project.

''(vii) Estimates of Federal, State, and local government savings and other savings if the project is implemented and the outcomes are achieved.

''(viii) An estimated timeline for implementation and completion of the project, which shall not exceed 10 years.

''(ix) With respect to a project for which the State or local government selects an intermediary to operate the project, any partnerships needed to successfully execute the project and the ability of the intermediary to foster the partnerships.

''(x) The expected resources needed to complete the feasibility study for the State or local government to apply for social impact partnership funding under paragraph (2).

''(B) FEDERAL SELECTION OF APPLICATIONS FOR FEASIBILITY STUDY.—Not later than 6 months after receiving an application for feasibility study funding under subparagraph (A), the Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships and the head of any Federal agency administering a similar intervention or serving a population similar to that served by the project, shall select State or local government feasibility study proposals for funding based on the following:

''(i) The recommendations made by the Commission on Social Impact Partnerships.

''(ii) The likelihood that the proposal will achieve the desired outcomes.

''(iii) The value of the outcomes expected to be achieved.

''(iv) The potential savings to the Federal Government if the social impact partnership project is successful.

''(v) The potential savings to the State and local governments if the project is successful.

''(C) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Not later than 30 days after selecting a State or local government for feasibility study funding under this paragraph, the Secretary shall cause to be published on the website of the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships information explaining why a State or local government was granted feasibility study funding.

''(D) FUNDING RESTRICTION.—

''(i) FEASIBILITY STUDY RESTRICTION.—The Secretary may not provide feasibility study funding under this paragraph for more than 50 percent of the estimated total cost of the

feasibility study reported in the State or local government application submitted under subparagraph (A).

''(ii) AGGREGATE RESTRICTION.—Of the total amount reserved to carry out this subsection, the Secretary may not use more than $10,000,000 to provide feasibility study funding to States or local governments under this paragraph.

''(iii) NO GUARANTEE OF FUNDING.—The Secretary shall have the option to award no funding under this paragraph.

''(E) SUBMISSION OF FEASIBILITY STUDY REQUIRED.—Not later than 9 months after the receipt of feasibility study funding under this paragraph, a State or local government receiving the funding shall complete the feasibility study and submit the study to the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships.

''(F) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may transfer to the head of another Federal agency the authorities provided in this paragraph and any funds necessary to exercise the authorities.

''(5) EVALUATIONS.—

''(A) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS.—For each State or local government awarded a social impact partnership project approved by the Secretary under this subsection, the head of the relevant agency, as determined by the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships, shall enter into an agreement with the State or local government to pay for all or part of the independent evaluation to determine whether the State or local government project has met an outcome specified in the agreement in order for the State or local government to receive outcome payments under this subsection.

''(B) EVALUATOR QUALIFICATIONS.—The head of the relevant agency may not enter into an agreement with a State or local government unless the head determines that the evaluator is independent of the other parties to the agreement and has demonstrated substantial experience in conducting rigorous evaluations of program effectiveness including, where available and appropriate, well-implemented randomized controlled trials on the intervention or similar interventions.

''(C) METHODOLOGIES TO BE USED.—The evaluation used to determine whether a State or local government will receive outcome payments under this subsection shall use experimental designs using random assignment or other reliable, evidence-based research methodologies, as certified by the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships, that allow for the strongest possible causal inferences when random assignment is not feasible.

''(D) PROGRESS REPORT.—

''(i) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—The independent evaluator shall—

''(I) not later than 2 years after a project has been approved by the Secretary and biannually thereafter until the project is concluded, submit to the head of the relevant agency and the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships a written report summarizing the progress that has been made in achieving each outcome specified in the agreement; and

''(II) before the scheduled time of the first outcome payment and before the scheduled time of each subsequent payment, submit to the head of the relevant agency and the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships a written report that includes the results of the evaluation conducted to determine whether an outcome payment should be made along with information on the unique factors that contributed to achieving or failing to achieve the outcome, the challenges faced in attempting to achieve the outcome, and information on the improved future delivery of this or similar interventions.

''(ii) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after receipt of the written report pursuant to clause (i)(II), the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships shall submit the report to each committee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

''(E) FINAL REPORT.—

''(i) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—Within 6 months after the social impact partnership project is completed, the independent evaluator shall—

''(I) evaluate the effects of the activities undertaken pursuant to the agreement with regard to each outcome specified in the agreement; and

''(II) submit to the head of the relevant agency and the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships a written report that includes the results of the evaluation and the conclusion of the evaluator as to whether the State or local government has fulfilled each obligation of the agreement, along with information on the unique factors that contributed to the success or failure of the project, the challenges faced in attempting to achieve the outcome, and information on the improved future delivery of this or similar interventions.

''(ii) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after receipt of the written report pursuant to clause (i)(II), the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships shall submit the report to each committee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

''(F) LIMITATION ON COST OF EVALUATIONS.—Of the amount reserved under this subsection for social impact partnership projects, the Secretary may not obligate more than 15 percent to evaluate the implementation and outcomes of the projects.

''(G) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may transfer to the head of another Federal agency the authorities provided in this paragraph and any funds necessary to exercise the authorities.

''(6) FEDERAL INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIPS.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships (in this paragraph referred to as the 'Council') to—

''(i) coordinate the efforts of social impact partnership projects funded under this subsection;

''(ii) advise and assist the Secretary in the development and implementation of the projects;

''(iii) advise the Secretary on specific programmatic and policy matter related to the projects;

''(iv) provide subject-matter expertise to the Secretary with regard to the projects;

''(v) ensure that each State or local government that has entered into an agreement with the Secretary for a social impact partnership project under this subsection and each evaluator selected by the head of the relevant agency under paragraph (5) has access to Federal administrative data to assist the State or local government and the evaluator in evaluating the performance and outcomes of the project;

''(vi) address issues that will influence the future of social impact partnership projects in the United States;

''(vii) provide guidance to the executive branch on the future of social impact partnership projects in the United States;

''(viii) review State and local government applications for social impact partnerships to ensure that agreements will only be awarded under this subsection when rigorous, independent data and reliable, evidence-based research methodologies support the conclusion that an agreement will yield savings to the Federal Government if the project outcomes are achieved before the applications are approved by the Secretary;

''(ix) certify, in the case of each approved social impact partnership, that the project will yield a projected savings to the Federal Government if the project outcomes are achieved, and coordinate with the relevant Federal agency to produce an after-action accounting once the project is complete to determine the actual Federal savings realized, and the extent to which actual savings aligned with projected savings; and

''(x) provide oversight of the actions of the Secretary and other Federal officials under this subsection and report periodically to Congress and the public on the implementation of this subsection.

''(B) COMPOSITION OF COUNCIL.—The Council shall have 11 members, as follows:

''(i) CHAIR.—The Chair of the Council shall be the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(ii) OTHER MEMBERS.—The head of each of the following entities shall designate 1 officer or employee of the entity to be a Council member:

''(I) The Department of Labor.

''(II) The Department of Health and Human Services.

''(III) The Social Security Administration.

''(IV) The Department of Agriculture.

''(V) The Department of Justice.

''(VI) The Department of Housing and Urban Development.

''(VII) The Department of Education.

''(VIII) The Department of Veterans Affairs.

''(IX) The Department of the Treasury.

''(X) The Corporation for National and Community Service.

''(7) COMMISSION ON SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIPS.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Commission on Social Impact Partnerships (in this paragraph referred to as the 'Commission').

''(B) DUTIES.—The duties of the Commission shall be to—

''(i) assist the Secretary and the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships in reviewing applications for funding under this subsection;

''(ii) make recommendations to the Secretary and the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships regarding the funding of social impact partnership agreements and feasibility studies; and

''(iii) provide other assistance and information as requested by the Secretary or the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships.

''(C) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of 9 members, of whom—

''(i) 1 shall be appointed by the President, who will serve as the Chair of the Commission;

''(ii) 1 shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate;

''(iii) 1 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate;

''(iv) 1 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

''(v) 1 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives;

''(vi) 1 shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

''(vii) 1 shall be appointed by the ranking member of the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

''(viii) 1 member shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

''(ix) 1 shall be appointed by the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

''(D) QUALIFICATIONS OF COMMISSION MEMBERS.—The members of the Commission shall—

''(i) be experienced in finance, economics, pay for performance, or program evaluation;

''(ii) have relevant professional or personal experience in a field related to 1 or more of the outcomes listed in this subsection; or

''(iii) be qualified to review applications for social impact partnership projects to determine whether the proposed metrics and evaluation methodologies are appropriately rigorous and reliant upon independent data and evidence-based research.

''(E) TIMING OF APPOINTMENTS.—The appointments of the members of the Commission shall be made not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, or, in the event of a vacancy, not later than 90 days after the date the vacancy arises. If a member of Congress fails to appoint a member by that date, the President may select a member of the President's choice on behalf of the member of Congress. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, if not all appointments have been made to the Commission as of that date, the Commission may operate with no fewer than 5 members until all appointments have been made.

''(F) TERM OF APPOINTMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The members appointed under subparagraph (C) shall serve as follows:

''(I) 3 members shall serve for 2 years.

''(II) 3 members shall serve for 3 years.

''(III) 3 members (1 of which shall be Chair of the Commission appointed by the President) shall serve for 4 years.

''(ii) ASSIGNMENT OF TERMS.—The Commission shall designate the term length that each member appointed under subparagraph (C) shall serve by unanimous agreement. In the event that unanimous agreement cannot be reached, term lengths shall be assigned to the members by a random process.

''(G) VACANCIES.—Subject to subparagraph (E), in the event of a vacancy in the Commission, whether due to the resignation of a member, the expiration of a member's term, or any other reason, the vacancy shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made and shall not affect the powers of the Commission.

''(H) APPOINTMENT POWER.—Members of the Commission appointed under subparagraph (C) shall not be subject to confirmation by the Senate.

''(8) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Of the amounts reserved to carry out this subsection, the Secretary may not use more than $2,000,000 in any fiscal year to support the review, approval, and oversight of social impact partnership projects, including activities conducted by—

''(A) the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships; and

''(B) any other agency consulted by the Secretary before approving a social impact partnership project or a feasibility study under paragraph (4).

''(9) NO FEDERAL FUNDING FOR CREDIT ENHANCEMENTS.—No amount reserved to carry out this subsection may be used to provide any insurance, guarantee, or other credit enhancement to a State or local government under which a Federal payment would be made to a State or local government as the result of a State or local government failing to achieve an outcome specified in a contract.

''(10) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts reserved to carry out this subsection shall remain available until 10 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

''(11) WEBSITE.—The Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships shall establish and maintain a public website that shall display the following:

''(A) A copy of, or method of accessing, each notice published regarding a social impact partnership project pursuant to this subsection.

''(B) A copy of each feasibility study funded under this subsection.

''(C) For each State or local government that has entered into an agreement with the Secretary for a social impact partnership project, the website shall contain the following information:

''(i) The outcome goals of the project.

''(ii) A description of each intervention in the project.

''(iii) The target population that will be served by the project.

''(iv) The expected social benefits to participants who receive the intervention and others who may be impacted.

''(v) The detailed roles, responsibilities, and purposes of each Federal, State, or local government entity, intermediary, service provider, independent evaluator, investor, or other stakeholder.

''(vi) The payment terms, methodology used to calculate outcome payments, the payment schedule, and performance thresholds.

''(vii) The project budget.

''(viii) The project timeline.

''(ix) The project eligibility criteria.

''(x) The evaluation design.

''(xi) The metrics used to determine whether the proposed outcomes have been achieved and how these metrics are measured.

''(D) A copy of the progress reports and the final reports relating to each social impact partnership project.

''(E) An estimate of the savings to the Federal, State, and local government, on a program-by-program basis and in the aggregate, resulting from the successful completion of the social impact partnership project.

''(12) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships, may issue regulations as necessary to carry out this subsection.

''(13) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) AGENCY.—The term 'agency' has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

''(B) INTERVENTION.—The term 'intervention' means a specific service delivered to achieve an impact through a social impact partnership project.

''(C) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Treasury.

''(D) SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIP PROJECT.—The term 'social impact partnership project' means a project that finances social services using a social impact partnership model.

''(E) SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIP MODEL.—The term 'social impact partnership model' means a method of financing social services in which—

''(i) Federal funds are awarded to a State or local government only if a State or local government achieves certain outcomes agreed on by the State or local government and the Secretary; and

''(ii) the State or local government coordinates with service providers, investors (if applicable to the project), and (if necessary) an intermediary to identify—

''(I) an intervention expected to produce the outcome;

''(II) a service provider to deliver the intervention to the target population; and

''(III) investors to fund the delivery of the intervention.

''(F) STATE.—The term 'State' means each State of the United States, the District of Columbia, each commonwealth, territory or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian tribe.

''(14) FUNDING.—Of the amounts made available to carry out subsection (b) for fiscal year 2017, the Secretary shall reserve $100,000,000 to carry out this subsection.''.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF TANF PROGRAM.

(a) FAMILY ASSISTANCE GRANTS.—Section 403(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(1)) is amended in each of subparagraphs (A) and (C), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2017''.

(b) HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROMOTION AND RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD GRANTS.—Section 403(a)(2)(D) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(2)(D)) is amended by striking ''2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''2017''.

(c) TRIBAL GRANTS.—Section 412(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 612(a)) is amended in each of paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2017''.

(d) CHILD CARE ENTITLEMENT.—Section 418(a)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 618(a)(3)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2017''.

(e) GRANTS TO THE TERRITORIES.—Section 1108(b)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1308(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2017''.

SEC. 4. STRENGTHENING WELFARE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF A WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 413 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 613) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 413. EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES AND RELATED PROGRAMS.

''(a) EVALUATION OF THE IMPACTS OF TANF.—The Secretary shall conduct research on the effect of State programs funded under this part and any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i)) on employment, self-sufficiency, child well-being, unmarried births, marriage, poverty, economic mobility, and other factors as determined by the Secretary.

''(b) EVALUATION OF GRANTS TO IMPROVE CHILD WELL-BEING BY PROMOTING HEALTHY MARRIAGE AND RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD.—The Secretary shall conduct research to determine the effects of the grants made under section 403(a)(2) on child well-being, marriage, family stability, economic mobility, poverty, and other factors as determined by the Secretary.

''(c) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with States receiving funds provided under this part, develop methods of disseminating information on any research, evaluation, or study conducted under this section, including facilitating the sharing of information and best practices among States and localities.

''(d) STATE-INITIATED EVALUATIONS.—A State shall be eligible to receive funding to evaluate the State program funded under this part or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i)) if—

''(1) the State submits to the Secretary a description of the proposed evaluation;

''(2) the Secretary determines that the design and approach of the proposed evaluation is rigorous and is likely to yield information that is credible and will be useful to other States; and

''(3) unless waived by the Secretary, the State contributes to the cost of the evaluation, from non-Federal sources, an amount equal to at least 25 percent of the cost of the proposed evaluation.

''(e) CENSUS BUREAU RESEARCH.—

''(1) The Bureau of the Census shall implement or enhance household surveys of program participation, in consultation with the Secretary and the Burueau of Labor Statistics and made available to interested parties,

to allow for the assessment of the outcomes of continued welfare reform on the economic and child well-being of low-income families with children, including those who received assistance or services from a State program funded under this part or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i)). The content of the surveys should include such information as may be necessary to examine the issues of unmarried childbearing, marriage, welfare dependency and compliance with work requirements, the beginning and ending of spells of assistance, work, earnings and employment stability, and the well-being of children.

''(2) To carry out the activities specified in paragraph (1), the Bureau of the Census, the Secretary, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall consider ways to improve the surveys and data derived from the surveys to—

''(A) address underreporting of the receipt of means-tested benefits and tax benefits for low-income individuals and families;

''(B) increase understanding of poverty spells and long-term poverty, including by facilitating the matching of information to better understand intergenerational poverty;

''(C) generate a better geographical understanding of poverty such as through State-based estimates and measures of neighborhood poverty;

''(D) increase understanding of the effects of means-tested benefits and tax benefits on the earnings of low-income families; and

''(E) improve how poverty and economic well-being are measured, including through the use of consumption measures.

''(f) RESEARCH AND EVALUATION CONDUCTED UNDER THIS SECTION.—Research and evaluation conducted under this section designed to determine the effects of a program or policy (other than research conducted under subsection (e)) shall use experimental designs using random assignment or other reliable, evidence-based research methodologies that allow for the strongest possible causal inferences when random assignment is not feasible.

''(g) DEVELOPMENT OF WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE OF PROVEN AND PROMISING APPROACHES TO MOVE WELFARE RECIPIENTS INTO WORK.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall develop a database (which shall be referred to as the 'What Works Clearinghouse of Proven and Promising Projects to Move Welfare Recipients into Work') of the projects that used a proven approach or a promising approach in moving welfare recipients into work, based on independent, rigorous evaluations of the projects. The database shall include a separate listing of projects that used a developmental approach in delivering services and a further separate listing of the projects with no or negative effects. The Secretary shall add to the What Works Clearinghouse of Proven and Promising Projects to Move Welfare Recipients into Work data about the projects that, based on an independent, well-conducted experimental evaluation of a program or project, using random assignment or other research methodologies that allow for the strongest possible causal inferences, have shown they are proven, promising, developmental, or ineffective approaches.

''(2) CRITERIA FOR EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS OF APPROACH.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor and organizations with experience in evaluating research on the effectiveness of various approaches in delivering services to move welfare recipients into work, shall—

''(A) establish criteria for evidence of effectiveness; and

''(B) ensure that the process for establishing the criteria—

''(i) is transparent;

''(ii) is consistent across agencies;

''(iii) provides opportunity for public comment; and

''(iv) takes into account efforts of Federal agencies to identify and publicize effective interventions, including efforts at the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Education, and the Department of Justice.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) APPROACH.—The term 'approach' means a process, product, strategy, or practice that is—

''(i) research-based, based on the results of 1 or more empirical studies, and linked to program-determined outcomes; and

''(ii) evaluated using rigorous research designs.

''(B) PROVEN APPROACH.—The term 'proven approach' means an approach that—

''(i) meets the requirements of a promising approach; and

''(ii) has demonstrated significant positive outcomes at more than 1 site in terms of increasing work and earnings of participants, reducing poverty and dependence, or strengthening families.

''(C) PROMISING APPROACH.—The term 'promising approach' means an approach—

''(i) that meets the requirements of subparagraph (D)(i);

''(ii) that has been evaluated using well-designed and rigorous randomized controlled or quasi-experimental research designs;

''(iii) that has demonstrated significant positive outcomes at only 1 site in terms of increasing work and earnings of participants, reducing poverty and dependence, or strengthening families; and

''(iv) under which the benefits of the positive outcomes have exceeded the costs of achieving the outcomes.

''(D) DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH.—The term 'developmental approach' means an approach that—

''(i) is research-based, grounded in relevant empirically-based knowledge, and linked to program-determined outcomes;

''(ii) is evaluated using rigorous research designs; and

''(iii) has yet to demonstrate a significant positive outcome in terms of increasing work and earnings of participants in a cost-effective way.

''(h) APPROPRIATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount appropriated by section 403(a)(1) for each fiscal year, 0.33 percent shall be available for research and evaluation under this section.

''(2) ALLOCATION.—Of the amount made available under paragraph (1) for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall make available $10,000,000 plus such additional amount as the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate, to carry out subsection (e).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 403(a)(1)(B) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(1)(B)) is amended by inserting '', reduced by the percentage specified in section 413(h) with respect to the fiscal year,'' before ''as the amount''.

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM COORDINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 411(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 611(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget and considering State government perspectives, by rule, designate data exchange standards to govern, under this part—

''(A) necessary categories of information that State agencies operating programs under State plans approved under this part are required under applicable Federal law to electronically exchange with another State agency; and

''(B) Federal reporting and data exchange required under applicable Federal law.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The data exchange standards required by paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable—

''(A) incorporate a widely accepted, nonproprietary, searchable, computer-readable format, such as the eXtensible Markup Language;

''(B) contain interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model;

''(C) incorporate interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance;

''(D) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

''(E) be implemented in a manner that is cost-effective and improves program efficiency and effectiveness; and

''(F) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a change to existing data exchange standards found to be effective and efficient.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Not later than the date that is 24 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue a proposed rule that—

(1) identifies federally required data exchanges, include specification and timing of exchanges to be standardized, and address the factors used in determining whether and when to standardize data exchanges; and

(2) specifies State implementation options and describes future milestones.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2016.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 5170, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For all our best intentions, we too often see government programs fail both the constituencies they are intended to help and the taxpayers who fund them.

Thousands of families across this country continue to be trapped, generation after generation, in programs that were well intended but are now ineffective or outdated. Our social safety net has instead become a poverty trap

and not the springboard to prosperity we once envisioned.

Our constituents, all Americans, deserve better. They need their Federal Government working together with their communities to focus on how we can help members of our society successfully climb that ladder out of poverty, not just check them off as another individual served.

By changing the Federal Government's definition of success in Federal social programs, from inputs to actual outcomes, we can help our fellow Americans overcome the root causes of poverty and seize economic opportunities to work and provide for our families. It is this shift in focus, this focus from inputs to outcomes, that could substantially transform our safety net to better serve our most vulnerable.

The Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act does just that. It empowers States, local governments, nonprofits, and the private sector to scale up evidence-based interventions that address our Nation's most pressing social challenges.

This legislation would foster the creation of public-private partnerships that harness philanthropic and other private-sector investments so we can expand and replicate scientifically proven social and public health programs. Because social impact partnerships are focused on achieving real results, government dollars are paid out only when desired outcomes are met.

Furthermore, this legislation would reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program at current spending levels for 1 year as well as build evidence on our efforts to help our most needy families find jobs and achieve self-sufficiency by cataloging the best evidence-based approaches.

The What Works Clearinghouse would make it easier for States to know which approaches have been tested using independent, rigorous evaluations and, based on those results, an understanding of their effectiveness in achieving positive results for individuals and families.

By cataloging the different approaches States are taking in helping welfare recipients move into work, we can help empower well-intentioned policymakers across all levels of government to improve lives through evidence-based policymaking.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, TANF, program expires at the end of September. We need to extend this program, and this legislation accomplishes that goal; but we have so much more to do.

Once TANF is temporarily extended, our committee and this Congress should work toward a more comprehensive review and reauthorization of the program. We need to make sure that spending under TANF is focused on the core missions of helping needy families and promoting work. We need to further open opportunities to education and training so that TANF recipients can prepare for and find good jobs. And we need to ensure that adequate child care and other supports are available for low-income parents in the workforce.

Of course, if we are serious about reducing poverty, improving TANF must be part of a broader agenda that seeks to help Americans endeavoring to help themselves. We should substantially increase the minimum wage for hard-working Americans, expanding the earned income tax credit to childless workers, and expanding access to affordable housing. By the way, those are inputs that relate to outputs and outcomes. And we should be building on successful programs like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the Social Services Block Grant, and the Affordable Care Act.

Instead, the agenda we have seen from the Republican leadership of this House is to block meaningful improvements or, even worse, to gut programs that now provide opportunities for Americans. Eliminating the Social Services Block Grant, as Republicans propose, will make child care less available, making it harder for low-income parents to go to work. Cutting funding for education and training, as the Republican budget suggests, would have the same effect of blocking a path to work. And repealing the Affordable Care Act, as Republicans have voted repeatedly to do, would make it harder for people to move into work and to move between jobs. Republicans say they support work, but time and time again, they oppose work supports.

The programs that arose out of the war on poverty reduced poverty by over 40 percent, despite erroneous claims to the contrary by some of our Republican colleagues. However, at the same time, we still have 47 million Americans who live in poverty. These struggling families deserve real action, not more of the same old failed policies and empty rhetoric that we have heard in the report from the Republican House Poverty Task Force several weeks ago. And they certainly deserve better than huge cuts to programs they depend on.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill because it extends the TANF program, a necessary program for low-income families. The bill also includes a 1-year allocation to test social impact partnerships in which the private, nonprofit, and government sectors attempt to come together to address certain social problems.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be managed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), ranking member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. As someone who was raised by a single mother when my father passed when I was 2 years old, and having 11 older brothers and sisters, poverty is something that I know firsthand and that we have seen firsthand in our household.

As we go forward and we deal with extending TANF cash welfare for 1 year, I think what Mr. YOUNG of Indiana has done is try to put forward innovative ideas that change the dialogue, that change the debate when it comes to our antipoverty measures out of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, no longer should we measure the success of a program just by the amount of money we spend on that program, but measure it by the lives that are positively changed.

□ 1745

That is what this social impact bonding legislation is all about. It is rewarding and standing with people who are moving out of poverty, standing on their own two feet.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this critical legislation as we care for those young men and women, as well as those adults who live in poverty, and break that cycle once and for all.

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

The bill which Mr. YOUNG brings to the floor this afternoon concerns five-tenths of 1 percent of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. I want to talk about the other 99.5 percent, and I will address the 0.5 percent—the five-tenths—a little later.

Overall, this legislation perpetuates the myth of compassionate conservatism that was originally spun by George W. Bush. It involves a Republican strategy that we have seen over the last few weeks to block every single Democratic proposal that would reform welfare to work, or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families as it is formally known.

I favor full reform of TANF, to pursue the original objectives of the 1996 welfare reform that I supported to end generational poverty and help poor Americans who are not physically able to work. TANF would permit them to climb up the economic ladder into the middle class while supporting those who are unable to work.

Instead, what we are presented is one modest, unproven social experiment paid for at the expense of poor children. Over the last 20 years, the total resources that are available to get people from welfare to work have steadily declined. Today's legislation is just one more small cut to those resources.

Republicans previously terminated one major part of TANF that helped States with poor populations, like Texas, whacking out $319 million from

the program. What we have left with TANF today is about one-third of the purchasing power that it had 20 years ago when we adopted the reform. In Texas, about 1 in 20 children receive assistance from TANF. Folks who need a life vest are instead given an anchor.

While it may have had some initial positive impact, the 1996 welfare law has become an example of a failed Federal block grant program. Through the years, the States have diverted more and more moneys that were intended to support poor mothers finding the education and training that they needed and the childcare and placement services they needed to go out and have the dignity of a livable wage, longterm job, and now the States are spending, on average, 8 cents of every dollar on work and another 16 cents on child care.

To the extent that President Johnson's War on Poverty has not been fully won, much of the responsibility goes to those who refuse to fight, who surrendered at the first obstacle, who engaged in passive resistance, and, in places like Texas, who just abandoned the field of battle when it came to protecting their poorest citizens. Clearly, the social safety net that TANF was supposed to be has become mostly hole and little net.

If this is a poverty trap, as we have heard, it is because our Republican colleagues have shut the door on any efforts to unlock it with the exception of this one bill. Now with their recently announced poverty plan, they want to take the same kind of thinking—these failed block grants—and apply it to the national school lunch program, apply it to Medicaid, and according to one of their exhibits, to everything from Pell grants to cervical cancer, blocking it all together, and then putting the victims on the chopping block.

Beginning last summer, I encouraged now-Speaker RYAN and other Republicans to support a reform, basically saying to them: I know you are not going to give another dime to help the poor, but at least ask the States to use the moneys that they already have from the Federal Government to accomplish the law's original objectives and stop diverting this money to plug budget loopholes. Unfortunately, TANF is still a welfare program, but it is Republican Governors, largely, who are on the dole, who take this Federal money and don't use it for the purposes for which it was originally intended.

Last year, even Speaker RYAN recognized that existing TANF limitations impair the ability of the poor to get the educational opportunities that they need to get good jobs. Five Republicans, including a couple from our committee, offered the Preparing More Welfare Recipients for Work Act, which doubled the time that was permitted for educational training to count as a work activity, and as one of them—our colleague, Mr. TIBERI—said, these commonsense reforms streamline and simplify complicated work requirements, leading to higher enrollment in work or job training programs. It was common sense then, but as soon as it was attacked by rightwing ideologues, they ran away from it.

Republicans could join us in reforming TANF to make it a true pathway to work and into the middle class, but they have declined to do that. Instead of offering a reauthorization, they split TANF up into six pieces that did not continue it. Part of the same package that hasn't been brought to the floor this afternoon are two other bills.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD our dissenting views to those bills.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 17, 2016.

DISSENTING VIEWS FOR H.R. 2959

What began as a legislative step forward has become a step backward. What did some modest good, now does harm. As introduced, the TANF Accountability and Integrity Improvement Act (H.R. 2959) would have closed a loophole that a few states have created and exploited to avoid providing their state match for the federal TANF block grant. This loophole unfairly misapplies third-party spending as if it were state spending.

The non-partisan General Accountability Office (GAO) has criticized this wrongful approach, which shortchanges poor children and their parents. I fully support the bill's complete closure of this loophole that only a few states exploit to avoid providing their fair share of support for moving their impoverished residents from welfare to work.

Unfortunately, only hours prior to the Committee markup, this bill was amended to do the opposite of what it originally would have accomplished. As amended, it legalizes this unfair loophole by grandfathering in current offenders. Now it does little more than prevent other states from following the leadership of a few pioneers in abuse. Why reward those states who balance their books on the backs of those least able to bear the burden?

According to the GAO, Georgia is the chief offender, with nearly 60 percent of its TANF contributions coming from private entities. Not only is it not making its proper match to access federal funds, but Georgia also consistently ignores the needs of its poorest citizens. For every TANF dollar, Georgia uses 80 cents for in ways that ignore the core purposes of TANF—work, direct assistance and child care.

The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) should have already initiated action to close this unjustified loophole. As amended, the bill would now prevent HHS from collecting this abuse. It should be rejected.

LLOYD DOGGETT.
JIM MCDERMOTT.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 27, 2016.

DISSENTING VIEWS FOR H.R. 2952

The Committee has considered multiple bills regarding Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) without actually extending TANF, which expires in four months. The reason for so many different TANF bills and a refusal to consider an extension in Committee is to block Members from offering genuine reforms of TANF designed to make it function more effectively, to avoid state diversion of TANF funds away from core TANF purposes, and to do more to help TANF recipients move into good, sustainable jobs. This is accomplished through a maneuver claiming that any significant reform that any member proposes is not germane to any of the narrow bills in question. Indeed, the Committee refused to consider an amendment that would simply have extended the expiring TANF program for another fiscal year on grounds that it was not germane.

This particular part of the Republican TANF package concerns data on wages and employment status, but unfortunately a belated amendment to it would make that data a less accurate measure of the effectiveness of State efforts to move people into work. The revised bill manipulates numbers, creating the misimpression that those who cannot work because of age or disability refuse to work. Furthermore, this bill does not provide a measure of the percentage of those leaving TANF who have found work. It would be insightful to learn whether a state has simply forced an individual off TANF or actually helped them to secure a job through which they can support their family.

We strongly support an accurate employment outcomes measure that can offer insight regarding whether state programs are really malcing a difference in moving people from welfare to real, wage-paying, longterm employment and providing opportunity for individuals to work their way out of poverty. This bill's flaws undercut that goal, and unfortunately the Majority rejected an amendment that would have corrected these shortcomings.

Representatives Sander Levin, Charles B. Rangel, John Lewis, Xavier Becerra, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Lloyd Doggett, Jim McDermott, Richard E. Neal, Earl Blumenauer, John B. Larson, Ron Kind, Danny Davis, Mike Thompson, Joseph Crowley, Linda Sanchez.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would say that what we have here is an attempt to also add by amendment the very reauthorization that I sought to offer in committee that was blocked then. I guess today will be the first time even our Republican colleagues learn what has been done with this authorization.

Overall, what we have had is a Republican roadblock to real welfare reform and poverty reduction that this Congress should be focused on, and it obviously will take a new President and a new Congress to do it. Like the compassionate conservatism of George W. Bush, Republicans are offering us a slogan, not a solution.

The same day that they rejected our efforts to deal with this issue, they were all about more tax breaks. Their poverty agenda is a collection of retreads that offer little hope for change. It only demonstrates that their approach to poverty is indeed impoverished.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my good friend from Indiana for yielding and for his work on this important legislation. I also want to thank my good friend from Maryland, who has also put a lot of work into what I think is really a unique piece of legislation. I want to make sure that I rise in support of the Social

Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act.

This reform-minded legislation, Mr. Speaker, is so important because it offers a fresh approach for the way that the Federal Government assists those who are truly in need. It focuses our efforts on evidence-based reforms.

How refreshing is that?

We spend a tremendous amount of money, Mr. Speaker, trying to make sure that we are giving people an opportunity to get out from being impoverished. We have too many people today, Mr. Speaker, around the country who are fighting poverty. This actually brings entrepreneurs, nonprofits, and the government together to actually solve these problems.

The Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act is a bipartisan solution that rewards and promotes programs that actually help individuals achieve positive outcomes. It actually helps and relieves the taxpayers a tremendous burden. No longer are the taxpayers on the hook for failed programs. This actually is providing the opportunity for entrepreneurs and those who are in the nonprofit sector to also play a role in trying to actually come up with unique solutions in very different ways in State-by-State outcomes. This innovative piece of legislation will give the States more flexibility to be creative with TANF dollars and establish approaches that will uniquely address the problems facing local communities.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will also serve as an extension of the TANF program to make sure that we continue to provide necessary assistance to individuals looking to achieve self-sufficiency through job training and education.

The challenges we face in fighting poverty are clearly steep. We know that in the War on Poverty, we have spent over $22 trillion to move the needle from 15 percent in poverty to 14.6 percent in poverty. We need to start thinking creatively about how can we focus on outcomes, how can we get more people off of the unemployment rolls, how can we get more people off the TANF rolls, off the welfare rolls. This is a program, this is an idea, a bipartisan reform that is going to focus on outcomes and will help start solving the problem. It does require meaningful action.

I believe that the American Dream revolves around the idea that each and every one of us has something positive to contribute to our great Nation. This legislation is a step in the right direction in helping individuals reach their full potential, and gives States flexibility.

Again, I want to go back and I want to thank my good friend from Maryland for his work on this and my friend from Indiana for, again, working in a bipartisan way to start thinking outside of the box. The government doesn't always have the solution, and we need to leverage nonprofits. We need to leverage those who are working out there and bringing unique ideas to the fold.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), a leading advocate for social impact financing and, I know, a partner of Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and colleague from Texas for yielding me this time, and I want to express my support for his comments and associate myself with his comments. He has been a singular champion of the TANF program and the goals that it represents. I appreciate his work and the opportunity to work with him on this bill.

I also want to thank my good friend and colleague from Indiana. We have spent a considerable amount of time working on this piece of legislation together, talking to groups, and he has been a wonderful champion and it has been a real pleasure to work with him on this concept.

Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress, I spent my whole career as an entrepreneur in the private sector building businesses. The one thing I would observe from that experience whenever I would travel around the United States, or around the world for that matter, whenever you saw good economic outcomes and broad-based prosperity for the citizens, you always found a situation where the government, the nonprofit sector, and the private sector worked well together to solve the problems in society, and it is that spirit that animates the social impact partnership that we are here to discuss this evening.

If you think about what is going on in the world today, Mr. Speaker, and the changes that are playing out in our economy based on technological innovation and global interconnection, you realize that it has helped many of our citizens and it has helped billions of people around the world, but it has also hurt many of our citizens. It happened too fast; we weren't quite prepared for it; and chronic and vexing issues like poverty, educational disparities, income and opportunity disparities have only grown based on these trends.

To make a difference against these problems, Mr. Speaker, we need to do several things. First, we need to invest. You cannot definitionally make transformative changes, whether it be in the private sector or the public sector, unless you make investments.

The second thing we need, Mr. Speaker, is we need innovation. We need the best ideas to be applied against some of these very difficult challenges that we have.

Mr. Speaker, we also need a new sense and spirit of collaboration and cooperation among all the stakeholders because the government right now has three significant problems when it tries to tackle these issues.

The first problem it has is a funding problem. Whether it is the condition of the Federal budget or the State budget, it is very difficult for the government to make investments.

The second issue the government has is an innovation problem. Mr. Speaker, I think we all know that the government has never been the incubator necessarily of great innovation. It has been good at investing, but we find more innovation often outside of government. Right now that gap is growing. So the government has an innovation problem.

The third problem the government has is a transparency problem. I used to say in business that if you can't measure it, you can't manage it. And we are not getting enough data in terms of a positive feedback loop to look at some of these issues and see what works and what doesn't work. That is why Pay for Success frameworks and social impact partnerships can make such a big difference because it solves those problems, it creates pathways for more capital, more investments to flow from the nonprofit sector or the private sector against issues that have traditionally been funded by the government.

□ 1800

It creates pathways for innovation and best ideas and new ideas to flow into the government sector, and it creates a pathway and a framework for more transparency and more metrics as it relates to what the results are.

Whether it is supplied against early childhood education, recidivism issues, chronic healthcare issues like asthma, whatever the framework can be, this approach can create an opportunity for more investment, which we need; more innovation, which we need; greater metrics and transparency, which we need; and a renewed spirit of cooperation between the government, the private sector, and the nonprofit sector to make a difference against these problems, which is why I am very supportive of the social impact partnership framework, the Pay for Success framework.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, but I also encourage my colleagues to think seriously about what my colleague from Texas said about the larger TANF program, because there is so much more to be done.

I do believe launching the social impact partnership framework can lead to transformative changes against these very, very difficult issues and create a situation where prosperity is shared more broadly and there is more opportunity for Americans, particularly our American colleagues who have been so affected negatively by some of the larger changes that are going on in the world.

I encourage adoption of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR), my colleague.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act.

As founding co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Social Investment Taskforce, I believe that we can harness the power of market forces and private capital to solve local problems, benefit American taxpayers, and uplift communities. This bill will encourage the private sector to invest in some of the most pressing challenges we face as a nation.

I believe in the power of government to be a force for good, but after 30 years in business, I tremendously believe in the untapped potential of the private market to solve problems. The goal of this bill is to unleash that power of the private sector to work with local governments and communities.

This bill is based on the pay for results model, in which Federal funds are only spent when measurable results have been achieved. Instead of simply creating more government programs, this saves taxpayer dollars by ensuring funds are only spent on successful programs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative TODD YOUNG and my fellow co-chair of the taskforce, Representative JOHN DELANEY, for introducing this important legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this.

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

I salute and appreciate the commitment of Mr. YOUNG and Mr. DELANEY to seek new ways to try to combat some old problems. We need creativity to address these challenges. There is no one single approach that will solve all these problems. Where I disagree with them is over how they choose to fund this initiative—a choice that I think they probably personally did not make—and the lack of safeguards to assure their very laudable objectives.

This bill takes money that has always been dedicated to benefit vulnerable children away from the Department of Health and Human Services and authorized its expenditure for other purposes that may be very well intentioned, but that have absolutely nothing to do with vulnerable children.

Now is not the time to further reduce this funding for needy children just because it happens to be an easy place to take money from. It is only $100 million, only five-tenths of a percent of the total TANF budget, but I can tell you that it is hard to come by $100 million to do anything to try to help vulnerable children, and it is a loss to have that money taken away.

It is true that President Obama finally, after almost 8 years of his administration, proposed that the contingency fund be repurposed and that money be added to family assistance grants and require the States to use more of the resources they get from TANF for the purposes of TANF to prevent two-generational poverty. The President's approach was to use the TANF contingency fund for a pathway to jobs initiative and a generational poverty initiative, not to take it out for other purposes. Today, this contingency fund is simply viewed as the easiest place to get money for what is not an evidence-based approach, but may still have merit.

In committee, I sought to protect at least some of these moneys for children. I appreciate the fact that Mr. YOUNG and Mr. DELANEY have been receptive and have incorporated in the amended version today a measure that will assure that at least half of the money taken away from TANF is allocated for children, with the focus being on helping those poor children who would otherwise have benefited from the money had it stayed with TANF.

Social impact financing offers the potential of greater private investment and resources to tackle some of the serious social ills that our country confronts. Without approving any new legislation, there is no restriction right now on any of our States from going out and using TANF money for social impact financing, so long as they focus on the statutory purposes of TANF. If these laboratories of democracy can do it already, then I think that is probably sufficient.

I do know that there are a number of young entrepreneurs with a social conscience—a number of them I have talked with in Austin, Texas—who want to apply their talents to resolve ills that they see around them. There are a number of feasibility studies already underway in Austin concerning some of the problems that we have in Texas.

But not everyone who applies for these funds will have the outlook of Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DELANEY, some of our colleagues who have come to the floor, and some of these young entrepreneurs because, unfortunately, with the starving of our social service and educational sector, one community after another is so desperate for funds to fight child abuse or neglect that they are willing to do almost anything that they might be sold upon.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD a list of safeguards that I hope the gentlemen will consider as this bill proceeds to the Senate.

In designing a new program with $100 million in taxpayer funds, which is designed to ultimately attract many additional taxpayer funds, to an initiative that is not evidence-based, we need to ensure that those dollars are not squandered. And after the Wall Street bailouts, many Americans question whether Wall Street is the place to turn to address social challenges. We have to consider the possibility of the unscrupulous offering false hope to a desperate local community.

In Committee, I raised a list of questions about the lack of adequate safeguards. A state or locality may encounter substantial costs in administering the programs, between fees owed to intermediaries, service providers, evaluators and the like. This bill caps the amount that may be expended on feasibility studies to evaluate a social impact financing proposal, but it places no cap on underwriting costs, which Wall Street firms can charge. The bill puts no limit on the returns an investor can gain in one of these projects. It has no limit on who can determine what "success" is in one of these proposals. This bill fails to require a clear cost/benefit analysis that includes as a cost the cost of any related feasibility study.

Even without proper safeguards, it is far from certain how many proposals will actually qualify for funding under this bill. Indeed, the Congressional Budget Office notes that "because there is uncertainty as to the extent states conducting the projects will achieve the measurable outcomes required for federal reimbursement, CBO estimates that not all of the funds reserved for the program will be spent.

House Republicans have been so eager to gain approval of any new idea they can claim responds to poverty and related social needs that this proposal has emerged without careful evaluation. Hopefully, the Senate in its legislative process can correct some of these shortcomings, and the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget can include additional safeguards in implementing this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bipartisan, bicameral bill was developed over the course of 2 years, incorporating feedback from a variety of stakeholders, ranging from State and local governments to child welfare organizations.

I want to thank these stakeholders, as well as give very special recognition to my colleague, Congressman DELANEY, my Democratic colleague from Maryland, for his leadership and partnership with me on this initiative.

I would also be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the substantial and impressive efforts of members of our staff, from the Ways and Means committee staff, Ryan Martin, to my own personal office staff, Jaymi Light, who literally authored this legislation—we went through about 50 different versions until we got it right—to Xan Fishman of Congressman DELANEY's staff, for his hard work. This was a team effort. This is the sort of big idea, bipartisan teamwork we need more of in Washington, D.C. All of you have helped make it happen here today.

I want to thank my fellow Ways and Means colleagues who are cosponsors of this legislation for their leadership and continued support.

Social impact partnerships address our moral responsibilities to ensure that social programs actually improve recipients' lives, and do so in a fiscally prudent manner. But they also respond to the imperative of improving our economic health by harnessing the capabilities of every able-bodied citizen. Our safety net must reflect our country's belief that, without exception, Americans aren't liabilities to be written off but, instead, assets to be realized.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5170, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS HEALTH CARE RELIEF ACT OF 2016

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5447) to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5447

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Health Care Relief Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. EXCEPTION FROM GROUP HEALTH PLAN REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 AND THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9831 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) EXCEPTION FOR QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title (except as provided in section 4980I(f)(4) and notwithstanding any other provision of this title), the term 'group health plan' shall not include any qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement.

''(2) QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement' means an arrangement which—

''(i) is described in subparagraph (B), and

''(ii) is provided on the same terms to all eligible employees of the eligible employer.

''(B) ARRANGEMENT DESCRIBED.—An arrangement is described in this subparagraph if—

''(i) such arrangement is funded solely by an eligible employer and no salary reduction contributions may be made under such arrangement,

''(ii) such arrangement provides, after the employee provides proof of coverage, for the payment of, or reimbursement of, an eligible employee for expenses for medical care (as defined in section 213(d)) incurred by the eligible employee or the eligible employee's family members (as determined under the terms of the arrangement), and

''(iii) the amount of payments and reimbursements described in clause (ii) for any year do not exceed $5,130 ($10,260 in the case of an arrangement that also provides for payments or reimbursements for family members of the employee).

''(C) CERTAIN VARIATION PERMITTED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), an arrangement shall not fail to be treated as provided on the same terms to each eligible employee merely because the employee's permitted benefits under such arrangement vary in accordance with the variation in the price of an insurance policy in the relevant individual health insurance market based on—

''(i) the age of the eligible employee (and, in the case of an arrangement which covers medical expenses of the eligible employee's family members, the age of such family members), or

''(ii) the number of family members of the eligible employee the medical expenses of which are covered under such arrangement.

The variation permitted under the preceding sentence shall be determined by reference to the same insurance policy with respect to all eligible employees.

''(D) RULES RELATING TO MAXIMUM DOLLAR LIMITATION.—

''(i) AMOUNT PRORATED IN CERTAIN CASES.—In the case of an individual who is not covered by an arrangement for the entire year, the limitation under subparagraph (A)(iii) for such year shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount which would (but for this clause) be in effect for such individual for such year under subparagraph (A)(iii) as the number of months for which such individual is covered by the arrangement for such year bears to 12.

''(ii) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any year beginning after 2016, each of the dollar amounts in subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(I) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(II) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2015' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

If any dollar amount increased under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of $100, such dollar amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $100.

''(3) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.—The term 'eligible employee' means any employee of an eligible employer, except that the terms of the arrangement may exclude from consideration employees described in any clause of section 105(h)(3)(B) (applied by substituting '90 days' for '3 years' in clause (i) thereof).

''(B) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.—The term 'eligible employer' means an employer that—

''(i) is not an applicable large employer as defined in section 4980H(c)(2), and

''(ii) does not offer a group health plan to any of its employees.

''(C) PERMITTED BENEFIT.—The term 'permitted benefit' means, with respect to any eligible employee, the maximum dollar amount of payments and reimbursements which may be made under the terms of the qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement for the year with respect to such employee.

''(4) NOTICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer funding a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement for any year shall, not later than 90 days before the beginning of such year (or, in the case of an employee who is not eligible to participate in the arrangement as of the beginning of such year, the date on which such employee is first so eligible), provide a written notice to each eligible employee which includes the information described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) CONTENTS OF NOTICE.—The notice required under subparagraph (A) shall include each of the following:

''(i) A statement of the amount which would be such eligible employee's permitted benefits under the arrangement for the year.

''(ii) A statement that the eligible employee should provide the information described in clause (i) to any health insurance exchange to which the employee applies for advance payment of the premium assistance tax credit.

''(iii) A statement that if the employee is not covered under minimum essential coverage for any month the employee may be subject to tax under section 5000A for such month and reimbursements under the arrangement may be includible in gross income.''.

(2) LIMITATION ON EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME.—Section 106 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENT.—For purposes of this section and section 105, payments or reimbursements from a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)) of an individual for medical care (as defined in section 213(d)) shall not be treated as paid or reimbursed under employer-provided coverage for medical expenses under an accident or health plan if for the month in which such medical care is provided the individual does not have minimum essential coverage (within the meaning of section 5000A(f)).''.

(3) COORDINATION WITH HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUM CREDIT.—Section 36B(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) SPECIAL RULES FOR QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'coverage month' shall not include any month with respect to an employee (or any spouse or dependent of such employee) if for such month the employee is provided a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement which constitutes affordable coverage.

''(B) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—In the case of any employee who is provided a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement for any coverage month (determined without regard to subparagraph (A)), the credit otherwise allowable under subsection (a) to the taxpayer for such month shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount described in subparagraph (C)(i)(II) for such month.

''(C) AFFORDABLE COVERAGE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement shall be treated as constituting affordable coverage for a month if—

''(i) the excess of—

''(I) the amount that would be paid by the employee as the premium for such month for self-only coverage under the second lowest cost silver plan offered in the relevant individual health insurance market, over

''(II) 1/12 of the employee's permitted benefit (as defined in section 9831(d)(3)(C)) under such arrangement, does not exceed—

''(ii) 1/12 of 9.5 percent of the employee's household income.

''(D) QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement' has the meaning given such term by section 9831(d)(2).

''(E) COVERAGE FOR LESS THAN ENTIRE YEAR.—In the case of an employee who is provided a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement for less than an entire year, subparagraph (C)(i)(II) shall be applied by substituting 'the number of months during the year for which such arrangement was provided' for '12'.

''(F) INDEXING.—In the case of plan years beginning in any calendar year after 2014, the Secretary shall adjust the 9.5 percent amount under subparagraph (C)(ii) in the same manner as the percentages are adjusted under subsection (b)(3)(A)(ii).''.

(4) APPLICATION OF EXCISE TAX ON HIGH COST EMPLOYER-SPONSORED HEALTH COVERAGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 4980I(f)(4) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Section 9831(d)(1) shall not apply for purposes of this section.''.

(B) DETERMINATION OF COST OF COVERAGE.—Section 4980I(d)(2) of such Code is amended by

redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E) and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

''(D) QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.—In the case of applicable employer-sponsored coverage consisting of coverage under any qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2)), the cost of coverage shall be equal to the amount described in section 6051(a)(15).''.

(5) ENFORCEMENT OF NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—Section 6652 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(o) FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICES WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.—In the case of each failure to provide a written notice as required by section 9831(d)(4), unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect, there shall be paid, on notice and demand of the Secretary and in the same manner as tax, by the person failing to provide such written notice, an amount equal to $50 per employee per incident of failure to provide such notice, but the total amount imposed on such person for all such failures during any calendar year shall not exceed $2,500.''.

(6) REPORTING.—

(A) W–2 REPORTING.—Section 6051(a) of such Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (14) and inserting '', and'', and by inserting after paragraph (14) the following new paragraph:

''(15) the total amount of permitted benefit (as defined in section 9831(d)(3)(C)) for the year under a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2)) with respect to the employee.''.

(B) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED BY EXCHANGE SUBSIDY APPLICANTS.—Section 1411(b)(3) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) CERTAIN INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE POLICIES OBTAINED THROUGH SMALL EMPLOYERS.—The amount of the enrollee's permitted benefit (as defined in section 9831(d)(3)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) under a qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2) of such Code).''.

(7) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to years beginning after the earlier of—

(i) the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(ii) December 31, 2016.

(B) TRANSITION RELIEF.—The relief under Treasury Notice 2015–17 shall be treated as applying to any plan year beginning on or before the date described in subparagraph (A).

(C) COORDINATION WITH HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUM CREDIT.—The amendments made by paragraph (3) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date described in subparagraph (A).

(D) EMPLOYEE NOTICE.—The amendments made by paragraph (5) shall apply to notices with respect to years beginning after the date described in subparagraph (A).

(E) W–2 REPORTING.—The amendments made by paragraph (6)(A) shall apply to calendar years beginning after December 31, 2016.

(F) INFORMATION PROVIDED BY EXCHANGE SUBSIDY APPLICANTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by paragraph (6)(B) shall apply to applications for enrollment made after the date described in subparagraph (A).

(ii) VERIFICATION.—Verification under section 1411 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of information provided under section 1411(b)(3)(B) of such Act shall apply with respect to months beginning after October 2016.

(8) SUBSTANTIATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or his designee) may issue substantiation requirements as necessary to carry out this subsection.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 733(a)(1) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1191b(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Such term shall not include any qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).''.

(2) EXCEPTION FROM CONTINUATION COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS, ETC.—Section 607(1) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1167(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Such term shall not include any qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after the date described in subsection (a)(7)(A).

(c) AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2791(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–91(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Except for purposes of part C of title XI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d et seq.), such term shall not include any qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).''.

(2) EXCEPTION FROM CONTINUATION COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 2208(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300bb–8(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Such term shall not include any qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangement (as defined in section 9831(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after the date described in subsection (a)(7)(A).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5447, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to stand here before you to offer this bill.

This is a very important bill, H.R. 5447, the Small Business Health Care Relief Act. It is bipartisan legislation that has been more than 2 years in the making.

Mr. Speaker, as a small-business owner and a heart surgeon, I understand how important coverage is to get good, high-quality health care. But I also understand, from the standpoint of being a small-business owner, how difficult it often is and how expensive it has become to provide this kind of coverage for employees.

In 2013, Treasury issued regulatory guidance indicating that any employer offering health reimbursement accounts, also known as HRAs, was in violation of the Affordable Care Act group health plan requirements, irrespective of the size of the employer. The very smallest of small businesses were affected by this, businesses that were trying to help their employees, doing the very best they can to help their employees have coverage.

Furthermore, Treasury's guidance included an astronomically high penalty fine assessed on employers offering these HRAs: $100 per day per employee, with the potential of accruing a $36,500 fine per year per employee. This is just draconian treatment for small business.

In my home State of Louisiana, small businesses—those with 50 or fewer employees—account for 72 percent of all businesses in Louisiana. Yet only about 30 percent of those small businesses offer a specific group health plan, often citing the full cost of group health plans as the reason for offering nothing. I am sure this is the case all around the country.

We have to help small businesses and their employees afford good coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to my colleague from California, MIKE THOMPSON, for working with me on this bill to give small-business owners an opportunity to financially assist their employees with their health costs.

This legislation will be critical to ensuring that small businesses in Louisiana and around the country have an option that allows them to help their employees afford health coverage and costs. When 65 percent of those in Louisiana who are currently uninsured, indeed, have a full-time worker in their household and nearly three-quarters of all employers in Louisiana are small businesses, it is clear we can do better. This is something that will actually help these small-business owners and their employees get affordable coverage.

Mr. Speaker, the government must not penalize small-business owners for doing the right thing and trying to help employees with the high cost of healthcare coverage, so I urge swift passage of this legislation to empower our small-business owners.

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

□ 1815

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

One of the reforms in the Affordable Care Act banned employer-sponsored health plans from placing annual dollar limits on benefits paid by the plan to a beneficiary. This is good policy, as, for example, we don't want patients with

cancer finding out their insurance company only pays a set amount for their treatment and no more. But it has had the unintended effect of prohibiting stand-alone Health Reimbursement Arrangements because they are employer-sponsored health plans under which benefits are limited to a specified dollar amount.

HRAs are typically used by beneficiaries for out-of-pocket medical expenses such as meeting an insurance plan's annual deductible or co-pays for doctor and other medical provider visits. HRAs can also be used to pay for premiums for health insurance coverage.

The bill before us would permit small employers to offer stand-alone HRAs to their employees, referred to as ''qualified small employer HRA.'' This bill would also permit the use of the qualified small employer HRAs to purchase coverage in the ACA's public marketplaces.

I am pleased to see my Republican colleagues recognizing the benefit of the ACA marketplaces and coverage they offer to millions of Americans. This bill is yet another important way to support the ACA, ensuring more Americans have the health coverage and flexibility they need through the marketplaces. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be controlled by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), one of the sponsors of this bill, and a distinguished member of our committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), who is the chairman of the Physicians Caucus.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Small Business Health Care Relief Act.

I want to thank my colleagues, Dr. BOUSTANY and Representative THOMPSON, for their leadership on this important issue. It is not very often that we have bipartisan legislation that will make a real difference in lowering healthcare costs for working families, and I am pleased to see this bill come to the House floor today.

This legislation is a no-brainer. As a physician with more than 30 years of experience, I have personally seen the need for commonsense reforms that will remove barriers to lower healthcare costs and give Americans more control over their own healthcare decisions.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, I constantly hear from families who are paying higher premiums and out-of-pocket costs for less coverage and lower quality of care. I hear from small-business owners who desperately want to help their employees acquire health insurance, but face costly regulations that make it harder, if not impossible, for them to do so.

Employers of all sizes are implementing innovative solutions to address the rising healthcare costs, and we should do everything we can to support those efforts. Unfortunately, misguided Federal rules too often stand in the way.

Regulatory guidance issued by the IRS that penalizes small businesses who offer stand-alone Health Reimbursement Arrangements is a perfect example. HRAs are popular among both workers and employers. Employers offer HRAs to help their employees pay for health care. In return, families are provided greater flexibility and an opportunity to set aside pre-tax income for medical expenses.

It simply doesn't make sense for the Federal Government to restrict a positive tool aimed at expanding access to affordable healthcare coverage. It is unconscionable that ObamaCare is penalizing small businesses for trying to do the right thing and alleviate the financial burden on working families.

That is why this bill is so important. We need to encourage policies that empower every American with affordable coverage, provide more choice, and promote a healthy workforce. And I hope we can all agree that we should eliminate misguided rules that only make it harder for families and small businesses to obtain healthcare coverage they desperately need.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation which will restore the ability of small businesses to offer HRAs.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Small Business Health Care Relief Act, and I want to thank Dr. BOUSTANY for working with me on this bill. As he pointed out, it is an important bill. It will help a lot of people, businessowners, workers, and families.

The bill that we are considering today is the result of more than a year's worth of close collaboration between stakeholders and policymakers. It is bicameral, it is bipartisan, and it is supported by dozens of small businesses and small-business organizations across the country.

Our Small Business Health Care Relief Act would allow small businesses with fewer than 50 employees, those companies that are not required to provide health care, to offer tax preferred Health Reimbursement Arrangements or HRAs. The HRAs can be used to buy health insurance in the individual market, or pay for qualified health expenses if an individual already has coverage.

Historically, small businesses offered these funds to employees in lieu of group health plans. Most of these companies don't have the capacity to offer employer-sponsored coverage, so the HRAs served as health benefits for their workers.

But right now, businesses are subject to this $100 per person per day fine that was mentioned earlier just for offering this help to their employees. This legislation clarifies that an HRA isn't a group health plan, but a means for helping individuals purchase a health plan for health services.

There is no requirement, as I mentioned, for small companies of 50 or fewer people to provide health insurance. These employers don't offer health benefits because they have to, they do it to support their workforce. We shouldn't be penalizing responsible businessowners who are going above and beyond for their employees.

Instead, we should arm small businesses with the tools that help them recruit great workers and put them on a level playing field with their larger competitors. And we should help to make sure that quality, comprehensive coverage is affordable for folks who don't have access to subsidies or employer-sponsored health care. This bill does all of that.

Small businesses drive job creation. They grow our economy. We should be going out of our way to help them support their employees and focus on what they do best, running their business.

And as was mentioned by our ranking member earlier, this is a prime example of how we should be conducting business in this House. We should be working across the aisle in a bipartisan measure. We should be building on the positive aspects of the Affordable Care Act, and this is an example of doing just that.

Again, Dr. BOUSTANY, thank you for your cooperation and your help and your good work on this.

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

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

Again, I want to thank my colleague, MIKE THOMPSON from California, for his collaboration. I want to thank the Ways and Means staff for working with us to get this legislation done, working with the stakeholders.

I also want to single out some of our staffers who really worked very hard on this: Melissa Gierach, Casey Badmington, and Lakecia Foster. Without their help, we could not have gotten all this put together and seen this legislation through, so I am deeply grateful for their efforts as well.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense change that will expand options, it will increase portability, it will protect small businesses, and it will end these harsh penalties that small businesses were encountering as they were trying to do the right thing. So I urge my colleagues to join me and support H.R. 5447.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letters for the RECORD relating to H.R. 5447.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 13, 2016.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: I write in regard to H.R. 5447, to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements, which was referred in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I wanted to notify you that the Committee will forgo action on H.R. 5447 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 5447 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 5447 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, June 13, 2016.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5447, to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements. As you noted, the Committee on Energy and Commerce was granted an additional referral of the bill.

I am most appreciative of your decision to waive formal consideration of H.R. 5447 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees on any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include a copy of our letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, June 21, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 5447, the Small Business Heath Care Relief Act. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 5447 on those matters within the Committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 5447, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my Committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future. Additionally, I appreciate your committee's assistance with any additional improvements to the bill within the jurisdiction of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on H.R. 5447 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
Chairman.

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

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5447, the ''Small Business Health Care Relief Act.'' As you noted, the Committee on Education and the Workforce was granted an additional referral of the bill.

I am most appreciative of your decision to waive formal consideration of H.R. 5447 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees on any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include a copy of our letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5447, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE WESTERN BALKANS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–143)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2016.

The threat constituted by the actions of persons engaged in, or assisting, sponsoring, or supporting (i) extremist violence in the Republic of Macedonia and elsewhere in the Western Balkans region, or (ii) acts obstructing implementation of the Dayton Accords in Bosnia and Herzegovina or United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 of June 10, 1999, in Kosovo, has not been resolved. In addition, Executive Order 13219 was amended by Executive Order 13304 of May 28, 2003, to take additional steps with respect to acts obstructing implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement of 2001 relating to Macedonia.

Because the acts of extremist violence and obstructionist activity outlined in these Executive Orders are hostile to U.S. interests and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to the Western Balkans.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 21, 2016.*

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO NORTH KOREA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–144)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, expanded in

scope in Executive Order 13551 of August 30, 2010, addressed further in Executive Order 13570 of April 18, 2011, further expanded in scope in Executive Order 13687 of January 2, 2015, and under which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13722 of March 15, 2016, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2016.

The existence and risk of proliferation of weapons-usable fissile material on the Korean Peninsula; the actions and policies of the Government of North Korea that destabilize the Korean Peninsula and imperil U.S. Armed Forces, allies, and trading partners in the region, including its pursuit of nuclear and missile programs; and other provocative, destabilizing, and repressive actions and policies of the Government of North Korea, continue to constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to North Korea.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 21, 2016*.

□ 1830

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5525, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5388, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5389, by the yeas and nays.

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

END TAXPAYER FUNDED CELL PHONES ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5525) to prohibit universal service support of commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service through the Lifeline program, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 207, nays 143, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

YEAS—207

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crenshaw
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harris
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
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
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
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)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—143

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Edwards
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Moulton
Nadler
Neal
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Peters
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—84

Babin
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Fattah
Fincher
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Kind
Langevin
Lee
Lipinski
Lowenthal
Marchant
Meng
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Polis
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott (VA)
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Takai
Trott
Velázquez
Wagner
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yoho

□ 1851

Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. BASS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. BURGESS, AMASH, and LONG changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, isn't it true that the majority can schedule a vote on the no-fly, no buy bill right now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not entertain any inquiry that does not relate in a practical sense to the pending proceedings.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that that bill has been filed and it is languishing in the committee. My inquiry is, isn't it true that we can have a vote on that bill right now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated an inquiry that is relevant to the proceedings before the House at this time.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the Chair answer the question posed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is no longer recognized. The Chair has advised that the gentleman has not stated an inquiry that is relevant to the proceedings before the House at this time.

SUPPORT FOR RAPID INNOVATION ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5388) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 4, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

YEAS—351

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harris
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—4

Amash
Gohmert
Jones
Massie

NOT VOTING—79

Babin
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Castro (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Fattah
Fincher
Forbes
Garamendi
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Kind
Langevin
Lee
Lipinski
Lowenthal
Marchant
Meng
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moore
Napolitano
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Paulsen
Perlmutter
Pingree
Polis
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Takai
Trott
Velázquez
Wagner
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yoho

□ 1900

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

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEVERAGING EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5389) to encourage engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 347, nays 8, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

YEAS—347

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harris
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee

Kilmer	Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin
King (IA)	Nadler	Scott, David
King (NY)	Neal	Sensenbrenner
Kinzinger (IL)	Neugebauer	Serrano
Kirkpatrick	Newhouse	Sessions
Kline	Nugent	Sewell (AL)
Knight	Nunes	Sherman
Kuster	O'Rourke	Shimkus
Labrador	Olson	Shuster
LaHood	Palazzo	Simpson
LaMalfa	Pallone	Sinema
Lamborn	Palmer	Smith (MO)
Lance	Pascrell	Smith (NE)
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Larson (CT)	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Latta	Pelosi	Smith (WA)
Lawrence	Perry	Stefanik
Levin	Peters	Stewart
Lewis	Peterson	Stivers
Lieu, Ted	Pittenger	Stutzman
LoBiondo	Pitts	Swalwell (CA)
Loebsack	Pocan	Takano
Lofgren	Poe (TX)	Thompson (CA)
Long	Poliquin	Thompson (MS)
Loudermilk	Pompeo	Thompson (PA)
Love	Posey	Thornberry
Lowey	Price (NC)	Tiberi
Lucas	Price, Tom	Tipton
Luetkemeyer	Quigley	Titus
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Rangel	Tonko
	Ratcliffe	Torres
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Reed	Tsongas
	Reichert	Turner
Lummis	Renacci	Upton
Lynch	Ribble	Valadao
MacArthur	Rice (NY)	Van Hollen
Maloney, Carolyn	Rice (SC)	Vargas
	Richmond	Veasey
Maloney, Sean	Rigell	Vela
Marchant	Roby	Visclosky
Marino	Roe (TN)	Walberg
Matsui	Rogers (AL)	Walden
McCarthy	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
McCaul	Rokita	Walters, Mimi
McClintock	Rooney (FL)	Wasserman Schultz
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	
McDermott	Roskam	Watson Coleman
McGovern	Ross	Weber (TX)
McHenry	Rothfus	Webster (FL)
McKinley	Rouzer	Welch
McMorris Rodgers	Roybal-Allard	Wenstrup
	Royce	Westerman
McNerney	Ruiz	Westmoreland
McSally	Ruppersberger	Williams
Meadows	Russell	Wilson (SC)
Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Wittman
Meeks	Salmon	Womack
Messer	Sarbanes	Woodall
Miller (FL)	Scalise	Yarmuth
Moolenaar	Schakowsky	Yoder
Mooney (WV)	Schiff	Young (AK)
Moulton	Schrader	Young (IA)
Mullin	Schweikert	Young (IN)
Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)	Zeldin

NAYS—8

Amash	Grothman	Mulvaney
Duncan (TN)	Jones	Sanford
Gohmert	Massie	

NOT VOTING—79

Babin	Garamendi	Noem
Beyer	Graves (GA)	Nolan
Blumenauer	Grayson	Norcross
Bonamici	Green, Al	Paulsen
Brownley (CA)	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bucshon	Hahn	Pingree
Butterfield	Hanna	Polis
Cárdenas	Harper	Rohrabacher
Carson (IN)	Hartzler	Rush
Castro (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clawson (FL)	Higgins	
Cohen	Hill	Sanchez, Loretta
Connolly	Hoyer	Sires
Conyers	Huelskamp	Slaughter
Courtney	Hultgren	Speier
Cramer	Jackson Lee	Takai
Crawford	Jeffries	Trott
Culberson	Kind	Velázquez
Curbelo (FL)	Langevin	Wagner
DeSantis	Lee	Walker
Duckworth	Lipinski	Walz
Duffy	Lowenthal	Waters, Maxine
Ellison	Meng	Whitfield
Ellmers (NC)	Mica	Wilson (FL)
Fattah	Miller (MI)	Yoho
Fincher	Moore	Zinke
Forbes	Napolitano	

□ 1908

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall votes 334 to 336. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes: Roll call 334, on H.R. 5525, vote ''nay.'' Rollcall 335, on H.R. 5388, vote ''yea.'' Rollcall 336, on H.R. 5389, vote ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, due to a weather-related flight delay, I was unavoidably detained and unable to be present to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall votes 334, 335 and 336.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I missed the following votes: H.R. 5525, End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act of 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on this bill. H.R. 5388, Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on this bill. H.R. 5389, Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on this bill.

NATIVE AMERICAN HEALTH SAVINGS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5452) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit individuals eligible for Indian Health Service assistance to qualify for health savings accounts, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5452

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Native American Health Savings Improvement Act''.

SEC. 2. INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE ASSISTANCE NOT DISQUALIFIED FROM HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 223(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) SPECIAL RULE FOR INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE UNDER INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE PROGRAMS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), an individual shall not be treated as covered under a health plan described in such subparagraph merely because the individual receives hospital care or medical services under a medical care program of the Indian Health Service or of a tribal organization.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2016.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5452, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am happy to stand before you today as we consider H.R. 5452, the Native American Health Savings Improvement Act, a bipartisan bill that makes a commonsense improvement to current rules surrounding health savings accounts and those who get care at Indian Health Services.

Generally, anyone covered solely by a high-deductible plan is allowed to make deductible contributions to a health savings account; but under IRS guidance, an individual who has received medical services at an Indian Health Service facility at any time during the previous 3 months is made ineligible from making contributions to an HSA. This practice could discourage those who rely on care that is delivered at an Indian Health Service facility from participating in an HSA. That is something that must be remedied.

High-deductible health plans and HSAs are critical components of consumer-driven health care. Together, they empower individuals and families to shop around, unleashing the powers of choice and competition to lower costs and improve quality. We want to lower barriers to these types of accounts and encourage individuals who are otherwise eligible to not forgo treatment at an Indian Health Service facility simply because of confusion over when they might be able to resume contributing to their HSAs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan, commonsense measure.

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

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

Currently, contributions to a health savings account may only be made when an account owner is enrolled in a high-deductible health plan. Additionally, the account owner may not be eligible for other health coverage that is not a high-deductible health plan.

This bill would make sure that receiving benefits under an Indian Health Service or a tribal medical care program does not disqualify a taxpayer from HSA eligibility. Furthermore, under this bill, the taxpayer would still have to be covered by a high-deductible health plan to be able to receive or to make HSA contributions.

It is unclear how big of a problem this currently is across the country, particularly in Indian country. I have made it clear that HSAs and high-deductible plans move our country in the wrong direction—away from affordable

and comprehensive health coverage—but I don't think individuals who are covered through IHS or tribal medical care programs should be forced to forgo one insurance or the other.

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

□ 1915

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, the Budget Committee, and the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BRADY of the House Committee on Ways and Means, Congressman PAULSEN, Congresswoman NOEM, and Congressman BLUMENAUER for cosponsoring this bipartisan legislation. I also thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for his comments.

This legislation today before the House, H.R. 5452, will improve access to health savings accounts for Native Americans who choose to receive care at Indian Health Service facilities by ending an unnecessary penalty against them.

Currently, Native Americans are not allowed to contribute to their own health savings accounts for 3 months after receiving care at an Indian Health Service facility. These accounts can be a useful tool for families to cover the cost of deductibles, copayments, and coinsurance. However, current policy prevents this ability for Native Americans, and the 3-month waiting period limits their access to services that can help with treating high-risk health conditions.

This commonsense legislation eliminates the waiting period so Native Americans don't have to wait to save their hard-earned money to make their own healthcare choices and to receive treatment from Indian Health Service doctors. Today's legislation advances a bipartisan, patient-centered solution to an unfortunate, government-created problem. It will benefit all Native Americans who use HSAs, and I am glad that we can eliminate this unfair Federal penalty against them.

I thank my colleagues for their support of this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, let me just mention that Mr. BLUMENAUER wanted to be here but, because of the weather, he has just been unable to arrive. I think the majority may have the same problem.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would add that Representative NOEM faced a similar situation with air travel and the weather.

Mr. Speaker, about 20 million Americans are covered by a high deductible health plan with an HSA. These options are an increasingly popular option, and it is a popular option that many Native Americans would like to take advantage of. So let's come together and make sure that any current law practices that could dissuade tribal members from participation in an HSA-eligible plan would be reversed.

I urge my colleague to join me and support H.R. 5452.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5452, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAMILY FIRST PREVENTION SERVICES ACT OF 2016

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5456) 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, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5456

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 ''Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—INVESTING IN PREVENTION AND FAMILY SERVICES

SEC. 101. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to enable States to use Federal funds available under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide enhanced support to children and families and prevent foster care placements through the provision of mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment services, in-home parent skill-based programs, and kinship navigator services.

Subtitle A—Prevention Activities Under Title IV–E

SEC. 111. FOSTER CARE PREVENTION SERVICES AND PROGRAMS.

(a) STATE OPTION.—Section 471 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''and'' and all that follows through the semicolon and inserting '', adoption assistance in accordance with section 473, and, at the option of the State, services or programs specified in subsection (e)(1) of this section for children who are candidates for foster care or who are pregnant or parenting foster youth and the parents or kin caregivers of the children, in accordance with the requirements of that subsection;''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) PREVENTION AND FAMILY SERVICES AND PROGRAMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the succeeding provisions of this subsection, the Secretary may make a payment to a State for providing the following services or programs for a child described

in paragraph (2) and the parents or kin caregivers of the child when the need of the child, such a parent, or such a caregiver for the services or programs are directly related to the safety, permanence, or well-being of the child or to preventing the child from entering foster care:

''(A) MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT SERVICES.—Mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment services provided by a qualified clinician for not more than a 12-month period that begins on any date described in paragraph (3) with respect to the child.

''(B) IN-HOME PARENT SKILL-BASED PROGRAMS.—In-home parent skill-based programs for not more than a 12-month period that begins on any date described in paragraph (3) with respect to the child and that include parenting skills training, parent education, and individual and family counseling.

''(2) CHILD DESCRIBED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a child described in this paragraph is the following:

''(A) A child who is a candidate for foster care (as defined in section 475(13)) but can remain safely at home or in a kinship placement with receipt of services or programs specified in paragraph (1).

''(B) A child in foster care who is a pregnant or parenting foster youth.

''(3) DATE DESCRIBED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the dates described in this paragraph are the following:

''(A) The date on which a child is identified in a prevention plan maintained under paragraph (4) as a child who is a candidate for foster care (as defined in section 475(13)).

''(B) The date on which a child is identified in a prevention plan maintained under paragraph (4) as a pregnant or parenting foster youth in need of services or programs specified in paragraph (1).

''(4) REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO PROVIDING SERVICES AND PROGRAMS.—Services and programs specified in paragraph (1) may be provided under this subsection only if specified in advance in the child's prevention plan described in subparagraph (A) and the requirements in subparagraphs (B) through (E) are met:

''(A) PREVENTION PLAN.—The State maintains a written prevention plan for the child that meets the following requirements (as applicable):

''(i) CANDIDATES.—In the case of a child who is a candidate for foster care described in paragraph (2)(A), the prevention plan shall—

''(I) identify the foster care prevention strategy for the child so that the child may remain safely at home, live temporarily with a kin caregiver until reunification can be safely achieved, or live permanently with a kin caregiver;

''(II) list the services or programs to be provided to or on behalf of the child to ensure the success of that prevention strategy; and

''(III) comply with such other requirements as the Secretary shall establish.

''(ii) PREGNANT OR PARENTING FOSTER YOUTH.—In the case of a child who is a pregnant or parenting foster youth described in paragraph (2)(B), the prevention plan shall—

''(I) be included in the child's case plan required under section 475(1);

''(II) list the services or programs to be provided to or on behalf of the youth to ensure that the youth is prepared (in the case of a pregnant foster youth) or able (in the case of a parenting foster youth) to be a parent;

''(III) describe the foster care prevention strategy for any child born to the youth; and

''(IV) comply with such other requirements as the Secretary shall establish.

''(B) TRAUMA-INFORMED.—The services or programs to be provided to or on behalf of a child are provided under an organizational structure and treatment framework that involves understanding, recognizing, and responding to the effects of all types of trauma and in accordance with recognized principles of a trauma-informed approach and trauma-specific interventions to address trauma's consequences and facilitate healing.

''(C) ONLY SERVICES AND PROGRAMS PROVIDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROMISING, SUPPORTED, OR WELL-SUPPORTED PRACTICES PERMITTED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Only State expenditures for services or programs specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) that are provided in accordance with practices that meet the requirements specified in clause (ii) of this subparagraph and that meet the requirements specified in clause (iii), (iv), or (v), respectively, for being a promising, supported, or well-supported practice, shall be eligible for a Federal matching payment under section 474(a)(6)(A).

''(ii) GENERAL PRACTICE REQUIREMENTS.—The general practice requirements specified in this clause are the following:

''(I) The practice has a book, manual, or other available writings that specify the components of the practice protocol and describe how to administer the practice.

''(II) There is no empirical basis suggesting that, compared to its likely benefits, the practice constitutes a risk of harm to those receiving it.

''(III) If multiple outcome studies have been conducted, the overall weight of evidence supports the benefits of the practice.

''(IV) Outcome measures are reliable and valid, and are administrated consistently and accurately across all those receiving the practice.

''(V) There is no case data suggesting a risk of harm that was probably caused by the treatment and that was severe or frequent.

''(iii) PROMISING PRACTICE.—A practice shall be considered to be a 'promising practice' if the practice is superior to an appropriate comparison practice using conventional standards of statistical significance (in terms of demonstrated meaningful improvements in validated measures of important child and parent outcomes, such as mental health, substance abuse, and child safety and well-being), as established by the results or outcomes of at least 1 study that—

''(I) was rated by an independent systematic review for the quality of the study design and execution and determined to be well-designed and well-executed; and

''(II) utilized some form of control (such as an untreated group, a placebo group, or a wait list study).

''(iv) SUPPORTED PRACTICE.—A practice shall be considered to be a 'supported practice' if—

''(I) the practice is superior to an appropriate comparison practice using conventional standards of statistical significance (in terms of demonstrated meaningful improvements in validated measures of important child and parent outcomes, such as mental health, substance abuse, and child safety and well-being), as established by the results or outcomes of at least 1 study that—

''(aa) was rated by an independent systematic review for the quality of the study design and execution and determined to be well-designed and well-executed;

''(bb) was a rigorous random-controlled trial (or, if not available, a study using a rigorous quasi-experimental research design); and

''(cc) was carried out in a usual care or practice setting; and

''(II) the study described in subclause (I) established that the practice has a sustained effect (when compared to a control group) for at least 6 months beyond the end of the treatment.

''(v) WELL-SUPPORTED PRACTICE.—A practice shall be considered to be a 'well-supported practice' if—

''(I) the practice is superior to an appropriate comparison practice using conventional standards of statistical significance (in terms of demonstrated meaningful improvements in validated measures of important child and parent outcomes, such as mental health, substance abuse, and child safety and well-being), as established by the results or outcomes of at least 2 studies that—

''(aa) were rated by an independent systematic review for the quality of the study design and execution and determined to be well-designed and well-executed;

''(bb) were rigorous random-controlled trials (or, if not available, studies using a rigorous quasi-experimental research design); and

''(cc) were carried out in a usual care or practice setting; and

''(II) at least 1 of the studies described in subclause (I) established that the practice has a sustained effect (when compared to a control group) for at least 1 year beyond the end of treatment.

''(D) GUIDANCE ON PRACTICES CRITERIA AND PRE-APPROVED SERVICES AND PROGRAMS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2018, the Secretary shall issue guidance to States regarding the practices criteria required for services or programs to satisfy the requirements of subparagraph (C). The guidance shall include a pre-approved list of services and programs that satisfy the requirements.

''(ii) UPDATES.—The Secretary shall issue updates to the guidance required by clause (i) as often as the Secretary determines necessary.

''(E) OUTCOME ASSESSMENT AND REPORTING.—The State shall collect and report to the Secretary the following information with respect to each child for whom, or on whose behalf mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment services or in-home parent skill-based programs are provided during a 12-month period beginning on the date the child is determined by the State to be a child described in paragraph (2):

''(i) The specific services or programs provided and the total expenditures for each of the services or programs.

''(ii) The duration of the services or programs provided.

''(iii) In the case of a child described in paragraph (2)(A), the child's placement status at the beginning, and at the end, of the 1-year period, respectively, and whether the child entered foster care within 2 years after being determined a candidate for foster care.

''(5) STATE PLAN COMPONENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A State electing to provide services or programs specified in paragraph (1) shall submit as part of the State plan required by subsection (a) a prevention services and programs plan component that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

''(B) PREVENTION SERVICES AND PROGRAMS PLAN COMPONENT.—In order to meet the requirements of this subparagraph, a prevention services and programs plan component, with respect to each 5-year period for which the plan component is in operation in the State, shall include the following:

''(i) How providing services and programs specified in paragraph (1) is expected to improve specific outcomes for children and families.

''(ii) How the State will monitor and oversee the safety of children who receive services and programs specified in paragraph (1), including through periodic risk assessments throughout the period in which the services and programs are provided on behalf of a child and reexamination of the prevention plan maintained for the child under paragraph (4) for the provision of the services or programs if the State determines the risk of the child entering foster care remains high despite the provision of the services or programs.

''(iii) With respect to the services and programs specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1), information on the specific promising, supported, or well-supported practices the State plans to use to provide the services or programs, including a description of—

''(I) the services or programs and whether the practices used are promising, supported, or well-supported;

''(II) how the State plans to implement the services or programs, including how implementation of the services or programs will be continuously monitored to ensure fidelity to the

practice model and to determine outcomes achieved and how information learned from the monitoring will be used to refine and improve practices;

''(III) how the State selected the services or programs;

''(IV) the target population for the services or programs; and

''(V) how each service or program provided will be evaluated through a well-designed and rigorous process, which may consist of an ongoing, cross-site evaluation approved by the Secretary.

''(iv) A description of the consultation that the State agencies responsible for administering the State plans under this part and part B engage in with other State agencies responsible for administering health programs, including mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment services, and with other public and private agencies with experience in administering child and family services, including community-based organizations, in order to foster a continuum of care for children described in paragraph (2) and their parents or kin caregivers.

''(v) A description of how the State shall assess children and their parents or kin caregivers to determine eligibility for services or programs specified in paragraph (1).

''(vi) A description of how the services or programs specified in paragraph (1) that are provided for or on behalf of a child and the parents or kin caregivers of the child will be coordinated with other child and family services provided to the child and the parents or kin caregivers of the child under the State plan under part B.

''(vii) Descriptions of steps the State is taking to support and enhance a competent, skilled, and professional child welfare workforce to deliver trauma-informed and evidence-based services, including—

''(I) ensuring that staff is qualified to provide services or programs that are consistent with the promising, supported, or well-supported practice models selected; and

''(II) developing appropriate prevention plans, and conducting the risk assessments required under clause (iii).

''(viii) A description of how the State will provide training and support for caseworkers in assessing what children and their families need, connecting to the families served, knowing how to access and deliver the needed trauma-informed and evidence-based services, and overseeing and evaluating the continuing appropriateness of the services.

''(ix) A description of how caseload size and type for prevention caseworkers will be determined, managed, and overseen.

''(x) An assurance that the State will report to the Secretary such information and data as the Secretary may require with respect to the provision of services and programs specified in paragraph (1), including information and data necessary to determine the performance measures for the State under paragraph (6) and compliance with paragraph (7).

''(C) REIMBURSEMENT FOR SERVICES UNDER THE PREVENTION PLAN COMPONENT.—

''(i) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subclause (ii), a State may not receive a Federal payment under this part for a given promising, supported, or well-supported practice unless (in accordance with subparagraph (B)(iii)(V)) the plan includes a well-designed and rigorous evaluation strategy for that practice.

''(ii) WAIVER OF LIMITATION.—The Secretary may waive the requirement for a well-designed and rigorous evaluation of any well-supported practice if the Secretary deems the evidence of the effectiveness of the practice to be compelling and the State meets the continuous quality improvement requirements included in subparagraph (B)(iii)(II) with regard to the practice.

''(6) PREVENTION SERVICES MEASURES.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT; ANNUAL UPDATES.—Beginning with fiscal year 2021, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall establish the following prevention services measures based on information and data reported by States that elect to provide services and programs specified in paragraph (1):

''(i) PERCENTAGE OF CANDIDATES FOR FOSTER CARE WHO DO NOT ENTER FOSTER CARE.—The percentage of candidates for foster care for whom, or on whose behalf, the services or programs are provided who do not enter foster care, including those placed with a kin caregiver outside of foster care, during the 12-month period in which the services or programs are provided and through the end of the succeeding 12-month-period.

''(ii) PER-CHILD SPENDING.—The total amount of expenditures made for mental health and substance abuse prevention and treatment services or in-home parent skill-based programs, respectively, for, or on behalf of, each child described in paragraph (2).

''(B) DATA.—The Secretary shall establish and annually update the prevention services measures—

''(i) based on the median State values of the information reported under each clause of subparagraph (A) for the 3 then most recent years; and

''(ii) taking into account State differences in the price levels of consumption goods and services using the most recent regional price parities published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce or such other data as the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(C) PUBLICATION OF STATE PREVENTION SERVICES MEASURES.—The Secretary shall annually make available to the public the prevention services measures of each State.

''(7) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT FOR STATE FOSTER CARE PREVENTION EXPENDITURES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a State elects to provide services and programs specified in paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the State foster care prevention expenditures for the fiscal year shall not be less than the amount of the expenditures for fiscal year 2014.

''(B) STATE FOSTER CARE PREVENTION EXPENDITURES.—The term 'State foster care prevention expenditures' means the following:

''(i) TANF; IV–B; SSBG.—State expenditures for foster care prevention services and activities under the State program funded under part A (including from amounts made available by the Federal Government), under the State plan developed under part B (including any such amounts), or under the Social Services Block Grant Programs under subtitle A of title XX (including any such amounts).

''(ii) OTHER STATE PROGRAMS.—State expenditures for foster care prevention services and activities under any State program that is not described in clause (i) (other than any State expenditures for foster care prevention services and activities under the State program under this part (including under a waiver of the program)).

''(C) STATE EXPENDITURES.—The term 'State expenditures' means all State or local funds that are expended by the State or a local agency including State or local funds that are matched or reimbursed by the Federal Government and State or local funds that are not matched or reimbursed by the Federal Government.

''(D) DETERMINATION OF PREVENTION SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall require each State that elects to provide services and programs specified in paragraph (1) to report the expenditures specified in subparagraph (B) for fiscal year 2014 and for such fiscal years thereafter as are necessary to determine whether the State is complying with the maintenance of effort requirement in subparagraph (A). The Secretary shall specify the specific services and activities under each program referred to in subparagraph (B) that are 'prevention services and activities' for purposes of the reports.

''(8) PROHIBITION AGAINST USE OF STATE FOSTER CARE PREVENTION EXPENDITURES AND FEDERAL IV–E PREVENTION FUNDS FOR MATCHING OR EXPENDITURE REQUIREMENT.—A State that elects to provide services and programs specified in paragraph (1) shall not use any State foster care prevention expenditures for a fiscal year for the State share of expenditures under section 474(a)(6) for a fiscal year.

''(9) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Expenditures described in section 474(a)(6)(B)—

''(A) shall not be eligible for payment under subparagraph (A), (B), or (E) of section 474(a)(3); and

''(B) shall be eligible for payment under section 474(a)(6)(B) without regard to whether the expenditures are incurred on behalf of a child who is, or is potentially, eligible for foster care maintenance payments under this part.

''(10) APPLICATION.—The provision of services or programs under this subsection to or on behalf of a child described in paragraph (2) shall not be considered to be receipt of aid or assistance under the State plan under this part for purposes of eligibility for any other program established under this Act.''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 475 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 675) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(13) The term 'child who is a candidate for foster care' means, a child who is identified in a prevention plan under section 471(e)(4)(A) as being at imminent risk of entering foster care (without regard to whether the child would be eligible for foster care maintenance payments under section 472 or is or would be eligible for adoption assistance or kinship guardianship assistance payments under section 473) but who can remain safely in the child's home or in a kinship placement as long as services or programs specified in section 471(e)(1) that are necessary to prevent the entry of the child into foster care are provided. The term includes a child whose adoption or guardianship arrangement is at risk of a disruption or dissolution that would result in a foster care placement.''.

(c) PAYMENTS UNDER TITLE IV–E.—Section 474(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 674(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; plus''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) subject to section 471(e)—

''(A) for each quarter—

''(i) subject to clause (ii)—

''(I) beginning after September 30, 2019, and before October 1, 2025, an amount equal to 50 percent of the total amount expended during the quarter for the provision of services or programs specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 471(e)(1) that are provided in accordance with promising, supported, or well-supported practices that meet the applicable criteria specified for the practices in section 471(e)(4)(C); and

''(II) beginning after September 30, 2025, an amount equal to the Federal medical assistance percentage (which shall be as defined in section 1905(b), in the case of a State other than the District of Columbia, or 70 percent, in the case of the District of Columbia) of the total amount expended during the quarter for the provision of services or programs specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 471(e)(1) that are provided in accordance with promising, supported, or well-supported practices that meet the applicable criteria specified for the practices in section 471(e)(4)(C) (or, with respect to the payments made during the quarter under a cooperative agreement or contract entered into by the State and an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium for the administration or payment of funds under this part, an amount equal to the Federal medical assistance percentage that would apply under section 479B(d) (in this paragraph referred to as the 'tribal FMAP') if the Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium made the payments under a program operated under that section, unless the tribal FMAP is less than the Federal medical assistance percentage that applies to the State); except that

''(ii) not less than 50 percent of the total amount payable to a State under clause (i) for a fiscal year shall be for the provision of services or programs specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 471(e)(1) that are provided in accordance with well-supported practices; plus

''(B) for each quarter specified in subparagraph (A), an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amount expended during the quarter:

''(i) 50 percent of so much of the expenditures as are found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan for the provision of services or programs specified in section 471(e)(1), including expenditures for activities approved by the Secretary that promote the development of necessary processes and procedures to establish and implement the provision of the services and programs for individuals who are eligible for the services and programs and expenditures attributable to data collection and reporting; and

''(ii) 50 percent of so much of the expenditures with respect to the provision of services and programs specified in section 471(e)(1) as are for training of personnel employed or preparing for employment by the State agency or by the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision and of the members of the staff of State-licensed or State-approved child welfare agencies providing services to children described in section 471(e)(2) and their parents or kin caregivers, including on how to determine who are individuals eligible for the services or programs, how to identify and provide appropriate services and programs, and how to oversee and evaluate the ongoing appropriateness of the services and programs.''.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND BEST PRACTICES, CLEARINGHOUSE, AND DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATIONS.—Section 476 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 676) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND BEST PRACTICES, CLEARINGHOUSE, DATA COLLECTION, AND EVALUATIONS RELATING TO PREVENTION SERVICES AND PROGRAMS.—

''(1) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND BEST PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall provide to States and, as applicable, to Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and tribal consortia, technical assistance regarding the provision of services and programs described in section 471(e)(1) and shall disseminate best practices with respect to the provision of the services and programs, including how to plan and implement a well-designed and rigorous evaluation of a promising, supported, or well-supported practice.

''(2) CLEARINGHOUSE OF PROMISING, SUPPORTED, AND WELL-SUPPORTED PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall, directly or through grants, contracts, or interagency agreements, evaluate research on the practices specified in clauses (iii), (iv), and (v), respectively, of section 471(e)(4)(C), and programs that meet the requirements described in section 427(a)(1), including culturally specific, or location- or population-based adaptations of the practices, to identify and establish a public clearinghouse of the practices that satisfy each category described by such clauses. In addition, the clearinghouse shall include information on the specific outcomes associated with each practice, including whether the practice has been shown to prevent child abuse and neglect and reduce the likelihood of foster care placement by supporting birth families and kinship families and improving targeted supports for pregnant and parenting youth and their children.

''(3) DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary, directly or through grants, contracts, or interagency agreements, may collect data and conduct evaluations with respect to the provision of services and programs described in section 471(e)(1) for purposes of assessing the extent to which the provision of the services and programs—

''(A) reduces the likelihood of foster care placement;

''(B) increases use of kinship care arrangements; or

''(C) improves child well-being.

''(4) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives periodic reports based on the provision of services and programs described in section 471(e)(1) and the activities carried out under this subsection.

''(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the reports to Congress submitted under this paragraph publicly available.

''(5) APPROPRIATION.—Out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there is appropriated to the Secretary $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter to carry out this subsection.''.

(e) APPLICATION TO PROGRAMS OPERATED BY INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 479B of such Act (42 U.S.C. 679c) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (C)(i)—

(I) in subclause (II), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(II) in subclause (III), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

''(IV) at the option of the tribe, organization, or consortium, services and programs specified in section 471(e)(1) to children described in section 471(e)(2) and their parents or kin caregivers, in accordance with section 471(e) and subparagraph (E).''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) PREVENTION SERVICES AND PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND THEIR PARENTS AND KIN CAREGIVERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a tribe, organization, or consortium that elects to provide services and programs specified in section 471(e)(1) to children described in section 471(e)(2) and their parents or kin caregivers under the plan, the Secretary shall specify the requirements applicable to the provision of the services and programs. The requirements shall, to the greatest extent practicable, be consistent with the requirements applicable to States under section 471(e) and shall permit the provision of the services and programs in the form of services and programs that are adapted to the culture and context of the tribal communities served.

''(ii) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—The Secretary shall establish specific performance measures for each tribe, organization, or consortium that elects to provide services and programs specified in section 471(e)(1). The performance measures shall, to the greatest extent practicable, be consistent with the prevention services measures required for States under section 471(e)(6) but shall allow for consideration of factors unique to the provision of the services by tribes, organizations, or consortia.''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''and (5)'' and inserting ''(5), and (6)(A)''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading for subsection (d) of section 479B of such Act (42 U.S.C. 679c) is amended by striking ''FOR FOSTER CARE MAINTENANCE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS''.

SEC. 112. FOSTER CARE MAINTENANCE PAYMENTS FOR CHILDREN WITH PARENTS IN A LICENSED RESIDENTIAL FAMILY-BASED TREATMENT FACILITY FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 472 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 672) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(C), by striking ''or'' and inserting '', with a parent residing in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility, but only to the extent permitted under subsection (j), or in a''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(j) CHILDREN PLACED WITH A PARENT RESIDING IN A LICENSED RESIDENTIAL FAMILY-BASED TREATMENT FACILITY FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, a child who is eligible for foster care maintenance payments under this section, or who would be eligible for the payments if the eligibility were determined without regard to paragraphs (1)(B) and (3) of subsection (a), shall be eligible for the payments for a period of not more than 12 months during which the child is placed with a parent who is in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility for substance abuse, but only if—

''(A) the recommendation for the placement is specified in the child's case plan before the placement;

''(B) the treatment facility provides, as part of the treatment for substance abuse, parenting skills training, parent education, and individual and family counseling; and

''(C) the substance abuse treatment, parenting skills training, parent education, and individual and family counseling is provided under an organizational structure and treatment framework that involves understanding, recognizing, and responding to the effects of all types of trauma and in accordance with recognized principles of a trauma-informed approach and trauma-specific interventions to address the consequences of trauma and facilitate healing.

''(2) APPLICATION.—With respect to children for whom foster care maintenance payments are made under paragraph (1), only the children who satisfy the requirements of paragraphs (1)(B) and (3) of subsection (a) shall be considered to be children with respect to whom foster care maintenance payments are made under this section for purposes of subsection (h) or section 473(b)(3)(B).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 474(a)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 674(a)(1)) is amended by inserting ''subject to section 472(j),'' before ''an amount equal to the Federal'' the 1st place it appears.

SEC. 113. TITLE IV–E PAYMENTS FOR EVIDENCE-BASED KINSHIP NAVIGATOR PROGRAMS.

Section 474(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 674(a)), as amended by section 111(c), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; plus''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) an amount equal to 50 percent of the amounts expended by the State during the quarter as the Secretary determines are for kinship navigator programs that meet the requirements described in section 427(a)(1) and that the Secretary determines are operated in accordance with promising, supported, or well-supported practices that meet the applicable criteria specified for the practices in section 471(e)(4)(C), without regard to whether the expenditures are incurred on behalf of children who are, or are potentially, eligible for foster care maintenance payments under this part.''.

Subtitle B—Enhanced Support Under Title IV–B

SEC. 121. ELIMINATION OF TIME LIMIT FOR FAMILY REUNIFICATION SERVICES WHILE IN FOSTER CARE AND PERMITTING TIME-LIMITED FAMILY REUNIFICATION SERVICES WHEN A CHILD RETURNS HOME FROM FOSTER CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 431(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629a(a)(7)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''TIME-LIMITED FAMILY'' and inserting ''FAMILY''; and

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''time-limited family'' and inserting ''family'';

(B) by inserting ''or a child who has been returned home'' after ''child care institution''; and

(C) by striking '', but only during the 15-month period that begins on the date that the child, pursuant to section 475(5)(F), is considered to have entered foster care'' and inserting

''and to ensure the strength and stability of the reunification. In the case of a child who has been returned home, the services and activities shall only be provided during the 15-month period that begins on the date that the child returns home''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 430 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''time-limited''.

(2) Subsections (a)(4), (a)(5)(A), and (b)(1) of section 432 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629b) are amended by striking ''time-limited'' each place it appears.

SEC. 122. REDUCING BUREAUCRACY AND UNNECESSARY DELAYS WHEN PLACING CHILDREN IN HOMES ACROSS STATE LINES.

(a) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 471(a)(25) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(25)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''provide'' and insert ''provides''; and

(2) by inserting '', which, not later than October 1, 2026, shall include the use of an electronic interstate case-processing system'' before the 1st semicolon.

(b) GRANTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ELECTRONIC INTERSTATE CASE-PROCESSING SYSTEM TO EXPEDITE THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE OR GUARDIANSHIP, OR FOR ADOPTION.—Section 437 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) GRANTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ELECTRONIC INTERSTATE CASE-PROCESSING SYSTEM TO EXPEDITE THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE OR GUARDIANSHIP, OR FOR ADOPTION.—

''(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subsection is to facilitate the development of an electronic interstate case-processing system for the exchange of data and documents to expedite the placements of children in foster, guardianship, or adoptive homes across State lines.

''(2) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—A State that desires a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Secretary an application containing the following:

''(A) A description of the goals and outcomes to be achieved during the period for which grant funds are sought, which goals and outcomes must result in—

''(i) reducing the time it takes for a child to be provided with a safe and appropriate permanent living arrangement across State lines;

''(ii) improving administrative processes and reducing costs in the foster care system; and

''(iii) the secure exchange of relevant case files and other necessary materials in real time, and timely communications and placement decisions regarding interstate placements of children.

''(B) A description of the activities to be funded in whole or in part with the grant funds, including the sequencing of the activities.

''(C) A description of the strategies for integrating programs and services for children who are placed across State lines.

''(D) Such other information as the Secretary may require.

''(3) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may make a grant to a State that complies with paragraph (2).

''(4) USE OF FUNDS.—A State to which a grant is made under this subsection shall use the grant to support the State in connecting with the electronic interstate case-processing system described in paragraph (1).

''(5) EVALUATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the final year in which grants are awarded under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress, and make available to the general public by posting on a website, a report that contains the following information:

''(A) How using the electronic interstate case-processing system developed pursuant to paragraph (4) has changed the time it takes for children to be placed across State lines.

''(B) The number of cases subject to the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children that were processed through the electronic interstate case-processing system, and the number of interstate child placement cases that were processed outside the electronic interstate case-processing system, by each State in each year.

''(C) The progress made by States in implementing the electronic interstate case-processing system.

''(D) How using the electronic interstate case-processing system has affected various metrics related to child safety and well-being, including the time it takes for children to be placed across State lines.

''(E) How using the electronic interstate case-processing system has affected administrative costs and caseworker time spent on placing children across State lines.

''(6) DATA INTEGRATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretariat for the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children and the States, shall assess how the electronic interstate case-processing system developed pursuant to paragraph (4) could be used to better serve and protect children that come to the attention of the child welfare system, by—

''(A) connecting the system with other data systems (such as systems operated by State law enforcement and judicial agencies, systems operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the purposes of the Innocence Lost National Initiative, and other systems);

''(B) simplifying and improving reporting related to paragraphs (34) and (35) of section 471(a) regarding children or youth who have been identified as being a sex trafficking victim or children missing from foster care; and

''(C) improving the ability of States to quickly comply with background check requirements of section 471(a)(20), including checks of child abuse and neglect registries as required by section 471(a)(20)(B).''.

(c) RESERVATION OF FUNDS TO IMPROVE THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN.—Section 437(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) IMPROVING THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN.—The Secretary shall reserve $5,000,000 of the amount made available for fiscal year 2017 for grants under subsection (g), and the amount so reserved shall remain available through fiscal year 2021.''.

SEC. 123. ENHANCEMENTS TO GRANTS TO IMPROVE WELL-BEING OF FAMILIES AFFECTED BY SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

Section 437(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(f)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''INCREASE THE WELL-BEING OF, AND TO IMPROVE THE PERMANENCY OUTCOMES FOR, CHILDREN AFFECTED BY'' and inserting ''IMPLEMENT IV-E PREVENTION SERVICES, AND IMPROVE THE WELL-BEING OF, AND IMPROVE PERMANENCY OUTCOMES FOR, CHILDREN AND FAMILIES AFFECTED BY HEROIN, OPIOIDS, AND OTHER'';

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'regional partnership' means a collaborative agreement (which may be established on an interstate, State, or intrastate basis) entered into by the following:

''(A) MANDATORY PARTNERS FOR ALL PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—

''(i) The State child welfare agency that is responsible for the administration of the State plan under this part and part E.

''(ii) The State agency responsible for administering the substance abuse prevention and treatment block grant provided under subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act.

''(B) MANDATORY PARTNERS FOR PARTNERSHIP GRANTS PROPOSING TO SERVE CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENTS.—If the partnership proposes to serve children in out-of-home placements, the Juvenile Court or Administrative Office of the Court that is most appropriate to oversee the administration of court programs in the region to address the population of families who come to the attention of the court due to child abuse or neglect.

''(C) OPTIONAL PARTNERS.—At the option of the partnership, any of the following:

''(i) An Indian tribe or tribal consortium.

''(ii) Nonprofit child welfare service providers.

''(iii) For-profit child welfare service providers.

''(iv) Community health service providers, including substance abuse treatment providers.

''(v) Community mental health providers.

''(vi) Local law enforcement agencies.

''(vii) School personnel.

''(viii) Tribal child welfare agencies (or a consortia of the agencies).

''(ix) Any other providers, agencies, personnel, officials, or entities that are related to the provision of child and family services under a State plan approved under this subpart.

''(D) EXCEPTION FOR REGIONAL PARTNERSHIPS WHERE THE LEAD APPLICANT IS AN INDIAN TRIBE OR TRIBAL CONSORTIA.—If an Indian tribe or tribal consortium enters into a regional partnership for purposes of this subsection, the Indian tribe or tribal consortium—

''(i) may (but is not required to) include the State child welfare agency as a partner in the collaborative agreement;

''(ii) may not enter into a collaborative agreement only with tribal child welfare agencies (or a consortium of the agencies); and

''(iii) if the condition described in paragraph (2)(B) applies, may include tribal court organizations in lieu of other judicial partners.'';

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''; and

(ii) by striking ''$500,000 and not more than $1,000,000'' and inserting ''$250,000 and not more than $1,000,000'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting ''; PLANNING'' after ''APPROVAL'';

(ii) in clause (i), by striking ''clause (ii)'' and inserting ''clauses (ii) and (iii)''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) SUFFICIENT PLANNING.—A grant awarded under this subsection shall be disbursed in 2 phases: a planning phase (not to exceed 2 years); and an implementation phase. The total disbursement to a grantee for the planning phase may not exceed $250,000, and may not exceed the total anticipated funding for the implementation phase.''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) LIMITATION ON PAYMENT FOR A FISCAL YEAR.—No payment shall be made under subparagraph (A) or (C) for a fiscal year until the Secretary determines that the eligible partnership has made sufficient progress in meeting the goals of the grant and that the members of the eligible partnership are coordinating to a reasonable degree with the other members of the eligible partnership.'';

(4) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting '', parents, and families'' after ''children'';

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking ''safety and permanence for such children; and'' and inserting ''safe, permanent caregiving relationships for the children;'';

(iii) in clause (iii), by striking ''or'' and inserting ''increase reunification rates for children who have been placed in out of home care, or decrease''; and

(iv) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (v) and inserting after clause (ii) the following:

''(iii) improve the substance abuse treatment outcomes for parents including retention in treatment and successful completion of treatment;

''(iv) facilitate the implementation, delivery, and effectiveness of prevention services and programs under section 471(e); and'';

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''where appropriate,''; and

(C) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F) and inserting the following:

''(E) A description of a plan for sustaining the services provided by or activities funded under the grant after the conclusion of the grant period, including through the use of prevention services and programs under section 471(e) and other funds provided to the State for child welfare and substance abuse prevention and treatment services.

''(F) Additional information needed by the Secretary to determine that the proposed activities and implementation will be consistent with research or evaluations showing which practices and approaches are most effective.'';

(5) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking ''abuse treatment'' and inserting ''use disorder treatment including medication assisted treatment and in-home substance abuse disorder treatment and recovery'';

(6) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E) and inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) demonstrate a track record of successful collaboration among child welfare, substance abuse disorder treatment and mental health agencies; and'';

(7) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''establish indicators that will be'' and inserting ''review indicators that are''; and

(ii) by striking ''in using funds made available under such grants to achieve the purpose of this subsection'' and inserting ''and establish a set of core indicators related to child safety, parental recovery, parenting capacity, and family well-being. In developing the core indicators, to the extent possible, indicators shall be made consistent with the outcome measures described in section 471(e)(6)'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting ''base the performance measures on lessons learned from prior rounds of regional partnership grants under this subsection, and'' before ''consult''; and

(ii) by striking clauses (iii) and (iv) and inserting the following:

''(iii) Other stakeholders or constituencies as determined by the Secretary.'';

(8) in paragraph (9)(A), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than September 30 of each fiscal year in which a recipient of a grant under this subsection is paid funds under the grant, and every 6 months thereafter, the grant recipient shall submit to the Secretary a report on the services provided and activities carried out during the reporting period, progress made in achieving the goals of the program, the number of children, adults, and families receiving services, and such additional information as the Secretary determines is necessary. The report due not later than September 30 of the last such fiscal year shall include, at a minimum, data on each of the performance indicators included in the evaluation of the regional partnership.''; and

(9) in paragraph (10), by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous

SEC. 131. REVIEWING AND IMPROVING LICENSING STANDARDS FOR PLACEMENT IN A RELATIVE FOSTER FAMILY HOME.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF REPUTABLE MODEL LICENSING STANDARDS.—Not later than October 1, 2017, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall identify reputable model licensing standards with respect to the licensing of foster family homes (as defined in section 472(c)(1) of the Social Security Act).

(b) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 471(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (34)(B), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (35)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(36) provides that, not later than April 1, 2018, the State shall submit to the Secretary information addressing—

''(A) whether the State licensing standards are in accord with model standards identified by the Secretary, and if not, the reason for the specific deviation and a description as to why having a standard that is reasonably in accord with the corresponding national model standards is not appropriate for the State;

''(B) whether the State has elected to waive standards established in 471(a)(10)(A) for relative foster family homes (pursuant to waiver authority provided by 471(a)(10)(D)), a description of which standards the State most commonly waives, and if the State has not elected to waive the standards, the reason for not waiving these standards;

''(C) if the State has elected to waive standards specified in subparagraph (B), how caseworkers are trained to use the waiver authority and whether the State has developed a process or provided tools to assist caseworkers in waiving nonsafety standards per the authority provided in 471(a)(10)(D) to quickly place children with relatives; and

''(D) a description of the steps the State is taking to improve caseworker training or the process, if any; and''.

SEC. 132. DEVELOPMENT OF A STATEWIDE PLAN TO PREVENT CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT FATALITIES.

Section 422(b)(19) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(19)) is amended to read as follows:

''(19) document steps taken to track and prevent child maltreatment deaths by including—

''(A) a description of the steps the State is taking to compile complete and accurate information on the deaths required by Federal law to be reported by the State agency referred to in paragraph (1), including gathering relevant information on the deaths from the relevant organizations in the State including entities such as State vital statistics department, child death review teams, law enforcement agencies, offices of medical examiners or coroners; and

''(B) a description of the steps the state is taking to develop and implement of a comprehensive, statewide plan to prevent the fatalities that involves and engages relevant public and private agency partners, including those in public health, law enforcement, and the courts.''.

SEC. 133. MODERNIZING THE TITLE AND PURPOSE OF TITLE IV–E.

(a) PART HEADING.—The heading for part E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 670 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''PART E—FEDERAL PAYMENTS FOR FOSTER CARE, PREVENTION, AND PERMANENCY''.

(b) PURPOSE.—The 1st sentence of section 470 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 670) is amended—

(1) by striking ''1995) and'' and inserting ''1995),'';

(2) by inserting ''kinship guardianship assistance, and prevention services or programs specified in section 471(e)(1),'' after ''needs,''; and

(3) by striking ''(commencing with the fiscal year which begins October 1, 1980)''.

SEC. 134. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), subject to subsection (b), the amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2016.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The amendments made by sections 131 and 133 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) TRANSITION RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a State plan under part B or E of title IV of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this title, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such part solely on the basis of the failure of the plan to meet such additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(2) APPLICATION TO PROGRAMS OPERATED BY INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—In the case of an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires time to take action necessary to comply with the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this title (whether the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium has a plan under section 479B of the Social Security Act or a cooperative agreement or contract entered into with a State), the Secretary shall provide the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium with such additional time as the Secretary determines is necessary for the tribe, organization, or tribal consortium to take the action to comply with the additional requirements before being regarded as failing to comply with the requirements.

TITLE II—ENSURING THE NECESSITY OF A PLACEMENT THAT IS NOT IN A FOSTER FAMILY HOME

SEC. 201. LIMITATION ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION FOR PLACEMENTS THAT ARE NOT IN FOSTER FAMILY HOMES.

(a) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 472 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 672), as amended by section 112, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)(C), by inserting '', but only to the extent permitted under subsection (k)'' after ''institution''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(k) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with the third week for which foster care maintenance payments are made under this section on behalf of a child placed in a child-care institution, no Federal payment shall be made to the State under section 474(a)(1) for amounts expended for foster care maintenance payments on behalf of the child unless—

''(A) the child is placed in a child-care institution that is a setting specified in paragraph (2) (or is placed in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility consistent with subsection (j)); and

''(B) in the case of a child placed in a qualified residential treatment program (as defined in paragraph (4)), the requirements specified in paragraph (3) and section 475A(c) are met.

''(2) SPECIFIED SETTINGS FOR PLACEMENT.—The settings for placement specified in this paragraph are the following:

''(A) A qualified residential treatment program (as defined in paragraph (4)).

''(B) A setting specializing in providing prenatal, post-partum, or parenting supports for youth.

''(C) In the case of a child who has attained 18 years of age, a supervised setting in which the child is living independently.

''(3) ASSESSMENT TO DETERMINE APPROPRIATENESS OF PLACEMENT IN A QUALIFIED RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT PROGRAM.—

''(A) DEADLINE FOR ASSESSMENT.—In the case of a child who is placed in a qualified residential treatment program, if the assessment required under section 475A(c)(1) is not completed within 30 days after the placement is made, no Federal payment shall be made to the State under section 474(a)(1) for any amounts expended for foster care maintenance payments on behalf of the child during the placement.

''(B) DEADLINE FOR TRANSITION OUT OF PLACEMENT.—If the assessment required under section 475A(c)(1) determines that the placement of a child in a qualified residential treatment program is not appropriate, a court disapproves such a placement under section 475A(c)(2), or a child who has been in an approved placement in a qualified residential treatment program is going to return home or be placed with a fit and willing relative, a legal guardian, or an adoptive parent, or in a foster family home, Federal payments shall be made to the State under section 474(a)(1) for amounts expended for foster care maintenance payments on behalf of the child while the child remains in the qualified residential treatment program only during the period necessary for the child to transition home or to such a placement. In no event shall a State receive Federal payments under section 474(a)(1) for amounts expended for foster care maintenance payments on behalf of a child who remains placed in a qualified residential treatment program after the end of the 30-day period that begins on the date a determination is made that the placement is no longer the recommended or approved placement for the child.

''(4) QUALIFIED RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT PROGRAM.—For purposes of this part, the term 'qualified residential treatment program' means a program that—

''(A) has a trauma-informed treatment model that is designed to address the needs, including clinical needs as appropriate, of children with serious emotional or behavioral disorders or disturbances and, with respect to a child, is able to implement the treatment identified for the child by the assessment of the child required under section 475A(c);

''(B) has registered or licensed nursing staff and other licensed clinical staff who—

''(i) provide care within the scope of their practice as defined by State law;

''(ii) are on-site during business hours; and

''(iii) are available 24 hours a day and 7 days a week;

''(C) to extent appropriate, and in accordance with the child's best interests, facilitates participation of family members in the child's treatment program;

''(D) facilitates outreach to the family members of the child, including siblings, documents how the outreach is made (including contact information), and maintains contact information for any known biological family and fictive kin of the child;

''(E) documents how family members are integrated into the treatment process for the child, including post-discharge, and how sibling connections are maintained;

''(F) provides discharge planning and family-based aftercare support for at least 6 months post-discharge; and

''(G) is licensed in accordance with section 471(a)(10) and is accredited by any of the following independent, not-for-profit organizations:

''(i) The Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF).

''(ii) The Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (JCAHO).

''(iii) The Council on Accreditation (COA).

''(iv) Any other independent, not-for-profit accrediting organization approved by the Secretary.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 474(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 674(a)(1)), as amended by section 112(b), is amended by striking ''section 472(j)'' and inserting ''subsections (j) and (k) of section 472''.

(b) DEFINITION OF FOSTER FAMILY HOME, CHILD-CARE INSTITUTION.—Section 472(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 672(c)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this part:

''(1) FOSTER FAMILY HOME.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'foster family home' means the home of an individual or family—

''(i) that is licensed or approved by the State in which it is situated as a foster family home that meets the standards established for the licensing or approval; and

''(ii) in which a child in foster care has been placed in the care of an individual, who resides with the child and who has been licensed or approved by the State to be a foster parent—

''(I) that the State deems capable of adhering to the reasonable and prudent parent standard;

''(II) that provides 24-hour substitute care for children placed away from their parents or other caretakers; and

''(III) that provides the care for not more than 6 children in foster care.

''(B) STATE FLEXIBILITY.—The number of foster children that may be cared for in a home under subparagraph (A) may exceed the numerical limitation in subparagraph (A)(ii)(III), at the option of the State, for any of the following reasons:

''(i) To allow a parenting youth in foster care to remain with the child of the parenting youth.

''(ii) To allow siblings to remain together.

''(iii) To allow a child with an established meaningful relationship with the family to remain with the family.

''(iv) To allow a family with special training or skills to provide care to a child who has a severe disability.

''(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed as prohibiting a foster parent from renting the home in which the parent cares for a foster child placed in the parent's care.

''(2) CHILD-CARE INSTITUTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'child-care institution' means a private child-care institution, or a public child-care institution which accommodates no more than 25 children, which is licensed by the State in which it is situated or has been approved by the agency of the State responsible for licensing or approval of institutions of this type as meeting the standards established for the licensing.

''(B) SUPERVISED SETTINGS.—In the case of a child who has attained 18 years of age, the term shall include a supervised setting in which the individual is living independently, in accordance with such conditions as the Secretary shall establish in regulations.

''(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The term shall not include detention facilities, forestry camps, training schools, or any other facility operated primarily for the detention of children who are determined to be delinquent.''.

(c) TRAINING FOR STATE JUDGES, ATTORNEYS, AND OTHER LEGAL PERSONNEL IN CHILD WELFARE CASES.—Section 438(b)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(b)(1)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by inserting ''shall provide for the training of judges, attorneys, and other legal personnel in child welfare cases on Federal child welfare policies and payment limitations with respect to children in foster care who are placed in settings that are not a foster family home,'' after ''with respect to the child,''.

(d) ASSURANCE OF NONIMPACT ON JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM.—

(1) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 471(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)), as amended by section 131, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(37) includes a certification that, in response to the limitation imposed under section 472(k) with respect to foster care maintenance payments made on behalf of any child who is placed in a setting that is not a foster family home, the State will not enact or advance policies or practices that would result in a significant increase in the population of youth in the State's juvenile justice system.''.

(2) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall evaluate the impact, if any, on State juvenile justice systems of the limitation imposed under section 472(k) of the Social Security Act (as added by section 201(a)(1)) on foster care maintenance payments made on behalf of any child who is placed in a setting that is not a foster family home, in accordance with the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section. In particular, the Comptroller General shall evaluate the extent to which children in foster care who also are subject to the juvenile justice system of the State are placed in a facility under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system and whether the lack of available congregate care placements under the jurisdiction of the child welfare systems is a contributing factor to that result. Not later than December 31, 2023, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation.

SEC. 202. ASSESSMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF THE NEED FOR PLACEMENT IN A QUALIFIED RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT PROGRAM.

Section 475A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 675a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) ASSESSMENT, DOCUMENTATION, AND JUDICIAL DETERMINATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PLACEMENT IN A QUALIFIED RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT PROGRAM.—In the case of any child who is placed in a qualified residential treatment program (as defined in section 472(k)(4)), the following requirements shall apply for purposes of approving the case plan for the child and the case system review procedure for the child:

''(1)(A) Within 30 days of the start of each placement in such a setting, a qualified individual (as defined in subparagraph (D)) shall—

''(i) assess the strengths and needs of the child using an age-appropriate, evidence-based, validated, functional assessment tool approved by the Secretary;

''(ii) determine whether the needs of the child can be met with family members or through placement in a foster family home or, if not, which setting from among the settings specified in section 472(k)(2) would provide the most effective and appropriate level of care for the child in the least restrictive environment and be consistent with the short- and long-term goals for the child, as specified in the permanency plan for the child; and

''(iii) develop a list of child-specific short- and long-term mental and behavioral health goals.

''(B)(i) The State shall assemble a family and permanency team for the child in accordance with the requirements of clauses (ii) and (iii). The qualified individual conducting the assessment required under subparagraph (A) shall work in conjunction with the family of, and permanency team for, the child while conducting and making the assessment.

''(ii) The family and permanency team shall consist of all appropriate biological family members, relative, and fictive kin of the child, as well as, as appropriate, professionals who are a resource to the family of the child, such as teachers, medical or mental health providers who have treated the child, or clergy. In the case of a child who has attained age 14, the family and permanency team shall include the members of the permanency planning team for the child that are selected by the child in accordance with section 475(5)(C)(iv).

''(iii) The State shall document in the child's case plan—

''(I) the reasonable and good faith effort of the State to identify and include all such individuals on the family of, and permanency team for, the child;

''(II) all contact information for members of the family and permanency team, as well as

''contact information for other family members and fictive kin who are not part of the family and permanency team;

''(III) evidence that meetings of the family and permanency team, including meetings relating to the assessment required under subparagraph (A), are held at a time and place convenient for family;

''(IV) if reunification is the goal, evidence demonstrating that the parent from whom the child was removed provided input on the members of the family and permanency team;

''(V) evidence that the assessment required under subparagraph (A) is determined in conjunction with the family and permanency team; and

''(VI) the placement preferences of the family and permanency team relative to the assessment and, if the placement preferences of the family and permanency team and child are not the placement setting recommended by the qualified individual conducting the assessment under subparagraph (A), the reasons why the preferences of the team and of the child were not recommended.

''(C) In the case of a child who the qualified individual conducting the assessment under subparagraph (A) determines should not be placed in a foster family home, the qualified individual shall specify in writing the reasons why the needs of the child cannot be met by the family of the child or in a foster family home. A shortage or lack of foster family homes shall not be an acceptable reason for determining that a needs of the child cannot be met in a foster family home. The qualified individual also shall specify in writing why the recommended placement in a qualified residential treatment program is the setting that will provide the child with the most effective and appropriate level of care in the least restrictive environment and how that placement is consistent with the short- and long-term goals for the child, as specified in the permanency plan for the child.

''(D)(i) Subject to clause (ii), in this subsection, the term 'qualified individual' means a trained professional or licensed clinician who is not an employee of the State agency and who is not connected to, or affiliated with, any placement setting in which children are placed by the State.

''(ii) The Secretary may approve a request of a State to waive any requirement in clause (i) upon a submission by the State, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, that certifies that the trained professionals or licensed clinicians with responsibility for performing the assessments described in subparagraph (A) shall maintain objectivity with respect to determining the most effective and appropriate placement for a child.

''(2) Within 60 days of the start of each placement in a qualified residential treatment program, a family or juvenile court or another court (including a tribal court) of competent jurisdiction, or an administrative body appointed or approved by the court, independently, shall—

''(A) consider the assessment, determination, and documentation made by the qualified individual conducting the assessment under paragraph (1);

''(B) determine whether the needs of the child can be met through placement in a foster family home or, if not, whether placement of the child in a qualified residential treatment program provides the most effective and appropriate level of care for the child in the least restrictive environment and whether that placement is consistent with the short- and long-term goals for the child, as specified in the permanency plan for the child; and

''(C) approve or disapprove the placement.

''(3) The written documentation made under paragraph (1)(C) and documentation of the determination and approval or disapproval of the placement in a qualified residential treatment program by a court or administrative body under paragraph (2) shall be included in and made part of the case plan for the child.

''(4) As long as a child remains placed in a qualified residential treatment program, the State agency shall submit evidence at each status review and each permanency hearing held with respect to the child—

''(A) demonstrating that ongoing assessment of the strengths and needs of the child continues to support the determination that the needs of the child cannot be met through placement in a foster family home, that the placement in a qualified residential treatment program provides the most effective and appropriate level of care for the child in the least restrictive environment, and that the placement is consistent with the short- and long-term goals for the child, as specified in the permanency plan for the child;

''(B) documenting the specific treatment or service needs that will be met for the child in the placement and the length of time the child is expected to need the treatment or services; and

''(C) documenting the efforts made by the State agency to prepare the child to return home or to be placed with a fit and willing relative, a legal guardian, or an adoptive parent, or in a foster family home.

''(5) In the case of any child who is placed in a qualified residential treatment program for more than 12 consecutive months or 18 nonconsecutive months (or, in the case of a child who has not attained age 13, for more than 6 consecutive or nonconsecutive months), the State agency shall submit to the Secretary—

''(A) the most recent versions of the evidence and documentation specified in paragraph (4); and

''(B) the signed approval of the head of the State agency for the continued placement of the child in that setting.''.

SEC. 203. PROTOCOLS TO PREVENT INAPPROPRIATE DIAGNOSES.

(a) STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 422(b)(15)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(15)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (vi), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) by redesignating clause (vii) as clause (viii); and

(3) by inserting after clause (vi) the following:

''(vii) the procedures and protocols the State has established to ensure that children in foster care placements are not inappropriately diagnosed with mental illness, other emotional or behavioral disorders, medically fragile conditions, or developmental disabilities, and placed in settings that are not foster family homes as a result of the inappropriate diagnoses; and''.

(b) EVALUATION.—Section 476 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 676), as amended by section 111(d), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) EVALUATION OF STATE PROCEDURES AND PROTOCOLS TO PREVENT INAPPROPRIATE DIAGNOSES OF MENTAL ILLNESS OR OTHER CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the procedures and protocols established by States in accordance with the requirements of section 422(b)(15)(A)(vii). The evaluation shall analyze the extent to which States comply with and enforce the procedures and protocols and the effectiveness of various State procedures and protocols and shall identify best practices. Not later than January 1, 2019, the Secretary shall submit a report on the results of the evaluation to Congress.''.

SEC. 204. ADDITIONAL DATA AND REPORTS REGARDING CHILDREN PLACED IN A SETTING THAT IS NOT A FOSTER FAMILY HOME.

Section 479A(a)(7)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 679b(a)(7)(A)) is amended by striking clauses (i) through (vi) and inserting the following:

''(i) with respect to each such placement—

''(I) the type of the placement setting, including whether the placement is shelter care, a group home and if so, the range of the child population in the home, a residential treatment facility, a hospital or institution providing medical, rehabilitative, or psychiatric care, a setting specializing in providing prenatal, post-partum or parenting supports, or some other kind of child-care institution and if so, what kind;

''(II) the number of children in the placement setting and the age, race, ethnicity, and gender of each of the children;

''(III) for each child in the placement setting, the length of the placement of the child in the setting, whether the placement of the child in the setting is the first placement of the child and if not, the number and type of previous placements of the child, and whether the child has special needs or another diagnosed mental or physical illness or condition; and

''(IV) the extent of any specialized education, treatment, counseling, or other services provided in the setting; and

''(ii) separately, the number and ages of children in the placements who have a permanency plan of another planned permanent living arrangement; and''.

SEC. 205. EFFECTIVE DATES; APPLICATION TO WAIVERS.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2) and subsections (b) and (c), the amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2016.

(2) TRANSITION RULE.—In the case of a State plan under part B or E of title IV of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this title, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such part solely on the basis of the failure of the plan to meet the additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(b) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION FOR PLACEMENTS THAT ARE NOT IN FOSTER FAMILY HOMES AND RELATED PROVISIONS.—The amendments made by sections 201(a), 201(b), 201(d), and 202 shall take effect on October 1, 2019.

(c) APPLICATION TO STATES WITH WAIVERS.—In the case of a State that, on the date of enactment of this Act, has in effect a waiver approved under section 1130 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-9), the amendments made by this title shall not apply with respect to the State before the expiration (determined without regard to any extensions) of the waiver to the extent the amendments are inconsistent with the terms of the waiver.

TITLE III—CONTINUING SUPPORT FOR CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

SEC. 301. SUPPORTING AND RETAINING FOSTER FAMILIES FOR CHILDREN.

(a) SUPPORTING AND RETAINING FOSTER PARENTS AS A FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICE.—Section 431(a)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 631(a)(2)(B)) is amended by redesignating clauses (iii) through (vi) as clauses (iv) through (vii), respectively, and inserting after clause (ii) the following:

''(iii) To support and retain foster families so they can provide quality family-based settings for children in foster care.''.

(b) SUPPORT FOR FOSTER FAMILY HOMES.—Section 436 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) SUPPORT FOR FOSTER FAMILY HOMES.—Out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 2018, $8,000,000 for the Secretary to make competitive grants to States, Indian tribes, or tribal consortia to support the recruitment and retention

of high-quality foster families to increase their capacity to place more children in family settings, focused on States, Indian tribes, or tribal consortia with the highest percentage of children in non-family settings. The amount appropriated under this subparagraph shall remain available through fiscal year 2022.''.

SEC. 302. EXTENSION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION OF STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES CHILD WELFARE SERVICES PROGRAM.—Section 425 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 625) is amended by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''.

(b) EXTENSION OF PROMOTING SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 436(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629f(a)) is amended by striking all that follows ''$345,000,000'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021.''.

(2) DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.—Section 437(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(a)) is amended by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''.

(c) EXTENSION OF FUNDING RESERVATIONS FOR MONTHLY CASEWORKER VISITS AND REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—Section 436(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629f(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''.

(d) REAUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING FOR STATE COURTS.—

(1) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 438(c)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''.

(2) EXTENSION OF FEDERAL SHARE.—Section 438(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(d)) is amended by striking ''2012 through 2016'' and inserting ''2017 through 2021''.

(e) REPEAL OF EXPIRED PROVISIONS.—Section 438(e) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(e)) is repealed.

SEC. 303. IMPROVEMENTS TO THE JOHN H. CHAFEE FOSTER CARE INDEPENDENCE PROGRAM AND RELATED PROVISIONS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO SERVE FORMER FOSTER YOUTH UP TO AGE 23.—Section 477 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 677) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5), by inserting ''(or 23 years of age, in the case of a State with a certification under subsection (b)(3)(A)(ii) to provide assistance and services to youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained such age, in accordance with such subsection)'' after ''21 years of age'';

(2) in subsection (b)(3)(A)—

(A) by inserting ''(i)'' before ''A certification'';

(B) by striking ''children who have left foster care'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained 21 years of age.''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) If the State has elected under section 475(8)(B) to extend eligibility for foster care to all children who have not attained 21 years of age, or if the Secretary determines that the State agency responsible for administering the State plans under this part and part B uses State funds or any other funds not provided under this part to provide services and assistance for youths who have aged out of foster care that are comparable to the services and assistance the youths would receive if the State had made such an election, the certification required under clause (i) may provide that the State will provide assistance and services to youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained 23 years of age.''; and

(3) in subsection (b)(3)(B), by striking ''children who have left foster care'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained 21 years of age (or 23 years of age, in the case of a State with a certification under subparagraph (A)(i) to provide assistance and services to youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained such age, in accordance with subparagraph (A)(ii)).''.

(b) AUTHORITY TO REDISTRIBUTE UNSPENT FUNDS.—Section 477(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 677(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by inserting ''or does not expend allocated funds within the time period specified under section 477(d)(3)'' after ''provided by the Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) REDISTRIBUTION OF UNEXPENDED AMOUNTS.—

''(A) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—To the extent that amounts paid to States under this section in a fiscal year remain unexpended by the States at the end of the succeeding fiscal year, the Secretary may make the amounts available for redistribution in the 2nd succeeding fiscal year among the States that apply for additional funds under this section for that 2nd succeeding fiscal year.

''(B) REDISTRIBUTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall redistribute the amounts made available under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year among eligible applicant States. In this subparagraph, the term 'eligible applicant State' means a State that has applied for additional funds for the fiscal year under subparagraph (A) if the Secretary determines that the State will use the funds for the purpose for which originally allotted under this section.

''(ii) AMOUNT TO BE REDISTRIBUTED.—The amount to be redistributed to each eligible applicant State shall be the amount so made available multiplied by the State foster care ratio, (as defined in subsection (c)(4), except that, in such subsection, 'all eligible applicant States (as defined in subsection (d)(5)(B)(i))' shall be substituted for 'all States').

''(iii) TREATMENT OF REDISTRIBUTED AMOUNT.—Any amount made available to a State under this paragraph shall be regarded as part of the allotment of the State under this section for the fiscal year in which the redistribution is made.

''(C) TRIBES.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'State' includes an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium that receives an allotment under this section.''.

(c) EXPANDING AND CLARIFYING THE USE OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING VOUCHERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 477(i)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 677(i)(3)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''on the date'' and all that follows through ''23'' and inserting ''to remain eligible until they attain 26''; and

(B) by inserting '', but in no event may a youth participate in the program for more than 5 years (whether or not consecutive)'' before the period.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 477(i)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 677(i)(1)) is amended by inserting ''who have attained 14 years of age'' before the period.

(d) OTHER IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 477 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 677), as amended by subsections (a), (b), and (c), is amended—

*(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**INDEPENDENCE PROGRAM**'' and inserting ''**PROGRAM FOR SUCCESSFUL TRANSITION TO ADULTHOOD**'';*

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''identify children who are likely to remain in foster care until 18 years of age and to help these children make the transition to self-sufficiency by providing services'' and inserting ''support all youth who have experienced foster care at age 14 or older in their transition to adulthood through transitional services'';

(ii) by inserting ''and post-secondary education'' after ''high school diploma''; and

(iii) by striking ''training in daily living skills, training in budgeting and financial management skills'' and inserting ''training and opportunities to practice daily living skills (such as financial literacy training and driving instruction)'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''who are likely to remain in foster care until 18 years of age receive the education, training, and services necessary to obtain employment'' and inserting ''who have experienced foster care at age 14 or older achieve meaningful, permanent connections with a caring adult'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''who are likely to remain in foster care until 18 years of age prepare for and enter postsecondary training and education institutions'' and inserting ''who have experienced foster care at age 14 or older engage in age or developmentally appropriate activities, positive youth development, and experiential learning that reflects what their peers in intact families experience''; and

(D) by striking paragraph (4) and redesignating paragraphs (5) through (8) as paragraphs (4) through (7);

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(D), by striking ''adolescents'' and inserting ''youth''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by inserting ''including training on youth development'' after ''to provide training''; and

(II) by striking ''adolescents preparing for independent living'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''youth preparing for a successful transition to adulthood and making a permanent connection with a caring adult.'';

(ii) in subparagraph (H), by striking ''adolescents'' each place it appears and inserting ''youth''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (K)—

(I) by striking ''an adolescent'' and inserting ''a youth''; and

(II) by striking ''the adolescent'' each place it appears and inserting ''the youth''; and

(4) in subsection (f), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than October 1, 2017, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the National Youth in Transition Database and any other databases in which States report outcome measures relating to children in foster care and children who have aged out of foster care or left foster care for kinship guardianship or adoption. The report shall include the following:

''(A) A description of the reasons for entry into foster care and of the foster care experiences, such as length of stay, number of placement settings, case goal, and discharge reason of 17-year-olds who are surveyed by the National Youth in Transition Database and an analysis of the comparison of that description with the reasons for entry and foster care experiences of children of other ages who exit from foster care before attaining age 17.

''(B) A description of the characteristics of the individuals who report poor outcomes at ages 19 and 21 to the National Youth in Transition Database.

''(C) Benchmarks for determining what constitutes a poor outcome for youth who remain in or have exited from foster care and plans the Executive branch will take to incorporate these benchmarks in efforts to evaluate child welfare agency performance in providing services to children transitioning from foster care.

''(D) An analysis of the association between types of placement, number of overall placements, time spent in foster care, and other factors, and outcomes at ages 19 and 21.

''(E) An analysis of the differences in outcomes for children in and formerly in foster care at age 19 and 21 among States.''.

(e) CLARIFYING DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO FOSTER YOUTH LEAVING FOSTER CARE.—Section 475(5)(I) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 675(5)(I)) is

amended by inserting after ''REAL ID Act of 2005'' the following: '', and any official documentation necessary to prove that the child was previously in foster care''.

TITLE IV—CONTINUING INCENTIVES TO STATES TO PROMOTE ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP

SEC. 401. REAUTHORIZING ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP INCENTIVE PROGRAMS.

Section 473A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(4), by striking ''2013 through 2015'' and inserting ''2016 through 2020'';

(2) in subsection (h)(1)(D), by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2021''; and

(3) in subsection (h)(2), by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2021''.

TITLE V—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

SEC. 501. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM COORDINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 440 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629m) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 440. DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.

''(a) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget and considering State government perspectives, by rule, designate data exchange standards to govern, under this part—

''(1) necessary categories of information that State agencies operating programs under State plans approved under this part are required under applicable Federal law to electronically exchange with another State agency; and

''(2) Federal reporting and data exchange required under applicable Federal law.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The data exchange standards required by paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable—

''(1) incorporate a widely accepted, non-proprietary, searchable, computer-readable format, such as the eXtensible Markup Language;

''(2) contain interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model;

''(3) incorporate interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance;

''(4) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

''(5) be implemented in a manner that is cost-effective and improves program efficiency and effectiveness; and

''(6) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

''(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a change to existing data exchange standards found to be effective and efficient.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Not later than the date that is 24 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue a proposed rule that—

(1) identifies federally required data exchanges, include specification and timing of exchanges to be standardized, and address the factors used in determining whether and when to standardize data exchanges; and

(2) specifies State implementation options and describes future milestones.

SEC. 502. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO STATE REQUIREMENT TO ADDRESS THE DEVELOPMENTAL NEEDS OF YOUNG CHILDREN.

Section 422(b)(18) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(18)) is amended by striking ''such children'' and inserting ''all vulnerable children under 5 years of age''.

TITLE VI—ENSURING STATES REINVEST SAVINGS RESULTING FROM INCREASE IN ADOPTION ASSISTANCE

SEC. 601. DELAY OF ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PHASE-IN.

Section 473(e)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''fiscal year'' each place it appears and inserting ''period''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the matter preceding the table, by striking ''fiscal year'' and inserting ''period''; and

(B) in the table—

(i) by striking ''of fiscal year:'' and inserting ''of:'';

(ii) by striking ''2010'' and inserting ''Fiscal year 2010'';

(iii) by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''Fiscal year 2011'';

(iv) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''Fiscal year 2012'';

(v) by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''Fiscal year 2013'';

(vi) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''Fiscal year 2014'';

(vii) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''Fiscal year 2015'';

(viii) by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''October 1, 2015, through March 31, 2019'';

(ix) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''April 1, 2019, through March 31, 2020''; and

(x) by striking ''2018'' and inserting ''April 1, 2020,''.

SEC. 602. GAO STUDY AND REPORT ON STATE REINVESTMENT OF SAVINGS RESULTING FROM INCREASE IN ADOPTION ASSISTANCE.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall study the extent to which States are complying with the requirements of section 473(a)(8) of the Social Security Act relating to the effects of phasing out the AFDC income eligibility requirements for adoption assistance payments under section 473 of the Social Security Act, as enacted by section 402 of the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–351; 122 Stat. 3975) and amended by section 206 of the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act (Public Law 113–183; 128 Stat. 1919). In particular, the Comptroller General shall analyze the extent to which States are complying with the following requirements under section 473(a)(8)(D) of the Social Security Act:

(1) The requirement to spend an amount equal to the amount of the savings (if any) in State expenditures under part E of title IV of the Social Security resulting from phasing out the AFDC income eligibility requirements for adoption assistance payments under section 473 of such Act to provide to children of families any service that may be provided under part B or E of title IV of such Act.

(2) The requirement that a State shall spend not less than 30 percent of the amount of any savings described in subparagraph (A) on post-adoption services, post-guardianship services, and services to support and sustain positive permanent outcomes for children who otherwise might enter into foster care under the responsibility of the State, with at least ⅔ of the spending by the State to comply with the 30 percent requirement being spent on post-adoption and post-guardianship services.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services a report that contains the results of the study required by subsection (a), including recommendations to ensure compliance with laws referred to in subsection (a).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 5456, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Nation is in the grips of an opioid and heroin epidemic, which, according to States, is responsible for recent spikes in the need for out-of-home foster care placement after more than a decade of decline.

Under current child welfare financing, when a family is struggling, the majority of Federal dollars are only available if the State removes a child from his or her biological and adoptive home and places that child in foster care.

Even though it is often less expensive and more effective to keep a child safely at home, Federal support for these types of prevention services are extremely limited. Children who are raised by the State in foster care face increased risks of substance abuse, homelessness, teen pregnancy, and other negative outcomes.

The Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016 will reverse the current trends by supporting early, evidence-based, cost-effective interventions to keep children safely at home. This will increase the likelihood of positive short-term and long-term outcomes for both children and their parents. Moreover, it will ensure that children who do not need foster care are appropriately placed with families whenever possible.

Preliminary estimates are that the cost of the up-front prevention services to strengthen families will be more than fully offset by both reducing inappropriate placements into group homes for foster children, as well as briefly delaying additional adoption assistance to allow for a comprehensive GAO review to be completed.

In May, the Human Resources Subcommittee heard about challenges and successes of those on the ground as they attempt to fight the opioid and heroin epidemic in their communities. Today, we will move forward to ensure more struggling families get the help they so vitally need.

This bill is a result of a bipartisan, bicameral effort. So I would like to thank Ranking Member LEVIN and our Senate Finance Committee colleagues, Chairman HATCH and Ranking Member WYDEN, for working so diligently on this effort.

This bill also incorporates bipartisan efforts by Congressman YOUNG and

Congressman DAVIS to improve the exchange of information across State lines to get foster children settled into homes more quickly.

I would like to thank my fellow committee members, the bipartisan group of original cosponsors, and those on the committee who have also joined to sponsor this important legislation.

Finally, I would like to recognize the overwhelming support we have received from the child welfare community who, I know, have been working on this issue for many, many years, some say as long as 30 years, in terms of the prevention care for our kids.

I include in the RECORD some of these more than 60 letters of support we have received so far on this bill.

CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
Chicago, IL, June 14, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Congress, Washington, DC.
Hon. SANDY LEVIN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Congress, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY AND RANKING MEMBER LEVIN: As a nationwide membership organization comprised of many of the most long standing and respected child and family organizations in the country, Children's Home Society of America is writing in support of your efforts to promote and improve outcomes for many of the hundreds of thousands of children and youth who come to the attention of the child welfare system each year, including children in foster care. Over the decades the House Ways and Means Committee, with bipartisan support, has taken significant steps forward on behalf of our most vulnerable children and the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016 continues those efforts.

Allowing funds under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, currently used primarily for out-of-home care for children, to be used for the first time for prevention services to help keep children at risk of placement in foster care safely at home with their parents or with kin is a significant move in the right direction. Kinship caregivers play a critical role in protecting children temporarily while their parents are not able to and also in ensuring new permanent families for children who cannot return home.

We strongly support the bill's recognition of the importance of quality services for these children, which are evidence-based and trauma-informed and the importance of accountability in tracking the provision of services and their benefits for children. States at different stages in reforming their systems will also have help training staff for the development and delivery of these new services and putting in place the infrastructure needed to administer and oversee their delivery and child outcomes.

The Family First Prevention Services Act over time also will take important steps to ensure children who need to enter foster care will be placed in the least restrictive setting appropriate to their needs, by targeting federal dollars only on smaller family-foster homes and on other care settings for children and youth with special treatment needs or those in special circumstances, such as pregnant and parenting teens or older youth in independent living settings. A number of states already have undertaken special efforts to reduce the number of children in congregate care and to preserve group care settings for children with special treatment needs.

Children and society pay a high cost when the current systems fail to adequately address the needs of the children who come to the attention of our child welfare systems, nearly 80 percent of whom are victims of neglect. We believe that the specific changes proposed will go far in encouraging state and local child welfare systems, private providers, the courts and youth and families who have been involved in the system to work together to achieve significant change for children over the next decade.

We look forward to working with you to ensure these new child welfare finance reforms will truly benefit children who come to the attention of the child welfare system and to continue to explore additional improvements on their behalf to ensure they all have safe, permanent families. Thank you for your continuing leadership on behalf of these children.

Sincerely,

SHARON OSBORNE,
Board Chair.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF WISCONSIN,
Milwaukee, WI.

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
Chairman, Human Resources Subcommittee, House Committee on Ways & Means, Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BUCHANAN: Children's Hospital of Wisconsin strongly supports the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016 (H.R. 5456). We applaud your leadership on this important issue.

Children's Hospital of Wisconsin (Children's) is the region's only independent health care system dedicated solely to the health and well-being of children. We serve children from every county in the state and are recognized as one of the leading pediatric health care centers in the United States. In addition, Children's is the largest not-for-profit, community-based child and family serving agency in Wisconsin. Through our Community Services work, we provide a continuum of care to more than 15,000 children and families annually. This includes family preservation and support, child and family counseling, child welfare, child advocacy and protection, and foster care and adoption services.

We strongly support the Family First Prevention Services Act that would allow funds under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act to be used for the first time for evidence-based prevention services to help keep children at risk of placement in foster care safely at home with their parents or with kin. The legislation represents a significant and meaningful shift in child welfare policy by prioritizing up-front, evidence-based services to keep families together. We know from experience and empirical research that this is important for the healthy development of children.

The bill also makes significant advancements to integrate interventions and measures focused on child well-being into the child welfare system. Children's believes that prioritizing and providing accountability for child well-being, in addition to safety and permanency, is critical to achieving better outcomes for children and society and positioning children to thrive into adulthood.

Children's is committed to improving the health and well-being of children and families. We believe the Family First Prevention Services Act will enable the child welfare system to better serve our most vulnerable children and families.

Sincerely,

AMY HERBST,
Vice President, Child Well-Being.

[From the American Academy of Pediatrics, June 13, 2016]

AAP STATEMENT SUPPORTING THE FAMILY FIRST PREVENTION SERVICES ACT

(By Benard P. Dreyer, MD, FAAP)

''The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) commends House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Kevin Brady (R–Tex) and Ranking Member Sander Levin (D–Mich) and Senate Finance Committee Chairman Orrin Hatch (R–Utah) and Ranking Member Ron Wyden (D–Ore) for releasing the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016, a comprehensive, bipartisan effort to improve how the child welfare system serves children and families in adversity. This bill represents a pivotal opportunity for a major federal policy shift that moves away from placing children in out-of-home care and toward keeping families together.

''Children in or at-risk for entering foster care are especially vulnerable, they are more likely to be exposed to trauma and often have complex medical needs. This bill not only recognizes the unique needs of children and families in adversity, but also makes great strides to meet them in a way that pediatricians can stand behind through evidence-based, prevention-focused approaches. The bill offers states much-needed federal funding to support mental health, substance abuse and in-home parenting skills programs for families of children at-risk of entering foster care. This policy rewards state efforts to preserve and strengthen families by providing federal funds to administer prevention programs in a way that is steeped in science.

''Children fare best when they are raised in families equipped to meet their needs. Congregate care, when necessary, should be of high-quality for the shortest possible duration and reserved for instances in which it is absolutely essential. The AAP supports the bill's emphasis on ensuring that children are only placed in a non-family setting if they have a demonstrated need for the services available in that setting. The AAP also appreciates that congregate care facilities must be accredited and have licensed clinical and nursing staff to ensure they are capable of caring for vulnerable children and meeting their complex health needs.

''Fixing the shortcomings in our child welfare system will require continued investment across both state and federal governments. The Family First Prevention Services Act does just what its name says—it puts families first. This bill represents major, meaningful progress toward protecting children and supporting their families in creating safe and stable homes. Pediatricians look forward to continuing to work alongside bipartisan members of Congress to advance the bill toward a vote as soon as possible.''

CHILDREN AND FAMILY FUTURES,
Lake Forest, CA, June 13, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House Representatives.
Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate.
Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
Chairman, Human Resources Subcommittee, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.
Hon. SANDY LEVIN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.
Hon. RON WYDEN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Human Resources Subcommittee, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

DEAR WAYS AND MEANS AND SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN BRADY AND HATCH, RANKING MEMBERS LEVIN AND WYDEN AND HUMAN RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BUCHANAN AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of Children and Family Futures, I am pleased to share our support for the Family First Prevention Services Act (H.R. 5456) introduced today by House Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee Chairman Vern Buchanan (R–FL) and joined by eleven other bi-partisan original co-sponsors.

Children and Family Futures, a national nonprofit organization based in Lake Forest, California, has more than 20 years of experience in improving outcomes for children at the intersection of child welfare and substance use disorder treatment agencies and family courts. We recently had the opportunity to testify at Senate Finance and Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Hearings on the effects of opioids on our nation's child welfare agencies. As you may know, there are 8.3 million children—almost 11% of America's children—who live with a parent who is alcoholic or needs treatment for illicit drug abuse. About two-thirds of the children who enter the child welfare system are affected by parents with substance use disorders, and when we ask children and youth in foster care what they need the most, they often ask for substance abuse treatment for their parents so that their family can stay together. Quality substance abuse prevention and treatment is one of the cornerstones of a strong and effective child welfare system.

H.R. 5456 takes several critical steps to ensure that parents and children receive the full range of supportive services they need to heal and thrive. By allowing federal IV–E dollars to be used in a time-limited way for evidence-based prevention services, including mental health, substance abuse prevention and in-home skill-based programs, the proposed legislation provides an unprecedented opportunity for child welfare agencies to expand the services parents need to continue to care for their children safely without unnecessary foster care placements.

In addition, allowing states to draw down Title IV–E foster care maintenance payments on behalf of children who are placed in residential family treatment settings with a parent who is receiving treatment is another effective way to ensure that families can stay together while getting the services and supports they need to get back on their feet. For children whose parents struggle with alcohol and illicit drug abuse, the elimination of the time limit to allow family reunification services to be provided to any child in foster care and for up to 15 months after a child is reunited with his or her biological family will allow children of parents who are still in the very first stages of recovery to get the ongoing help they need to maintain both stability and sobriety.

CFF also strongly supports H.R. 5456's reauthorization of the Regional Partnership Grant program that provides funding to state and regional grantees seeking to provide evidence-based services to prevent child abuse and neglect related to substance abuse and revised grant requirements based on lessons learned from the most effective past grants. In addition to updating the program to specifically address the opioid and heroin epidemic, the proposal legislation leverages what has been learned to ensure that new foster care prevention funding provided under the bill is used effectively.

In addition to providing much-needed attention to prevention services for children and families who come to the attention of the child welfare system, the legislation's provisions to reduce the over-reliance on group care facilities are an equally important step in supporting children and keeping families together. The legislation's current approach to reducing unnecessary care while enhancing the protections and oversight for Qualified Residential Treatment Programs (QRTP) will ensure that young people who are struggling with their own substance use disorder or mental health issues have full access to clinically appropriate residential treatment options and that a continuum of quality services are available to help them transition back home to their families. Moreover, improving and expediting an effective assessment process and increasing judicial oversight of placement decisions on an ongoing basis also represent significant progress in connecting young people with the right services on a timely basis while also maintaining positive family and community connections.

Untreated substance use disorders are among the most critical and devastating crises facing the nation's children and families. Thanks to the leadership and bipartisanship demonstrated by members of the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees, H.R. 5456 offers a range of innovative solutions designed to keep children and families together and provide the services and supports they need to lead healthy and productive lives. We are deeply appreciative of your collective work on this bill and are confident that, if passed, it will continue to help thousands children and families, now and for years to come.

Sincerely,

NANCY K. YOUNG, Ph.D.,
Director.
SIDNEY L. GARDNER, M.P.A.,
President.

ALLIANCE FOR STRONG FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES,
Washington, DC, June 14, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY, *Chair,*
Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives.
Hon. VERN BUCHANAN, *Chair,*
Human Resources Subcommittee,
House of Representatives.
Hon. ORRIN HATCH, *Chair,*
Senate Finance Committee,
U.S. Senate.
Hon. SANDER LEVIN, *Ranking Member,*
Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT, *Ranking Member,*
Human Resources Subcommittee,
House of Representatives.
Hon. RON WYDEN, *Ranking Member,*
Senate Finance Committee,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY AND RANKING MEMBER LEVIN, CHAIRMAN BUCHANAN AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT, AND CHAIRMAN HATCH AND RANKING MEMBER WYDEN: The Alliance for Strong Families and Communities thanks you for your leadership and for introducing the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016. The legislation promotes numerous policy priorities that are consistent with our network's guiding principles for improving child and family safety, permanency and well-being.

We appreciate efforts you have made to address past concerns and to include components that are informed by effective practices in states and localities, technology updates, and current research. These include:

Permitting the use of federal funds to pay for programs across the evidence-based spectrum, and to continue knowledge formation in what works;

Making Title IV-B funds available to states so that they may modernize their Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) services so that so that children may be more quickly and effectively placed in appropriate homes across state lines;

Supporting the National Commission to Eliminate Child Abuse and Neglect Fatalities' recommendation that a 21st Century Child Welfare system require states to develop a statewide plan to prevent child abuse and neglect fatalities;

Requiring the use of an age-appropriate, evidence-based, validated needs assessment to help determine a child's need for behavioral health support through a therapeutic residential treatment setting; and

Engaging families in a child's residentially-based trauma-informed behavioral health treatment to strengthen the likelihood of their success, including establishing a family and permanency team in the initial needs assessment and ongoing progress monitoring.

We are very pleased with the bipartisan, bicameral effort to address child welfare reforms, and specifically, the longstanding policy priority to expand Title IV-E for prevention so that children and parents/caregivers may have access to services and interventions that ensure child safety and build family stability.

While the Alliance enthusiastically supports the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016, we do believe we have identified a significant technical misalignment within the definition of the Qualified Residential Treatment Program (QRTP) that, if addressed, would strengthen the bill, increase its effectiveness and mitigate against what we believe to be unintended consequences for children to whom we want to receive the right treatment, at the right time in the most appropriate setting. We fully support the requirement for a QRTP to use a trauma-informed treatment model, but are concerned about the rigid aspects of the language for QRTP staffing. The prescription of nursing and clinical staff being onsite during business hours is not consistent with Congress' desire to use evidence in its requirements on states and moves further away from a system that is child- and family-centered and community-based. We believe that QRTPs must abide by the fidelity elements of the approved, trauma-informed treatment model that they elect to use in accordance with the requirements in the bill and that the current language regarding staffing is inconsistent with the bill's treatment model requirement.

For example, if the fidelity elements of the selected treatment model require licensed or registered nurses to be onsite during business hours and available 24/7, then a QRTP must meet that requirement. Likewise, if fidelity to an approved model requires a different staffing composition and pattern, then the QRTP must meet that model's requirements and needs the flexibility to do so.

Therefore, rather than requiring the staff to be onsite during business hours, we recommend an amendment that aligns the treatment model requirement with the staffing requirement. The amendment would require staff to be onsite according to the trauma-informed treatment model being used by the QRTP. Our commonsense amendment acknowledges that high quality trauma-informed treatment models prescribe staffing patterns that are designed to achieve the outcomes proven by the program model. And, it strengthens the bill's effectiveness toward the greatest chance of success and normalcy for children provided in the most family-like settings possible.

The Alliance's wholehearted support of the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016 is unqualified and not contingent upon inclusion of the recommended amendment but, if the bill is passed without this amendment we intend to work to build a coalition to change this aspect of the QRTP requirements prior to implementation of these provisions in Title II in 2019.

Thank you very much for your hard work. We look forward to working with you and encourage you to contact Marlo Nash, Senior Vice President of Public Policy and Mobilization at *mnash@alliancel.org* with questions or to request additional information.

Sincerely,

SUSAN DREYFUS,
President and CEO.

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

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

The bill before us today, the Family First Prevention Services Act, has a very simple goal: improve the lives of our most vulnerable children. We worked across the aisle on this legislation because we recognize the importance of ensuring that kids grow up in safe, loving, and stable homes.

I mentioned that we worked together on this. Mr. BUCHANAN, who is the chairman of our committee, others on the Republican side, and Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BASS, and others worked so hard on this, and I think it has improved this legislation.

Our foster care system provides an essential safe haven for abused and neglected children. However, when it comes to our system today, it is clear that Federal funding has been stacked against prevention efforts. That means our Federal dollars aren't being used to effectively help families and prevent child abuse and neglect in homes. In fact, less than 10 percent of dedicated child welfare funding goes toward prevention.

This bill is intended to make sure families receive the help they needed before a child goes into foster care, not after, as our current system largely functions. This bill would provide substance abuse treatment for parents, support efforts to improve parenting skills and expand access to mental health care.

The Children's Defense Fund, which tirelessly advocates for our most vulnerable children, offered its full support for this bill, and it is my privilege to quote the Children's Defense Fund under its so esteemed leader: ''It takes historic and long overdue steps to direct Federal child welfare dollars to improve outcomes for vulnerable children and families.''

Simply put, this bill would help keep kids throughout our country safe and in their homes instead of placing them in a foster care system that we should use only when clearly necessary. It would be preferable if the bill's key provisions on prevention started sooner to help States facing immediate crises.

Furthermore, this legislation certainly does not address every problem facing our child welfare system, including the need to recruit more foster family homes; but, indeed, this bill is an important step forward in strengthening our Nation's child welfare system in the long-term. In fact, as we have seen, more than 50 organizations dedicated to advocating for vulnerable children have come out in support of this legislation, including, as mentioned, the Children's Defense Fund, the American Academy of Pediatrics, Prevent Child Abuse America, the American Psychological Association, Voice for Adoption, and the North American Council on Adoptable Children. This bill has also been endorsed by the national association representing State child welfare agency directors.

This legislation represents an effort to find important common ground in the House and also in the Senate with the leadership of Senators HATCH and WYDEN. We have more work to do. We have more work to do, indeed, to ensure our children have the opportunities and support they need to thrive, but this bill would take a very important step on that path.

So, once again, I would like to thank my colleagues on the Republican side and on the Democratic side. I would like to thank the staff on our side and, I am sure, the same has been true of the Republican side for all of their diligent and impassioned work on this important issue.

I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be governed and managed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Each day in America, as many as eight children die at the hands of those who are supposed to be caring for them. Three out of four of these children are under the age of three. Half of them will never reach their first birthday, and countless others of all ages will forever be scarred by abuse and by neglect.

The legislation that we consider tonight is all that remains of a comprehensive child safety bill offered by Senator RON WYDEN and offered by me here in the House last year. I salute his leadership then, and I accept his decision to settle for a small bit of what we sought to accomplish rather than no bit at all.

This year, Senator WYDEN put a fraction of our original bill into a proposal to which Senator ORRIN HATCH agreed, a bipartisan Family First draft proposal. Today's bill is a fraction of a fraction of our original initiative.

□ 1930

Despite the valiant efforts of many local groups and individuals across Texas, we have a child abuse crisis there. As The Dallas Morning News reported last month: ''Staggering number of Texas children in imminent danger neglected by CPS''—Child Protective Services—''investigation shows.''

And the same is true in one State after another. In short, the Republican answer in this bill is to do absolutely nothing with regard to child prevention services in additional resources now, to essentially do nothing about this crisis now, to continue neglecting the neglected this year, next year, and the year after that.

Adoption has proven one way that we can keep children out of the foster care system and in a loving family. I know this is not Mr. BUCHANAN's personal view, but the only way that House Republicans would agree for us to fund additional preventive services for these children to avoid child abuse—even though that takes 3 long, painful years of delay—is by our cutting about $700 million from adoption.

The other source of funding is congregate or group care. I believe we do need a change in group care, but while agreeing, I note that in Texas last month there were over 60 foster care youth. The only place they could find to sleep was in the State offices of Child Protective Services, and one has to ask about this bill the question of where these children will go if those group facilities are no longer available.

This measure was approved on the same day that the Committee on Ways and Means approved barring over $50 billion for additional tax breaks, and yet not another dime of additional resources to prevent child abuse this year. They demanded that there could be no resources going into child abuse unless it was paid for from other human resources, essentially robbing Peter to pay Paul.

One important aspect of the bill is the kinship provision, that assisting relatives who are willing to raise a child, keep them in a family home so they won't be bounced around from one place to another, that they get some support. I think it is a worthy approach, but it also shows how this House Republican proposal has slashed relief.

This year's bipartisan recommendation by Senators WYDEN and HATCH was estimated to cost $1.7 billion for kinship. Today we have a mere 8 percent—8 percent—of what they recommended, hardly worthy of a celebration. The major focus of this bill is to provide a

Federal incentive for the States to invest in prevention and early intervention to ensure the safety of children. For too long we backloaded everything. We responded to abuse after it occurred instead of trying to prevent it at the beginning.

We offer assistance now through this bill eventually, and we should be focused on it. I agree fully with that focus. That is why I plan to vote, reluctantly, for this proposal. But this bill would give the States an incentive through what is called Title IV–E, where the Federal Government would put up 50 percent, 50 cents on the dollar that is expended, and the States would put up 50 cents.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Unfortunately, this bill provides no immediate relief for children who are in danger right now. No additional funds for 3 years. In Texas, with the opioid crisis, and in other States, these children need help now. It has gotten so bad that Federal courts are beginning to declare these systems unconstitutional. We could have done better by these children. We have the capacity to do better. We have not had the will to do better in this Congress.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, having no other speakers, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), one of the members of our committee who has been a real advocate for children suffering from abuse.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas for yielding.

Child welfare advocates have used the adjectives ''landmark,'' ''historic,'' and ''trailblazing'' to describe this bill. I wholeheartedly agree with them. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation that begins a fundamental shift in Federal child welfare policy to preserving families rather than separating them.

I am deeply grateful to Ranking Member LEVIN, Chairman BRADY, Chairman BUCHANAN, Ranking Member WYDEN, and Chairman HATCH for including many provisions for which I have advocated, provisions that will substantially strengthen families in Chicago, in Illinois, and throughout the Nation. I am equally grateful to Ranking Member DOGGETT for his tireless efforts to secure additional resources for prevention.

My congressional district has the highest percentage of children living with grandparent caregivers in the Nation, followed closely by two other congressional districts in Illinois. We know that substance abuse and addiction underlie a substantial percentage of child welfare cases and separates families.

When I ask foster youth what policymakers could do to make child welfare better, they almost always say: You could have helped my mom and dad.

That is exactly what we are doing here today. The Family First Prevention Services Act invests in addressing key reasons that families struggle by providing evidence-based mental health, substance abuse, and parenting services to strengthen families so they can avoid the child welfare system. I am especially pleased that the bill includes my work to improve the effectiveness of child abuse and neglect prevention related to substance abuse by modernizing the Regional Partnership Grants.

Coupled with the prevention services, the extension of the Kinship Navigator program, the improved licensing standards to address barriers for relative caregivers, the extension of adoption and legal guardianship incentive payments, the new services for pregnant and parenting foster youth, the investment in electronic systems to improve interstate placement of youth, and the funding to support children in staying with their parents in residential treatment all promise to improve permanency and well-being for youth and kinship caregivers.

I want to thank the chairperson of my Child Welfare Task Force, Dr. Annetta Wilson, for sharing her expertise on how to improve policies to support children and families. I also want to thank Pam Rodriguez and George Williams with TASC in Chicago as well as Nancy Young with Children and Family Futures for sharing their expertise about what policies work to support parents affected by substance abuse so that we can strengthen families.

Finally, this is not a perfect bill, but it is a historic bill and a unique opportunity to strengthen families. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to enact additional supports for kinship caregivers, enhance services for expectant and parenting foster youth, and to protect the Social Security benefits of foster youth.

I attended a high school graduation last Friday, and the young lady who got the biggest applause was one whose mother and grandmothers both had died within the last 3 years. She also has given birth to two children. But she graduated with honors, and it is the assistance and help that we give to these young people who really prove that we can have an effective welfare help system for young people who need the help.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), who, though not a formal member of our committee, has been a very active participant in our subcommittee and who chairs the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth, among others.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5456. I believe this is a very positive step forward to reforming the child welfare system in our country.

H.R. 5456 takes into account what has been learned from years of county and State efforts at reform in the form of waivers. We have learned a lot. We have learned that we can safely reduce the numbers of children in care by providing services up front, prevention services that, until now, could not be supported with Federal dollars unless the State or county had a waiver.

What do we know?

We know that the main reason why children are in foster care is because of child neglect, and the main reason for this is substance abuse and mental illness. For example, there are programs, such as SHIELDS for Families in Los Angeles, that have been able to reduce the number of children in care by providing substance abuse services for families for 12 months.

The problem with H.R. 5456, however, is that services would be cut off after 12 months, and one of the features of addiction is relapse.

So what happens to a family if the individual relapses on the 11th month? Will the children automatically be removed and placed into care?

I think during the implementation phase, we need to consider flexibility with cutting off services at the end of 12 months.

The same thing applies to mental health services. The Chafee Grant is another thing that is a positive feature of H.R. 5456. Chafee grants help young people transition to adulthood. I am pleased that H.R. 5456 includes my language to extend time to 23 years old for a young person to receive prevention services. What these services are are essentially services that help a young person transition to adulthood, such as housing, counseling, job training, et cetera. Chafee is also extended in H.R. 5456 to the age of 26 for educational grants.

I want to applaud my State of California, where reforms are underway. We have passed legislation in California that long recognizes the need for housing to transition young people out of care, but in California we have had the insight and foresight to understand that children 16 years old sometimes want to transition out of the foster care system. Unfortunately, H.R. 5456 eliminates funding for children who are 16 years old.

I am concerned that the bill might have some unintended consequences. I think we would all agree that it would be best to keep a child in a family setting when they are 16 years old. However, many young people wind up running away from foster homes. Unfortunately, they wind up suffering from abuse, again, in a foster home, and

they need to be transitioned into adulthood.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. BASS. I am hoping H.R. 5456 will take into consideration unintended consequences and not contribute to homelessness amongst youth.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago I authored and passed into law the Protect our Kids Act. It became law with the help of former Ways and Means Republican Chair Dave Camp, and it established a commission to eliminate child abuse and neglect fatalities. It is a mark of the progress—or the lack of progress that this year, when that commission came forward with its report, Republicans on our committee would not permit a hearing to accept the modest findings of the commission.

And so we have reached tonight. I was offered in the traditional Washington way an opportunity to put my name on this legislation. It has some meritorious provisions that eventually come into effect, but I could not do that and face my constituents in Texas saying that I had done something to address this crisis when I know, in fact, we are not doing what needs to be done to address this crisis.

□ 1945

I advanced one of many alternatives to provide the dollars to deal with this crisis now. That was a proposal not for new taxes, but it was a proposal for tax compliance that would have fully funded the bipartisan agreement from the Senate.

But for the ideological commitment to oppose any new resources going to address child abuse, we would have those dollars. We wouldn't be taking the money out of good adoption programs. We wouldn't be delaying a response for 3 years. We would be doing something now to address the challenges that are out there for the children who face abuse and neglect today.

That is what should be happening. That is what today's bill fails to do, though it offers us the promise of eventual action to do what we should be doing right now.

And why wait three years to respond to this crisis? Because the Republican-controlled Ways and Means Committee that vulnerable children can receive federal relief only from money taken from other children or other portions of initiatives within the jurisdiction of the Human Resources Subcommittee. Republicans rejected the use of any additional resources to prevent child abuse, including a simple tax compliance measure that would require the filing of a 1099 for alimony payments to ensure that those payments were being reported as income, which federal law has long required. That modest requirement would have provided more than $2 billion of resources, without raising a dime of taxes.

Because taking money from adoption and congregate care fails to fully fund even today's delayed response, Republicans must also today waive a Budget point of order, since this bill does not comply with their own Budget rules.

Finally, this bill makes wholly unjustified and discriminatory cuts to adoption assistance. The sole reason for these cuts is budgetary—that was apparently the easiest way to find funds instead of adding the necessary revenue. This bill is paid for, in part, by delaying funding for children under the age of 4 to be adopted out of foster care, for those children with special needs, physical or mental, who are the hardest to adopt. According to a law Congress passed in 2008, those adopting 2- and 3-years-olds, who would otherwise have been entering foster care, would have been eligible in October for modest federal assistance; infants and 1-year-olds would have been eligible next year. Now, that funding will be delayed 2½ years, to pay for new services, none of which become available until 2020. The only excuse given for taking almost $700 million that otherwise would have supported adoptions is that some states are failing to reinvest in foster children the money that they save in foster care costs for each child who is adopted. There is no example of fraud or abuse, only the all too typical diversion by some states for other public services. Some states like Texas, which so regularly ignores the needs of its children, reinvested only a dime of every dollar of adoption savings in foster care. Others like Florida followed federal law and reinvested every dollar of their savings. This bill discriminates against Florida and similar states.

And what does this bill propose to do to crack down on this state diversion of savings from adoption? It asks for a government report. In 2014, Congress enacted provisions of the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act to prevent diversion. The Administration should enforce that Act. Requesting that the Government Accountability Office provide information already available from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services adds nothing not already known. But if all we wanted was a report, we could get that report just by writing a letter to the GAO. Seeking another report represents cover for taking away resources that would otherwise have benefitted blameless infants and toddlers.

We have a serious problem that deserves a serious state-federal, bipartisan solution. I am not opposing today's bill, but it does far less than it could and should have. It is a true missed opportunity to help some of our most vulnerable Americans. Today's bill does something, someday. We ought to be responding fully and effectively this day.

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

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

Again, this is bipartisan, bicameral legislation. It takes important steps to keep more children safely at home and out of foster care.

Under the current law, most Federal funding for child welfare is directed toward reimbursing States after they place a child in foster care. This is the least desirable outcome.

This legislation turns this around by putting resources towards preventative services to keep children safely with their parents or relatives. Most importantly, this bill will help ensure that more children grow up in a safe home surrounded by a stable family.

Strong families make for a strong community. I urge my colleagues to support the Family First Prevention Services Act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5456, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1777. An act to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the ''Former Presidents Act of 1958'', with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes.

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

S. 2736. An act to improve access to durable medical equipment for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

WORLD HARVEST CHURCH'S 15th ANNUAL HONOR OUR HEROES

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Georgia's Sixth Congressional District, I rise today to recognize the amazing works of Roswell, Georgia's World Harvest Church and their 15th annual Honor Our Heroes event scheduled for July 3 of this year.

The World Harvest Church has made a truly meaningful difference in people's lives by going into communities and ministering to all, young and old, with messages of hope and demonstrating the true love of Jesus Christ.

Mr. Speaker, part of this service is their annual Honor Our Heroes event, which is a wonderful opportunity for our local community to honor our veterans whose selfless acts of heroism have helped maintain our most fundamental freedoms: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The World Harvest Church also serves as headquarters for missionary

teams that travel internationally and administer help to those in dire need by building churches and centers of refuge.

Mr. Speaker, I offer our deepest appreciation for the World Harvest Church's pastor, Mirek Hufton, a faithful follower of God and a man of the highest compassion. Our Nation is made better by, and we are truly blessed by, World Harvest Church.

SEPARATION OF POWERS

(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 in support of H.R. 4768, which the House will consider later this week. This bill will prevent Federal agencies from using creative interpretations of law to expand their own authority.

In an ideal world, agencies would implement the law as Congress writes it. You wouldn't have judicial deference to agency interpretations of the law.

Unfortunately, we do not live in that ideal world. And rather than respect congressional intent, Federal agencies, especially under the Obama administration, have time and time again interpreted the laws in ways never intended in order to increase their own power.

The waters of the United States proposal and the Clean Power Plan, both rejected with bipartisan opposition, are just two recent examples of agency overreach.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that Congress remind these agencies that the people's elected Representatives, not bureaucracies, write our Nation's laws, not unaccountable bureaucrats or courts willing to go along with it.

CELEBRATING THE PENNSYLVANIA MARINE CORPS LEAGUE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Pennsylvania Marine Corps League. The organization will hold its 71st annual department convention later this week in State College, located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, the Marine Corps League was founded by Major General John A. Lejeune in 1923 and chartered by an act of Congress on August 4, 1937. Today, the Marine Corps League has a membership of more than 50,000 men and women and is comprised of honorably discharged, Active Duty, and Reserve Marines, including both officers and enlisted men and women.

I have the deepest respect for the accomplishments of the U.S. Marine Corps over the course of our Nation's history. The Corps was founded on November 10, 1775, and since then, those who have served as marines have shared the unyielding commitment to protecting the lives of American citizens and the interests of our Nation.

Marines have served our Nation bravely since before the start of the American Revolution, proving their courage from the shores of Tripoli to the island of Iwo Jima and, in recent actions, in places such as Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all the men and women from Pennsylvania and across our Nation who have served as United States Marines.

TIME TO ACT ON GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about an issue that is very alarming to many people across the country, an issue that saddens everyone, and an issue that, sadly, isn't being addressed by this Congress.

Last week, we lost 49 innocent lives in the worst mass shooting that our country has ever seen. Sadly, it is not an insulated case. Let me give you some numbers:

In the 3 years since the terrible tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School, there have been over 1,100 mass shootings. More than 34,000 lives have been cut short by someone using a gun. The House of Representatives has held 30 moments of silence for the victims of mass shootings since Sandy Hook, and yet we haven't taken a single vote on legislation that would help keep guns out of dangerous hands.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is shameful. The American people deserve more than silence. The American people deserve a Congress that is willing to stand up and do whatever it takes to keep our communities safe. That starts by making sure that terrorists, criminal domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill don't have easy access to purchase guns in our country.

Today, suspected terrorists can legally buy guns in our country. Individuals who are on the FBI's terrorist watch list can walk into a gun store, pass a background check, and walk out with a gun or the guns of their choosing—and they can do it legally.

Since 2004, more than 2,000 suspected terrorists were able to purchase guns. More than 90 percent of all suspected terrorists who tried to purchase guns in the last 11 years walked away with the weapon that they went in to buy.

Now, in the wake of the horrific attacks in Orlando, Congress must make it a priority to keep deadly weapons out of the hands of suspected terrorists. There is bipartisan legislation that would prohibit those on the terrorist watch list from being able to purchase firearms in our country. This bill is common sense. If you are too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun.

It is long past time for the Republican leadership to bring that bill up for a vote. We also need to pass my bipartisan bill to require background checks for all commercial gun sales.

Background checks are our first line of defense when it comes to stopping dangerous people from getting firearms. We know that background checks work. Every day, they stop more than 170 felons, some 50 domestic abusers, and nearly 20 fugitives from buying a gun.

Unfortunately, in 34 States, criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill can bypass a background check by purchasing guns online or at a gun show. This is a dangerous loophole that needs to be closed.

Yesterday, Senate Republicans blocked consideration of no fly, no buy legislation and a measure to strengthen and enhance background checks. Now the Republican House is going on with business as usual, without giving the American people a vote to help prevent gun violence in our country.

If the Republican leadership agrees that suspected terrorists, criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill shouldn't be able to buy guns, they should give us a vote.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY), the Member who represents Sandy Hook, where the Newtown tragedy took place.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to call on the U.S. Congress to call on this body, the United States House of Representatives, to do its job: to vote this week to keep guns out of the hands of would-be terrorists and to ensure that all commercial sales of weapons go through a background check.

Since the tragic shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School in my district in 2012, more than 100,000 Americans have lost their lives to gun violence.

Think about that. Think about a town in your district. Think about where your mother lives. I think about my hometown of Cheshire, with 30,000 people. Three Cheshires lost. Every single person—children, parents, teachers, grandparents—lost to gun violence. And this House does nothing.

In the 3½ years that I have been here, we have not been allowed one single, solitary vote to take commonsense, bipartisan steps to help prevent gun deaths in this country.

Congress' silence, our failure to act in this House, and the refusal of the leadership in this House time again to allow a vote is wrong, it is shameful, and it must stop.

Since my colleagues', Senator MURPHY and Senator BLUMENTHAL, historic, nearly 15-hour filibuster last week, Americans from all walks of life have risen up to say, ''Enough.''

□ 2000

Enough sons and daughters lost, enough families torn apart, enough of

absurd loopholes that make it easier for people on the FBI's terrorist watch list to buy guns than it is for your 16-year old to get a driver's license.

Reforms to stop terrorists from purchasing guns and extended background checks to all commercial sales are commonsense, bipartisan solutions to help prevent gun violence and to save lives. Outside of Washington, these ideas aren't the least bit controversial. In fact, they are simply common sense.

The American people get it. The overwhelming majority of Americans support the no fly, no buy rule that would allow us to close this absurd loophole that someone on the terrorist watch list can go in and legally purchase a gun anywhere in America, and to have background checks on each and every commercial sale.

Yesterday, on Monday, a majority of Senators decided to protect the interests of the gun lobby, rather than protecting the American people.

Now is the time for this House to lead. The House has remained silent for too long, for far too many acts of gun violence that have claimed the lives of tens of thousands of Americans.

It is unthinkable, unconscionable that this House would look to recess to celebrate the 4th of July, the freedom day, our Independence Day in this country, when we have yet to hold a single, solitary vote since Sandy Hook, when 100,000 Americans have died from gunshot wounds in 3½ years.

We must take up action. We must act this week. It is time for Congress to vote. It is time for Congress to act.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentlewoman for the compassion that she brings to this debate, and it is understandable. Having met with and spoken with many of the parents who lost their children at Sandy Hook Elementary School, to talk to them, and to have to tell them that yet another year has passed and the leadership in this Congress has refused, has refused to hold one single vote on any measure relating to gun violence, is just despicable and very, very sad.

I know that the gentlewoman from Connecticut goes home every weekend and talks with those parents and those community members who were shaken to their core to get that call that there was a shooting at an elementary school, and that their child was involved, and had to come down to that school and learn that their child was taken from them. It is unacceptable that we allow this to continue.

When Sandy Hook took place, I was asked by the minority leadership to chair a task force on gun violence prevention, and I took that on. I took it on for a couple of reasons: One, I know it had to be done; and two, I bring a unique perspective to this debate.

I am a strong supporter of the Second Amendment. I am a gun owner. I am a hunter. I have vast experiences with firearms, including carrying a military-type assault weapon for the tour that I served in Vietnam. I consider myself a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, and would do nothing to take an individual's Second Amendment right away from them. As I say, I support it strongly.

I also believe that, as a responsible gun owner, I, and all of my fellow responsible gun owners, have a responsibility to answer this call, to figure out how we can put on the books laws that—while protecting the Second Amendment, while protecting an individual's rights to own firearms and use firearms for target practicing, collecting, hunting, or self-defense, we have a responsibility to make sure we keep firearms out of the hands of people who shouldn't have firearms.

Criminals and the dangerously mentally ill should not be able to have firearms. They shouldn't be able to buy them, they shouldn't be able to own them, they shouldn't be able to use them. And surely this Congress can come together and figure out a way to make certain that this doesn't happen, to the best that we possibly can.

Now I will be the first to admit there is no bill in the world that we can pass that will solve every issue related to gun violence. But doggone it, we should try. We owe it to our constituents. We owe it to those who lost loved ones through gun violence, and we owe it to the responsible, law-abiding gun owners of this country to try.

Now I thought we had the makings of a good proposal when I sat down with my colleague and my friend from New York, Republican PETER KING, and we put together the legislation, commonly referred to as ''the King-Thompson Bill,'' to require that anyone who purchases a firearm through a commercial sale would be required to go through a background check.

You wouldn't think it would be necessary. You wouldn't think that anybody would want to sell a firearm to someone who may possibly be a danger to their community or to our society. But the fact of the matter is that there are people who sell firearms willy-nilly to anybody with the cash to buy them. And we need to step in and make sure that we stop willy-nilly from selling these firearms to criminals and the dangerously mentally ill, and that is what the King-Thompson bill does. It says that if you buy a firearm through a commercial sale, you have to have a background check.

Now anybody who buys a firearm in any of our 50 States through a licensed commercial dealer has to go through a background check. That is the floor. That is the minimum Federal law. Some States, however, don't go any further than that, which leaves this big loophole. It exempts individual sales, and some of those individual sales are commercial.

When you set up a table at a gun show and sell firearm after firearm after firearm, or when you go online and you list your firearms for sale as an individual, people can call and say: I want to buy that gun.

No background check needed because you are buying it from an individual. You can meet down in the parking lot of your local whatever store and you can make that transaction.

That needs to be stopped. Thirty-four States don't do anything about that. The King-Thompson legislation would do something about that. It would say that you have to first get a background check.

Now it is a bipartisan bill. As a matter of fact, there are 186 Members of this Congress who are coauthors of that bill. Five of them are Republicans.

Ninety percent of the American people believe that you should have background checks for commercial sale of firearms. Eighty-five percent of NRA members believe you should have background checks for firearms. They know that this is the first line of defense.

Again, it won't stop everything, but it does work. 170 felons a day, through the existing background check system, are stopped from buying firearms. We know it works.

Sadly, about 40 percent of all firearm purchases are done outside of federally licensed commercial sites, so 40 percent of the people who are buying guns today are able to avoid a background check. That is wrong. We ought to close that.

When we started the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force, we met with everybody. I conducted the meetings. I conducted the hearings. We met with gun owner groups, we met with gun dealers, people who sell firearms, we met with gun experts, we met with people who are opposed to guns and people who are for guns. We heard from police, sheriffs, the Federal agency that deals with gun laws. We heard ad nauseam. We heard from the NRA. We brought everybody in, all the outside gun groups, to tell us what we needed to do. And without question, we came away from that with the understanding that background checks is the number one thing that we can do if we want to make a dent in this gun violence problem that we have. And we should have a vote on that bill.

Now, we know that it works. I told you that, but don't take my word for it. Look at the facts.

When Connecticut passed what they call their Permit to Purchase, which is a background check legislation, their State saw a 40 percent drop in homicides by firearms; 40 percent drop.

Now, conversely, at the same time, Missouri repealed Permit to Purchase, which led to a 25 percent increase in homicide by firearms.

Those numbers alone tell us that we need to do something. We need to do everything we can to keep guns out of the hands of people who shouldn't have them. And, again, if you are dangerously mentally ill, if you are a criminal, if you are a domestic abuser, or if you are a terrorist, you should not be able to have a firearm.

It is this Congress' responsibility to do what we can. Background checks

are our first line of defense to making sure these aforementioned groups don't get their hands on firearms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to drill down a little bit on the remarks of my good friend and colleague, Mr. THOMPSON, about why these two bills, why the no fly, no buy bill, and the expanded background checks, are so important and why they are so critical for this House to take votes on them this week; because keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous people—and let's remember who these people are: convicted felons, domestic violence abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill, and the no fly, no buy would add would-be terrorists to that list—I think is something the overwhelming number of Americans and, frankly, people living anywhere in the world would agree would make sense.

Keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous people not only makes sense, but it works. Since background checks were instituted, over 2 million purchases of guns were stopped by would-be buyers who submitted to a background check and it came back with a rejection saying, You are not authorized; and the gun was not sold. So it does work. It doesn't work perfectly, but it works.

And why does it matter that we expand background checks?

Well, let me tell you a little bit of something that I learned when I was elected to this job and the horrible murders happened in Newtown. I learned about the details of our present system.

When the background check system was put in 20 years ago, nobody bought guns on the Internet. In fact, most of us didn't buy much of anything on the Internet, but now we do. Now nearly 40 percent of the sales go through the Internet, and almost none of those go through background checks. That was surely not the intent of our colleagues 20 years ago. It just wasn't the way anyone bought anything.

Simply to keep up with the times, to reflect the way Americans purchase guns, ammunition, and everything else, we need to close the Internet loophole because it is not just gun shows, more importantly, it is the Internet.

But let's also understand what it means now to have this loophole. I am going to tell you the analogy that a former ATF official—Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms official—told me when I first started working on this issue, now 3½ years ago. He said this:

Elizabeth, imagine you arrive at the airport. People flew in today. Imagine you arrive at the airport, and there's somebody loaded up with a suicide vest and a gun standing next to you in line.

But there are two lines you can go to get on the plane. One of the lines is the one we're customarily used to. We put our things through, metal detectors, x-ray scanners, backscatter scanners.

But there's another line. The other line you can choose, and you could just walk right onto the plane, take your gear with you. And if that gear happens to be bombs, if it happens to be a suicide vest, it if happens to be guns, you could just walk right onto the plane.

Now, I think we could all agree that that would be incredibly dangerous, incredibly irresponsible, senseless. And yet, that is the system we have right now for guns.

□ 2015

If you are a terrorist, if you are a domestic violence abuser, if you are dangerously mentally ill, and, most importantly, if you are a convicted felon, all you have to do is go online, or all you have to do is go to the gun show and go to the booth that doesn't list that it is a federally licensed firearms dealer.

Folks, that is just too easy. It is too easy for the bad guys to get their hands on guns. It is up to us to take action, the simple action of passing these two important pieces of legislation to close these loopholes.

Now, some will say it is too hard, this Congress is too gridlocked, and we can't get anything done, but I want to tell you what hard is. Hard is what Mark Barden does every day. Mark Barden's son, Daniel, was murdered in his classroom 3½ years ago, and Mark Barden gets up every morning. He tells me he can't even go and have breakfast with the rest of the family because that was his special time with his son. He can't do that now. It is too painful. So he gets up, he goes out of the house, he makes phone calls, and he does email because he can't be alone in his house with the rest of the family sleeping because his son is no longer there.

Mark Barden now is one of the growing number of American citizen activists, because this Congress has failed to act, these American heroes who fly around the country, pound the pavement, go to churches, synagogues, mosques, meet in schools, and go to chambers of commerce and plead with their fellow Americans to pressure this body, the House of Representatives, the people's House, to take action to defend the people.

What we do is not that hard, not compared to what Mark Barden does every day, not compared to the heartache of those in Chicago where you have dozens dying on a given weekend. Folks, it is not that hard. We can take the votes. We should take the heat, and we should act to save lives.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

She is absolutely correct. Our job is not that hard. Could you imagine that? On this floor, we are all parents; we have kids. Could you imagine losing your child? You send them to school, where they are supposed to be safe, and get the call that your son or your daughter has been murdered at school? That is hard. That is difficult.

What we are doing is not hard. It certainly shouldn't be hard for the Republican leadership to allow us to have a vote on gun violence prevention legislation that would help prevent these things from happening. They just happen too often. Every day, 31 people are murdered by someone using a gun. Every day, 151 people are shot in an assault in our country. That is hard.

What is the Republican leadership afraid of? You are afraid to take a vote? Are you more afraid than the people that were in that nightclub in Orlando hiding in the restrooms hoping they wouldn't be the next one who was murdered? Are you more afraid than those children in the classroom in Newtown, Connecticut?

Give us a vote. Let's address this issue. It is shameful. There is nothing to be afraid of. We were elected to come here and do a job. Give us a vote.

Our Gun Violence Prevention Task Force I mentioned heard from every imaginable interest on this issue. We took what we heard, and we put it in this legislation.

The King-Thompson background check legislation addressed a whole list of issues other than just the background check provision. They were issues that were brought to us primarily by the NRA.

The NRA asked for specific things. They asked us to make sure that there was due process for veterans adjudicated as mentally defective before losing their firearms rights. We put that in the bill. There was a request to clarify that the submissions to the NICS system don't violate HIPAA, the medical protections for patients. We put that in the bill.

The NRA was concerned that the length of time that you have to wait in order to get your firearm after you passed a background check was too long, so we put in place a provision that reduces the purchase proceed timeline. Right now it is 3 days. Eventually, it would phase into being 24 hours, with the idea that the NICS system would have more complete records because the bill also allows the States to get grant funding to allow them to better get their information into the NICS, and our bill requires the Federal courts to put records into the NICS system.

The NRA said that hunting buddies shouldn't have to go through the background check. If you are at the duck club, your buddy wants to sell a shotgun, you want to buy it, you have been hunting buddies for a long time and you know one another, they said they shouldn't have to go through a background check, so we put a hunting buddies known person exemption into our bill.

There was great concern that this bill would lead to some sort of Big Brother list of any gun owners. Not only is that nonsense, but we took their concern and we raised them one. We added a 15-year felony for the improper storage of records by anyone in the government.

We also heard concerns that members of the armed services were conflicted.

They have a permanent home address and a permanent duty station request, and that complicated their effort to own and purchase firearms. We put a provision in the bill that said members of our armed services can count their home and their permanent duty station as their residences. We took care of all of these concerns. These are things that the NRA said they have been trying to fix for years. Well, we fixed it in the King-Thompson bill.

At the same time, we take a step to fix this terrible problem we have where people can buy guns without having a background check—the dangerously mentally ill, criminals, domestic abusers, or terrorists.

This is a good bill, as I said, with 186 bipartisan coauthors. This is a bill that should be passed. No one knows that more than the gentleman from New York, Congressman ISRAEL.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman and my friend. More than anything, I want to thank him for his leadership in being able to bring people on both sides of this aisle together on the commonsense notion that, if you can't buy a plane ticket, you shouldn't be able to buy a gun. If you are on the terrorist watch list, you shouldn't be able to avail yourself of a weapon.

Mr. Speaker, when 20 children were murdered in Sandy Hook, the district of the gentlewoman from Connecticut, I really believed that Congress was going to do something. What did we do? Nothing. When Americans were murdered in San Bernardino, I said, well, this time we are going to do something. What did we do then? Nothing. We do moments of silence, and we do not act. Enough silence.

We are here to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and protect and defend the lives of the American people, and to allow lives to be mowed down, to allow our fellow citizens to be slaughtered and say that the solution to this is another moment of silence is unconscionable.

We came into session tonight, Mr. Speaker, and on Friday, the Speaker of the House will bang the gavel down and send Congress home for a week. In that week, so many more Americans will be killed by gun violence—so many more. To allow this Congress to take a week's vacation and do nothing on gun violence is unconscionable.

No bill, no break, Mr. Speaker. No bill, no break.

If the Speaker won't allow us to even vote on a bill, then we shouldn't be allowed to take a break and go home to our districts. For those who decide that they are going to leave here without even raising their voices in support of a vote, I don't know how you will defend that decision when you go home. I don't know how you will look your constituents in the eye and say: I have a week off, and I have done nothing to protect and defend my constituents.

I understand there are some real, fundamental, and profound differences on various potential solutions to gun violence. What this gentleman has done is brought us to common ground. No fly, no buy: 80 percent of the American people support no fly, no buy; 70 percent of NRA members support no fly, no buy; the vast majority of Republicans support no fly, no buy, along with Democrats and Independents.

The reason there is support for this bill is not only is it common sense, but as the gentleman just demonstrated, he and his bipartisan cosponsor, a Republican from New York, have worked out so many areas of disagreement to areas of agreement.

When the vast majority of the American people agree that terrorists should not be able to easily purchase guns, then the people's House should listen to the people. We should pass no fly, no buy, and we need to do it by the time we recess. No bill, no break, Mr. Speaker. I hope that our colleagues understand the importance of that.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his spot-on comments, passionate comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of California (Mr. RUIZ). He is a colleague of mine from California. As an emergency room doctor, Dr. RAUL RUIZ not only understands that we need to pass this legislation, but he has seen the carnage that has come in for his care.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Congressman THOMPSON, very much for his leadership and championing gun violence prevention in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in demanding that Speaker RYAN allow us to vote on measures to prevent gun violence before we adjourn at the end of this week.

Last week, we watched in horror as 49 of our LGBT brothers and sisters had their lives cut short at the hands of a firearm. This is not the first terrible slaughter we have witnessed as a nation. These mass shootings continue as Congress does nothing to act and nothing to keep our constituents safe.

As an emergency physician, I have taken care of too many patients injured by guns. I have had the gut-wrenching experience of telling parents, families, and friends that their loved one was killed by a gun. I have taken care of people who have been victims—innocent victims—of drive-by shootings. I have taken care of victims who have been shot by their spouse in a domestic dispute. I have taken care of victims who have been caught as bystanders in a violent crime at a store, and I have had the terrible experience of having to tell a mother that her child—her young, adolescent child—was killed in the streets. It is not something that we can ever be fully prepared for but we do way too often in our country.

These are needless deaths—needless deaths—because there is an opportunity right here and right now to curb the trend of violence in our country. This gun violence must end.

This week, we are calling on the Speaker to allow a vote so our constituents know where exactly we stand. There are several bills out there that would make a difference, including the bipartisan King-Thompson no fly, no buy that keeps guns out of the hands of terrorists and expands and strengthens background check systems.

If we can't agree on the fact that terrorists should not get their hands on guns in our country, then it is a political shame on the parts that are beholden to political interests.

Let's vote on the Zero Tolerance for Domestic Abusers Act, which would prohibit individuals convicted of stalking or domestic abuse from purchasing or owning a firearm; and let's vote on the bipartisan Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act, another bill of Congressman THOMPSON, which would improve the criminal history records systems, which would help our law enforcement and which would mandate that all commercial gun sales utilize this background check system.

□ 2030

It is not like we don't have ideas. It is not like we don't have a path forward to curb gun violence in America. There is no one cure-all.

If we take a public health approach, if we reduce the risk of the multifaceted aspects of gun violence, then we will reduce the risk of gun violence. By reducing the risk of gun violence, we reduce the incidence of gun violence in America.

Let us vote so that terrorists and violent criminals cannot access firearms, so we can prevent another Orlando. Let us vote to end gun violence to keep the American people safe.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in calling for no bill and no break.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his comments and for his service not only as a distinguished Member of this body, but his time as a medical professional. Sadly, he had to witness the carnage that comes about because of gun violence. I applaud his effort to help us reduce gun violence, to pass some commonsense laws that protect the Second Amendment.

As I said earlier, as a gun owner and as a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, I think that is absolutely necessary. I think it is absolutely irresponsible for any gun owner to not stand up and be counted when it comes to passing commonsense public safety measures, such as no fly, no buy and background checks for the commercial sale of firearms.

I thank my colleagues who joined with me this evening in this Special Order. You heard from everyone who spoke that moments of silence are not enough. We have had 30 moments of silence since the tragedy at Sandy Hook. It is not enough.

We need to stop being silent, we need to speak up, and we need to do our job. We need to show the courage that our constituents have placed in us. We need to do our job to make sure that when parents send their kids to school, they can be reasonably assured that their kids are going to be safe. We need to do our job so that when people go into a church to pray, they don't have to worry about some maniac coming in and shooting them during their prayer hour. We need to do our job to make sure that when people are relaxing and recreating in a club, or wherever it might be, they can feel reasonably assured that their Congress has taken steps to keep guns out of the hands of people who are criminals and people who are dangerously mentally ill, domestic abusers, or terrorists.

It is time to do our job. It is time to stop with the moments of silence. It is time to stand up, show some courage, and pass some commonsense, bipartisan gun violence prevention legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

TELLING SURVIVORS STORIES THROUGH THEIR OWN WORDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about what occurred at Stanford University a couple of weeks ago and a follow-up to some of the events that occurred after that.

The victim in that case gave a powerful victim impact statement. It was 7,200 words long. Last week, 18 Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, led by JACKIE SPEIER from California, read the statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: JACKIE SPEIER from California, KATHERINE CLARK from Massachusetts, DAVID CICILLINE from Rhode Island, NIKI TSONGAS from Massachusetts, MAXINE WATERS from California, BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN from New Jersey, JUDY CHU from California, ANNA ESHOO from California, MARK TAKANO from California, DEBBIE DINGELL from Michigan, MARCY KAPTUR from Ohio, TULSI GABBARD from Hawaii, TED POE from Texas, ERIC SWALWELL from California, LORETTA SANCHEZ from California, SUSAN DAVIS from California, PAUL GOSAR from Arizona, and ANN MCLANE KUSTER from New Hampshire. It took almost an hour to read her compelling statement about what happened to her when the rapist, Brock Turner, committed this crime against her.

After the crime was committed, there was a trial. The case was not, as we say in the system, plea bargained. There was no plea agreement. It was an actual trial. After the trial, the judge assessed punishment for three felony crimes that he committed—that being Brock Turner. The judge assessed punishment as a misdemeanor of 6 months in jail, which means that Brock Turner will spend probably 90 days in jail, a half of a semester, for the crime that he committed against the victim.

As a former prosecutor for 8 years trying these type of cases and a judge in Houston for 22 years hearing only criminal felony cases, I have seen historically how devastating the crime of sexual assault is. We, as a community, need to understand how victims are impacted by this crime.

Obviously, the judge in the Stanford case didn't get it. You can read what he said. It is obvious that he was more concerned about the feelings of the criminal and his future than he was about the victim. He was almost dismissive of her statement that she read into the record.

There is a movement that is being started by a Stanford law professor, Michele Landis Dauber, whom I got to meet last week—very impressive, Mr. Speaker. She gets it. She understands about sexual assault, this crime especially at Stanford, and the impact on the victim.

She is using a recall system that is in California that a public official can be recalled if there are enough signatures on a petition to get the recall on the ballot. She is feisty, and she is going to get it done.

I admire the State of California for having recall of public officials. This is a perfect example of why other States ought to have recall of public officials, especially judges who don't get it right. In my opinion, the judge should be removed from office.

After I spoke on the House floor, and then 19 Members spoke a couple of days later on the House floor about this crime, I have received hundreds—hundreds—of contacts from sexual assault victims throughout the country, primarily by email. Some of these sexual assault survivors have never told anybody, according to them, what happened to them years ago or of recent years. Many of them just didn't get the justice that they deserved.

They didn't tell for a lot of reasons, mainly because they were ashamed. Rape survivors—God bless them—think sometimes the crime is their fault. And it is not, Mr. Speaker. It is never the fault of the victim. When a sexual assault occurs, it is the fault of the criminal every time—not most of the time, every time. Judges need to understand that.

The justice system needs to work for victims of crime just like it works for the accused citizen. The same Constitution that protects defendants protects victims of crime as well.

We have come a long way since the days I was prosecuting. Once again, California has led the national movement for victims' rights. My friend JIM COSTA from California and I head up the Victims' Rights Caucus. He was the sponsor of the Three Strikes sentencing law that passed in California.

California has a history of looking out for victims. I commend California for that. I know that may shock you, Mr. Speaker, but I commend them for getting it right when it comes to victims.

In this particular case, it all went wrong. The victim articulated it quite well in her statement. I hope every Member of Congress reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because the statement of that woman is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Just read it. And, more importantly, if you are a dad, read it to your sons as well. I will come back to that in a minute.

I have four kids—three girls and a boy. I have 11 grandkids; 7 of them are girls. I sure don't want my kids and my grandkids to continue to grow up in a society that doesn't really take care of crime victims and is dismissive to them.

Of the many survivors that wrote me, several bravely offered to share their stories with me. I am here to read some of those stories. Not all of them, just a few. Some have asked me not to give their names. Some are anonymous. Some said it is okay for me to say what their name is. I am not going to tell their whole name. I am just not going to do that. I think they deserve that privacy. I hope, by sharing these words, the world will see what outstanding resilience these few sexual assault victims have had over the years.

Jennifer writes:

It was January 2004. I was 24 years of age. I am a divorced mother of three elementary school children studying to become a preschool teacher. The man I loved came home drunk after wrecking my car. My children were upstairs asleep. He beat me, beat my head against the cement floor, and then he raped me as I tried to stay quiet, so quiet, so still, so he would leave and no one upstairs would wake up. He did finally leave.

My mother said that since I loved him, it wasn't rape. Because I got involved with a man who would do that, it was my fault, and I couldn't very well make him lose his job because of my poor judgment. I was young. I didn't know. To this day, I blame myself for letting it happen, even though now I know that none of it was my fault.

Because of that night, I have post-traumatic stress disorder. My body remembers, even if my mind doesn't know all of the details.

After reading the speech you made, I told my new husband about what happened to me. This was the first time I have ever told him. We have been together for 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to Jennifer's mother, Jennifer's mother was wrong. It was not Jennifer's fault that she fell in love with a worthless guy. And the sexual assault was certainly not her fault. It was his fault. He should have been held accountable for what he did. Jennifer still suffers to this day for what that individual did.

The rape—and we use the word ''rape,'' and we use ''sexual assault.'' ''Sexual assault'' is a relatively new term. It used to be called ''rape'' because that is a specific type of sexual assault. Sexual assault is broader. But rape is never the fault of the victim, and neither is sexual assault.

The defendant always has an excuse to blame the victim: ''Well, she came

on to me,'' or, ''It was what she was wearing,'' or, ''She was drunk,'' or, ''She was under the influence of narcotics''; ''She didn't resist''; ''She didn't scream''; ''She didn't tell me no''; ''She didn't run for help.'' The defendants in these cases always blame the victim. But rape is not the fault of a victim. ''No'' means no.

If people out there in America want to join in on this conversation, they can use the #survivorsspeak, and just keep discussing this issue because I think we should discuss this issue.

Here we have a victim, ''I said no.'' Saying ''no'' means no. It doesn't mean maybe. It doesn't mean yes. ''No'' always means no.

So if folks want to join in on that, I would encourage them—#survivorsspeak.

That is Jennifer's story.

This story was written by a family member because of the age of the victim. She is anonymous, of course:

Twenty-six years ago, a 6-year-old was raped in Mercedes, Texas. The rapist got his fix as he pleased. The pervert? Well, he is still on the loose. He is a pedophile, a rapist, and a scumbag, yet he still walks the streets. His victim is now 30 years of age. She still has post-traumatic stress disorder. She still cries, is depressed, and relives her tragedy each day. Thank Congress for what they are trying to do for this crime.

This is a case where we know who the perpetrator was, and for some reason we don't know, he got away with it—maybe because of the age of the victim; maybe she didn't want to testify. We don't know.

□ 2045

He got away with it, and the victim still suffers now, 24 years later; but what happened to her when she was 6 years of age?

Christina writes this:

As a victim of rape 25 years ago, I am disappointed to see that we really haven't made progress as a Nation or a people in changing the attitude toward rape victims. It is time to recognize the lifetime impact that rape has on a victim. It affects every part of your being. It is time to stop the line of questioning that the victim is subjected to—the line of questions that insinuate: Well, what did you do to cause this?

I have been at the courthouse. I see how criminal defense lawyers ask a question in cases like this. Usually, the defense is: the individual. It is the fault of the victim. It is not the fault of the rapist. That is one of the defenses—to go after the victims. Attack them.

She continues:

My assailant was a friend of a friend. It still causes me to be overly guarded with relationships. I still question my judgment. On every new date, the first thought is: Where is my escape route? Then it progresses to: What are the signs that I am ignoring that I should be aware of that would harm me? I am aware that this is an abnormal thought process, but more than 25 years later, it is what I need to do to feel safe again—a lifetime of grief.

Aja writes this:

My name is Aja. I was raped. I have not received any sort of justice for the act committed against me. I have stayed silent about this for nearly 5 years, and, today, that ends. Today, I am no longer a victim of crime, but I am a survivor. I am not alone. I am not my past. I am not meant to stay silent. I actually matter.

Good for Aja.

Hillary writes this:

I am writing you so my voice and so many others may be heard. I was 19 when I was drugged and raped. To this day, I will never know how many individuals raped me. I may have no memory of the act, but it doesn't change the outcome. I was unconscious and never was given a chance to say no. I will always remember the pain, seeing the bruises that covered the inside of my thighs. My underwear was ripped from my body and tied together and put back on. I never want to see those clothes again.

I reported my rape, but never received justice, like so many other rape victims. I went through humiliating questions from the police. I felt so much pain and humiliation again at the hospital, through the pregnancy tests, the STD test, and the HIV test. Pictures were taken of my bruises on my body, and I felt so much shame. When the rape kit was done, I cried. It was painful. I felt ruined. I was given a lifelong sentence while he and others walk free.

I live with the feeling of shame. I could not smile. I live, even to this day, with nightmares. I blame myself because—maybe, if I had not taken that drink. He took my voice for years—a piece of me he did not deserve. I went through lots of therapy for depression, but I will live in fear no more. My body was taken without asking, but I have a voice now, and it will not be silenced.

I tell my story so others won't feel alone. We didn't ask for this. We need to make sure that no more victims are made to feel like they did something wrong. I did nothing wrong. I didn't violate him, but I carry the scars of what he did. I stand with every victim out there. I cried while writing this letter. It is the first time I have given my voice to be heard. Thank you again for giving us a voice to fight with.

She is thanking all Members of Congress who have spoken out against this type of crime.

This is another anonymous individual. I have three more, including this one.

Mr. POE, I can only hope that your words will be heeded and that the wrong will be made right, just a tiny bit, by this victim. From personal experience, the nightmares never stop. Not even after my rapist was killed in prison did the nightmares stop. I still see his face in the dark. I can hear his voice appraising my body like I was a cow at an auction. I have carried this burden since I was 7 years old, and it can't ever be fixed, but we can stop it from being the fate of others by making the punishment so severe, the crime is not an option.

She probably wouldn't have agreed with the 6-month sentence that the Stanford judge gave the defendant who will only do 90 days.

Another anonymous letter:

In college, a man broke into my apartment and brutally raped, beat, and pistol-whipped me.

It is hard to read this, Mr. Speaker.

He sodomized me with his gun. I have horrible flashbacks and can barely live a day when I don't have anxiety or panic attacks and the wish just to die and end it all from the emotional, physical, and psychological damage that he did to me.

You give some of us hope, and I want to sincerely thank you and other Members of Congress for standing up for us rape victims. I am honored for you to share my story to help others, but I want to remain anonymous because I still fear my attacker even though I don't know his name. My rapist knows my name. He stalked me prior to the rape. Thank you for taking the time to write me back.

The last case, Lauren's, was a case I actually tried. I tried the person who assaulted her and her sister. It was in 1997. Lauren was the age of 11, and her stepsister was 9 years of age. They were repeatedly molested, not by a stranger or by a friend, but by someone closer—their grandfather. He molested them several times. This happened 20 years ago next year, and Lauren still can't talk much about it. She reached out to my office to tell us that sexual assault stays with you for life. In her case, the individual was convicted. He received a 10-year sentence in one case and a 5-year sentence in the other, and they were stacked on top of each other, which means he had to do 15 years in the penitentiary of the State of Texas.

We have done some good things over the years. We have done some good things in Congress. The Justice for All Act strengthens the rights of victims of crime in the criminal justice process, increasing their access to restitution and the reauthorization of victims' notification grants. It takes steps to reduce the rape kit backlog. It expands the use of sexual assault nurse examiners in underserved communities.

I have been around so long that, when I started prosecuting cases, we didn't have a rape kit. We didn't know what that was. We certainly didn't have DNA. But we have rape kits now because some wonderful doctors have figured this out, some of them at the Texas Children's Hospital in Houston. It is a forensic kit that is taken of the sexual assault victim. These items are analyzed and tracked through DNA to find out who the rapist was; but right now, in our country, we have rape kits that are sitting on the shelves in police departments throughout the country that are gathering dust. People just can't get around to solving these crimes. They make all kinds of excuses: We don't have the money; we just need more help.

The bottom line is that we are denying justice to sexual assault victims for the failure to analyze these rape kits. We need to analyze the rape kits, but it cuts both ways, Mr. Speaker. Some of these rape kits, after they are analyzed, exonerate people in the penitentiary. Get it done. Solve this problem of the backlog of rape kits. There is no excuse for the Justice Department, for the FBI, for any local law enforcement agency not to analyze those sexual assault kits right away.

You see, when the crime is committed, Mr. Speaker, the system works in such a way that we don't let the victims forget about what happened to them because they may have to testify,

and they can't get on with their lives, so to speak, until the rape kit is analyzed, and the idea that one has to wait a year or 2 years before we know who committed this crime is abuse of the system. The system is abusing the victim again. Like I said, it may exonerate an offender who is in the penitentiary.

So no more excuses. It needs to be a priority of police departments. Analyze the sexual assault kits, analyze that DNA, because it really is good evidence in the courtroom to convict the guilty and exonerate the innocent; but you can't get to that point and the victims can't get to trial until the sexual assault kit is analyzed. They have to continue to remember this. They can't forget it, not that they would forget it, but they can't get on with their lives.

The same thing is true about postponing these cases. So many judges take a sexual assault case and: Ah, we will postpone this case. We are going to try some slip-and-fall case instead.

Courts in the United States, by the legislative authority of the legislatures, should make a priority of sexual assault cases, especially of minor children, and put them in the line first to get their day in court. Some States do it—some don't—but that is one easy fix that we could do.

Of course, this law, the Justice for All Act, protects VAWA funding streams that are critical to crime prevention, and I mentioned about DNA testing.

I mentioned JIM COSTA—a great American. This issue is a bipartisan issue. We have 80 in our Victims' Rights Caucus—40 Republicans and 40 Democrats. Every year, we have this fight with the appropriators. We are in the appropriations season. There was a great law that was passed by Congress—sponsored, I believe, by Ronald Reagan or whoever—that said this:

When a criminal is convicted in Federal court, the judge may impose a fee, and that fee goes into what is called the Victims of Crime Act fund. VOCA is what it is called. God bless those Federal judges. They are nailing these criminals, because more and more money every year is going into the Victims of Crime Act fund. That fund is to be used for victims of crime, including for services, restoration, counseling—all of those good things that we now do for victims that we didn't used to do; but here is the problem:

More money than ever before is coming into the Victims of Crime Act fund. Right now, my understanding is there is $9 billion in the fund. Now, this isn't taxpayer money. This is money that criminals have paid toward the rent on the courthouse. They have paid for the crimes they have committed, plus their sentences, and it is a fund that is supposed to go to crime victims. It is a great idea. The problem is Congress—us. This has been going on for years. It doesn't appropriate all of the money every year that came in the previous year. Only about 30 percent of it is appropriated to crime victims' organizations, and many of these organizations are barely keeping their lights on.

I am no appropriator. I am not a CPA. I am a lawyer. The appropriators say: Well, we can't spend that money because we need it as an offset for other spending in other programs.

It is not for other programs. It is not taxpayer money. What JIM COSTA and I have been trying to do since we came in here in 2005 is to say: What goes in this year comes out next year. Spend it all. We don't need to have a rainy day fund because the money keeps going up every year because Federal judges are making defendants pay into this fund.

Once again, it belongs to victims of crime, but it is administered by the Justice Department. It is no reflection on this administration. It has been going on for years. The Justice Department just hangs onto it because the appropriators don't spend it all and appropriate all of the money, as I said, because they want to use it as an offset.

□ 2100

The country and some judges, like the one at Stanford, have to get their mindset right today in 2016. Sexual assault is a crime we don't talk much about. It is just kind of distasteful, so we don't talk about it. We talk about other things.

Yet, these sexual assault victims live quiet lives of despair. And I have known a lot over the years. Some of them keep in contact with me. They just call to check in. And they don't ever get over it, Mr. Speaker. We would hope that they would. We would hope they get their lives together. You know they become survivors, but, emotionally, many of them just don't get over it for a lot of reasons; because they are ashamed, their mom told them it was their fault, whatever.

We need to make it real clear that Congress is on the side of sexual assault victims. Make no mistake about it, we are on their side because really we are their only voice. We are it. If we don't speak for them and help legislation forward to protect them, it doesn't get done. So we have a lot to do.

One thing that I would like to mention, the father and the mother of the rapist gave a statement to the judge, and I read those statements. I would like to talk about the father. He basically blamed the victim for the conduct of his son. He is wrong. And the problem is he actually believes it is her fault. He didn't just say that to try to protect his son. He believes it is her fault. That is what is really bad.

Most of us who are males in this House, we have sons. I do have one. I have grandsons. We have an obligation to raise our sons in accordance with basic human rights and explain to them when they are very young that there are some things you just can't do. You are going to be punished for it, but also it is wrong.

Sexual assault is one of those. It is wrong. You cannot do that. We need to explain that, because we have a generation of young males—every generation of young males has to be reeducated.

We have that obligation in our families to educate our sons that because you think you are somebody, you are not going to get off if you do that crime, whether you are an athlete, whether you come from pedigree, whether you are rich, famous, whatever. We need to explain to our sons that it is morally wrong to sexually assault a person under any circumstances because ''no'' always means no. It is not the fault of the victim.

So I would encourage dads to do this. This doesn't cost any money. It doesn't cost any legislation, but it is a moral obligation we have as fathers. I think if fathers did a better job—I have said this a long time—if fathers did a better job, we would have fewer young males at the courthouse; because most of the people who showed up at the courthouse when I was a judge, they were young males. Most of them were under 25 years of age and they were males. And it is not because the women get away with it. It is because young males commit most of the crime. We have that obligation, and I encourage fathers to do that.

I want to talk about two more cases that I was involved in. I tried this case as a prosecutor, and this was a senior citizen. Sadie was her first name. And in the trial, the victim had to state what happened to her. She would never say ''rape.'' She certainly never said ''sexual assault'' because we didn't use that term, but she kept testifying from the witness stand.

What happened to you?

And she said: It is a fate worse than death.

Well, can you be a little more detailed?

No. It is a fate worse than death.

And we went through this for a little bit, and she kept saying that: It is a fate worse than death.

She eventually said enough of the right words to meet the legal qualification for rape. And I asked her at the trial: Why do you keep saying it is a fate worse than death?

I don't know if you have ever heard that before or not.

And she said: It is real simple. When you die, you die once. When this crime is committed against you, you die every day. It is a fate worse than death.

That is the way sexual assault victims view this crime, and that is the way the law ought to view this crime. To many, it is a fate worse than death. And she had it perfectly because it is a fate worse than death.

The last case I will talk about is one that I prosecuted as well. This individual, the victim in this case—I won't use her name because her family still lives in Houston—she was leaving one of our major universities and driving home to a town north of Houston, and all the lights turned on on the dashboard.

She is having car trouble, and she pulled into a service station. She thought it was open. It was not. She came in contact with who she thought was the service station attendant. He was not the service station attendant. I am not going to mention his name; he doesn't deserve it.

He kidnapped her. He had a gun. He took her from this area, put her into some woods, sexually assaulted her, beat her up, and she survived because she was a remarkable lady. In fact, my understanding now after the trial, the defendant was mad that she did survive.

Anyway, he is tried. He is convicted by a jury of 12 right-thinking Houstonians who convicted the defendant. In Texas we have, in some cases, jury sentencing. And the jury sentenced this individual, this rapist, to 99 years in the Texas penitentiary. That was the maximum. He deserved every minute of it.

Now, we would hope everything would be okay and that life would go on. Bad guy, outlaw, goes to prison; sexual assault victim gets justice in court. But it doesn't work that way because that is not life.

The first thing that happened was she started abusing alcohol and then other narcotics. Her husband left her. And a year—maybe 2 years—after the crime, I get a call from her mother, and she tells me that her daughter has taken her own life and she left a note that says: I'm tired of running from the criminal in my nightmares.

See, she got the death penalty for what somebody did to her.

In the cases that I mentioned tonight and the many, many others that we have all received since last week, there are a lot of victim survivors. And we really are judged by the way we treat innocent folks in our community; not the rich, not the famous, not the athletes, but by the way we treat the innocent, the kids, the people who have no voice in our justice system, except Congress. So we speak for them, and we need to speak for them as well.

So I would remind the people that are out listening to this to use the #survivorsspeak and weigh in on this conversation if they want.

Mr. Speaker, this subject, as I mentioned at the outset, is one that we sometimes don't want to talk about, but we can't ignore it ever, not anymore, not today, not in this town, or any town in America. That is why the Stanford judge needs to go, and that is why I commend the folks in California for having a recall petition.

Judges need to get their head on straight to know they have to get it right every time when it comes to justice. The scales of justice are a balancing act. Justice for defendants, but also justice for victims and survivors of crime, because rape is never the fault of the victim. And when a rapist commits a crime against usually a woman or a child, that rapist is stealing the very soul of that victim because that is what happens sometimes. Let us not forget that.

And that is just the way it is.

WE ARE ALL EMILY DOE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for 30 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Judge POE for his eloquent words tonight. I appreciate the bipartisan sentiment.

I rise tonight in solidarity with my courageous colleagues from across the country who spoke last week and, as Judge POE joined us, we read the eloquent words of the survivor in the Stanford University case.

We rise tonight to show our continuing support for the woman known to the world as Emily Doe and to join with all of our sisters at Stanford and on college campuses and in communities around the Nation with one simple message to America: We are all Emily Doe.

I am going to start my remarks tonight 40 years ago on a cold winter night at a prestigious college campus—this time on the East Coast—I was an 18-year-old student. I was going to a dance. The dance was at a fraternity, and I intended to enjoy the evening with my friends. We danced. We listened to music. We enjoyed the evening and we enjoyed the party until one young man assaulted me in a crude and insulting way, and I ran alone into the cold, dark night. I have never forgotten that night. I was filled with shame, regret, humiliation while he was egged on by everyone at that party standing by.

Several years later, I was working as a legislative assistant right here on Capitol Hill, and I was assaulted again, this time by a distinguished guest of the United States Congress. I was 23 years old. And as Judge POE referenced tonight, I did not say a word to anyone. And, in fact, until I wrote these words to share with you tonight, I had never told anyone this story. My family didn't know, my husband, my children, my friends. I was 23.

A few months after that evening, I was walking home from dinner at a diner right here on Capitol Hill. If I named it, you all would know it well. I was mugged. I was grabbed in the dark, and I fought free. And when I broke free, I ran, again, alone into the cold, dark night.

I tell these stories tonight on the floor of the United States Congress not because they are remarkable or unique. Sadly, I tell these stories because they are all too common.

You see, all of us—Members of Congress, college students, soldiers and sailors, mothers and sisters—we are all Emily Doe. And the message we hear and the message that the court sent in Stanford is that we are not safe, we are not secure, and we do not deserve to be free, free from sexual assault, free from rape, free from rude, crude, obnoxious offensive assaults on our bodies, on our beings, on ourselves.

What we hear on college campuses, on military bases, in the workplace, and in the courthouse is that he has a future; he has potential; he was drunk; he didn't mean any harm; he just wanted to have fun, to get some action, and then get on with his life.

□ 2115

What about her? What about her future? The student, the soldier, the sailor, the mother, the sister? We have been silent for too long. We also have potential. We also have a future. We are all Emily Doe, and tonight we will not be silent anymore.

Tonight we stand together—Republicans and Democrats, mothers and sisters—from across the country to take a stand for liberty and justice for all. We will fight for consequences for the 3 percent of men on college campuses and in our communities who are sexual predators and a menace to women everywhere. We will fight for bystander education and sexual assault prevention.

For the 97 percent of men on college campuses and in our communities who can be part of the solution, join us in taking a stand against sexual assault. We will reward college campuses that are open, transparent, and not only change their policies and programs but actually hold the perpetrators accountable and provide real and effective counseling and support for those students who have been assaulted.

And we will impose sanctions on college administrators who fail to act, fail to change, fail to prevent, fail to protect. Every student deserves to be safe; every student deserves to be secure, to live her life and to live her future. So remember, tonight we are all Emily Doe. She has given us our voice, and we will not be silent any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), my good friend and colleague.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Hampshire for her personal story. It is moving, it is courageous, and it makes a difference. We so appreciate your words because your story is our story, and it is the story of our daughters, our nieces, our granddaughters, and ourselves.

Approximately 20 percent of women who go to college will be sexually assaulted, and according to the Department of Justice and the Center for Public Policy, 95 percent of those women will not report their crimes because they don't think they will be believed. They think they will be humiliated and shamed.

As Emily Doe said so eloquently and brutally frankly in her statement to her rapist Brock Turner, the judicial system and institutions will blame the victim. She had her consent questioned even though she was unconscious.

Another college student recently in the news in Massachusetts went to WPI, and when she was lured to a rooftop and raped by a university security guard, she was questioned in the courtroom on her so-called risky behavior of drinking alcohol, not getting off the elevator when the guard followed her on, and that she had ignored training on personal safety.

Recently at Harvard, an alumni group president of an elite men's club offered that the suggestion of making the club coed was not a good one because it would potentially increase sexual assault at the club, not decrease it.

Alcohol, trusting security guards, the mere presence of women, none of it justifies rape. Alcohol highlights the deeply rooted ideas of entitlement that we have, and in rapists—and in, too frequently, mass shooters—it is what Michael Kimmel terms ''aggrieved entitlement,'' a powerful toxic world view that justifies violent action against children, women, elderly, or the LGBTQ community because the perpetrator believes they can act with impunity.

So how do we begin to change this horrifying landscape? First, we need to collect data. We need to understand who is perpetrating these crimes to understand how we can get to better solutions. A lack of accurate capture and analysis for understanding perpetration has caused us to not be able to frame the questions for better solutions.

Second, we have to look at funding. Cuts to social services for domestic violence and sexual assault are ones that we simply can't afford in our very first line of defense and the funding that is so necessary to build communities. We also need to talk to our children about sexual assault. A No More study revealed 73 percent of parents with children under the age of 18 have never talked to them about sexual assault, domestic violence, or even alcohol. And we certainly aren't talking about double standards, power imbalances, bias, and bigotry.

Finally, we need to look at our institutions: higher education—our colleges and universities—community policing, and our criminal justice system. We must enable transparency and accountability and counteract our deep cultural questions and questioning and disbelief of victims and stereotypes that enable entitlements to flourish violently.

The work that Representative KUSTER has called for tonight begins with us, and I thank her again for her leadership and her bravery and her friendship not just to me, but to all women.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative CLARK.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS), my good friend and colleague.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman KUSTER for organizing this Special Order this evening and for bringing attention to such a critical issue. I also want to thank Congresswoman CLARK for her story as well. I appreciate so much her taking the time tonight. Most importantly, I want to thank both gentlewomen for sharing their stories. I thank Congresswoman KUSTER for having the courage to share her personal story, which I think will give hope and strength to women and survivors across the country. Sexual assault is an epidemic that knows no boundaries. It is a crisis on our campuses that mandates the attention of every Member of Congress.

I was in college in the late 1970s and the early 1980s, and I know what happened back then is sadly still happening today. I know of a college gang rape that happened when I was in school. I know of men who would brag about taking turns on drunk or unconscious women who could not give consent. They were not in a position to give consent. We would hear about these experiences later when a survivor was brave enough to confide in her friends about what happened on that night.

But every time, without exception, she felt powerless, with little hope that justice would be on her side if she reported the crime. That is because the rape culture is suffocating for women all across America. She knew then that they would ask her what she was wearing, was she showing cleavage, were her jeans too tight. She knew they would ask her how much she had to drink, if she were asking for it because she had a few cocktails, and she knew that they would ask about her sexual history, if she were promiscuous, if she egged him on. This is the rape culture that sexual assault survivors live through each and every day.

All of these memories came rushing back to me when I learned about the brave survivor at Stanford University. She courageously shared her vivid, graphic, and horrifying story of what happened before and after she was raped. Now, I didn't say during, because she was unconscious when she was raped behind Stanford University's dumpster.

Mr. Speaker, I am sick. I am sick and tired about this epidemic while we have meaningful legislation that sits and dies in committee. Those of us here tonight strongly support this legislation that will reform the way sexual assaults are handled on our college campuses. But where is the movement? Where is the vote on this floor of this Congress? The silence and the inaction from Congress is deafening and appalling.

For example, the Campus Accountability and Safety Act only has 34 cosponsors. That is right, 34 cosponsors out of 435 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. Just as troubling is the HALT Act, the HALT Campus Sexual Violence Act, which has only one Republican cosponsor—I repeat, one Republican cosponsor.

And why I bring that up is because rape is not a partisan issue. It does not have a label of Republican or Democrat on it. Rape victims are not Republicans; they are not Democrats. They are human beings, and they deserve better. At bare minimum, they deserve a hearing and a vote on this floor of Congress.

Let me just say this. If women made up more than our measly 20 percent of Congress, if Congress truly reflected the makeup of America, where 50-plus percent of Americans are women, I guarantee that sexual assault wouldn't be a back-burner issue because this has impacted all of us: our friends, our sisters, our daughters. They have lived this experience.

As a woman in Congress, I will not stay silent because why be Congresswomen if we can't help other women and do so vigorously and boldly? I will not stay silent while one in five college women experiences sexual assault during her undergraduate years. As a woman in Congress, I will not stay silent because every female staffer I work with knows of a woman who was raped in college.

How many more college women will be raped before Congress will act? We are here tonight for Emily Doe, who was sexually assaulted behind that fraternity dumpster while she was unconscious. We are all here for all survivors because we see you, we hear you, we respect you. As women Members of Congress, we will amplify your voice until there is action. Let me be clear. We will not be silent until meaningful action is taken. We will continue to challenge the status quo so all survivors are given the adequate justice they deserve.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BUSTOS and Representative CLARK. There were others who planned to join us, but because of the weather, their flights were not able to land. With these stories, we hope to show that Emily Doe is not alone and, in fact, we are all Emily Doe.

These types of experiences happen to every type of woman across the country—not just students, not just young women—mothers, daughters, teachers, and, yes, even Members of Congress. And that is why we must all come out of the shadows and the silence and demand action be taken to put an end to the victimization of women and other individuals by their abusers.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, we want to speak to America to say: we will be silent no longer. We hear you. We hear the stories of the survivors. And we plan to make this Congress take the action that needs to be done.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1270, RESTORING ACCESS TO MEDICATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Ms. KUSTER), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–638) on the resolution (H. Res. 793) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1270) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by

the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5485, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Ms. KUSTER), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–639) on the resolution (H. Res. 794) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a family event.

Mr. DUFFY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of travel delays.

Ms. HAHN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of weather-delayed flight.

Mr. JEFFRIES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2736. An act to improve access to durable medical equipment for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; 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.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 337. An act to improve the Freedom of Information Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 22, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

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. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5456. 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; with an amendment (Rept. 114–628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5388. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5389. A bill to encourage engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5452. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit individuals eligible for Indian Health Service assistance to qualify for health savings accounts; with an amendment (Rept. 114–631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CALVERT. Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5538. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2538. A bill to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5447. A bill to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements; with an amendment (Rept. 114–634, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. House Resolution 737. Resolution condemning and censuring John A. Koskinen, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; with an amendment (Rept. 114–635, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 4921. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 44, United States Code, to require the maintenance of certain records for 3 years, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. S. 1550. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish entities tasked with improving program and project management in certain Federal agencies, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 114–637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 793. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1270) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements (Rept. 114–638). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STIVERS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 794. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–639). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5447 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. ROYCE (for himself, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 5537. A bill to promote internet access in developing countries and update foreign policy toward the internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 5539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income contributions to the capital of a partnership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 5540. A bill to establish a fair and transparent process that will result in the timely consolidation, closure, and realignment of military installations inside the United States and will realize improved efficiencies in the cost and management of military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 5541. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to establish procedures for Federal credit unions to provide credit union services to underserved areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 5542. A bill to amend titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a comprehensive and nationwide system to evaluate the quality of care provided to beneficiaries of Medicaid and the Children's

Health Insurance Program and to provide incentives for voluntary quality improvement; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 5543. A bill to prioritize educating and training for existing and new environmental health professionals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5544. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transfer of a firearm to a person whose name is in the Terrorist Screening Database, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. NUNES, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 5545. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the application of certain rules with respect to certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5546. A bill to preempt State laws preventing a major city from regulating firearm-related conduct in the city that occurs in or affects interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 5547. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for increased price transparency of hospital information and to provide for additional research on consumer information on charges and out-of-pocket costs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 5548. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to sell Pershing Hall; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 5549. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to make marijuana accessible for use by qualified medical marijuana researchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. NUNES, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 5550. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on United States dollar clearing done for the benefit of Iran or Iranian persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 5551. A bill to require advance appropriations for the expenditure of any funds collected by the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. TIPTON:

H.R. 5552. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish an exemption from a rule or regulation to regulate payday loans, vehicle title loans, or other similar loans for certain States and Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5553. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require fines collected for violations of the rules of the Municipal Rulemaking Board to be deposited into the Treasury and to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to remove a requirement on the use of certain funds; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5554. A bill to require the Comptroller of the Currency to transfer administrative jurisdiction over the old Office of Thrift Supervision building to the General Services Administration; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. COLE, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. PEARCE):

H. Res. 795. A resolution recognizing the 70th Anniversary of the Fulbright Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 5538.

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. TIBERI:

H.R. 5539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress ''to provide for the common Defense'', ''to raise and support Armies'', ''to provide and maintain a Navy'' and ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces'' as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 5541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.''

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 5542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 5543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3. Within the Enumerated Powers of the U.S. Constitution, Congress is granted the power to lay and collect taxes. To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

Article I, 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. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 5547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress 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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 5548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 5550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: ''The Congress shall have 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 therof.''

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 5551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 5552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5554.

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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 169: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 225: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 258: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 391: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 465: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 532: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 539: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 563: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 670: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 711: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 729: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 735: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 829: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 969: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1076: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SABLAN and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1192: Ms. HAHN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 1211: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1221: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1311: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1343: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1559: Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 1586: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1706: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 1736: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1763: Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 1858: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1865: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1941: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2035: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2142: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2237: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2254: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2315: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2380: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2493: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2515: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2519: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2612: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2622: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2646: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 2713: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 2726: Mr. SALMON, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MICA, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 2737: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2903: Miss RICE of New York, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2963: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2994: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3012: Mr. COHEN, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 3051: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3095: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3151: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 3178: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 3179: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 3222: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 3268: Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 3356: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3381: Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3514: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 3520: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 3546: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 3720: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 3815: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 3870: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 3936: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3957: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 4019: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4062: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 4140: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 4172: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 4177: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4214: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 4219: Mr. ZINKE and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4247: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 4276: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4362: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 4365: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 4380: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4381: Mr. COOK and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4399: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 4479: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4514: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 4525: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4592: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BLUM, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 4613: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 4626: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 4640: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4646: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4667: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 4695: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4763: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4764: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 4766: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 4769: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 4770: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 4828: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 4848: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 4907: Ms. MOORE and Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 4918: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4927: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4931: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4956: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 4959: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4980: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 5001: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 5061: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5082: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5119: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 5133: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 5165: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5166: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5168: Mr. HONDA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 5177: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 5180: Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 5204: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 5207: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 5210: Mr. PERRY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 5219: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5230: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 5235: Mr. HONDA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 5249: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5292: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MOORE, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 5295: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 5307: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 5332: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ZINKE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 5356: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 5447: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. TURNER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 5456: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 5457: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 5475: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 5483: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 5484: Mr. COOK and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 5486: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 5488: Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5499: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 5500: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5504: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MEEKS,

Ms. LEE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COHEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BERA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5506: Ms. SINEMA and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 5513: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 5523: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. REED, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 5525: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BRAT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 5528: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 5529: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 5531: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 136: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H. Res. 12: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H. Res. 28: Ms. MOORE and Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 54: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H. Res. 62: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H. Res. 94: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 230: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H. Res. 289: Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 605: Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 686: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 728: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 729: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KIND, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DENT, Mr. BLUM, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. YOHO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COOK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. NEAL.

H. Res. 739: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H. Res. 750: Mr. COOK, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 752: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 755: Mr. MASSIE and Ms. LEE.

H. Res. 769: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KILMER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. VELA, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 782: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. KNIGHT.

H. Res. 789: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MOORE, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. NORCROSS.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 2016 *No. 99*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God and Father of all, without whom our labor is but lost and with whom the weak are made mighty, make us worthy of Your mercies.

Lord, help our lawmakers to find strength in Your abiding love. Lift their minds to the pure serenity of Your presence, enabling them to meet life's challenges with faith and optimism. May they find delight in doing Your will because Your precepts are within their hearts. Remind them that all that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good people to do nothing. Deliver them from sins of commission and omission, as You liberate them from all lesser loves and loyalties, until they find in You their reason for being.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

FIGHTING TERRORISM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday the Justice Department released a transcript of the Orlando terrorist's 911 call in which he claimed responsibility for the attack and declared his loyalty to ISIL.

''What's your name?'' the operator asked.

''My name,'' he said, ''is I pledge allegiance to Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi of the Islamic State.''

It was 2:35 a.m., a half-hour into his terrorist attack. The terrorist would soon meet his end at the hands of law enforcement, and first responders would make their way through the aftermath of his ISIL-inspired hatred—the deafening hum of unanswered cell phones crescendoing around them.

CIA Director Brennan called this terrorist attack ''an assault on the values of openness and tolerance that define us as a nation.'' He is right. The report he delivered to Congress last week was sobering.

Here is what seems clear to me.

It seems clear that this vile, hateful terrorist organization is going to keep bringing tragedies to our doorsteps until we defeat ISIL where it actually trains, operates, and prepares for attacks—places like Iraq and Syria.

It also seems clear that the President's current ''containment'' strategy has not been sufficient to defeat ISIL abroad or to prevent more ISIL-inspired attacks right here at home.

The President needs to finally lead a campaign to accomplish this objective.

Senators in both parties should work to fight terror beyond our borders and prevent attacks within them. This is an area where Republicans have long been focused. Now is the time for Democrats to join us too. Work with us to connect the dots on terrorist communications. Work with us to address the threat of lone-wolf attacks. Work with us to prevent more Americans from being inspired by ISIL, like the terrorist in Orlando.

Yesterday Democrats had a chance to support serious constitutional proposals from Senators CORNYN and GRASSLEY that would have helped to keep guns and explosives out of the hands of terrorists and improve the national background check system. While a majority of the Senate voted to support these proposals, most Democrats voted against both.

So let me say this again. Senator CORNYN put forward a serious proposal designed to prevent known or suspected terrorists from being able to buy a gun, and Democrats voted against it.

Now, does that mean Democrats have decided to sell weapons to ISIL? Of course not. Democrats surely don't believe their leadership's claim that any Senator voted to sell guns to terrorists last night, just as Democrats really don't believe that every Democrat who voted against the Cornyn amendment to block such sales and take terrorists off the streets is guilty of voting to sell guns to terrorists.

We all agree that the Obama administration must prevent the sale of guns to terrorists. Disagreeing on how best to do that doesn't require amateur claims that we all know to be false.

So why don't we get serious. ISIL is not the JV team. It is not contained. We need to defeat it overseas if we want to prevent more terrorist tragedies here at home.

By working together in the Senate, we could give this President and the next one more tools to achieve that objective, and we could advance commonsense, counterterror solutions to keep Americans safer here at home.

This week we will have the opportunity to strengthen our ability to combat lone-wolf terrorists and connect the dots so we are better able to prevent terrorist attacks here in the United States. It is an example of serious, thoughtful policy where we can work together to make progress for the American people.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last night the Republican leader filed cloture on the McCain amendment. The Republican leader has committed to a Democratic alternative pending to the McCain amendment, and we have one. We have it ready now, and we will have it typed up and ready to go in a couple of hours.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in the aftermath of last week's mass murder in Orlando that took the lives of 49 people, we saw where the American people stand on gun control. We know that gun safety is essential to making us a safer, more secure America. As an example of what went on in Orlando after that terrible morning, people stood for hours in long lines waiting to donate blood. People attended large gatherings to express their united grief. People left flowers and figurines at the scene of the murders. In cities across the country, people stood at candlelight vigils to honor members of the LGBT community and the Latino community who were slaughtered.

Here in the Capitol, Senator MURPHY stood on the floor of the Senate for 15 hours demanding that Congress act to stop gun violence. In Florida, families and friends of victims stood grieving at graveside services for their murdered loved ones.

Where were Senate Republicans? Where did they stand? Yet again, Senate Republicans stood with the National Rifle Association.

Yesterday, the leader of Gun Owners of America—the shadow organization of the NRA—said he believed that people should be armed in bars and taverns. That is what he said.

Last night, for the third time in as many years, Senate Republicans stood with the NRA in blocking commonsense gun legislation that would keep firearms and explosives away from suspected terrorists and other dangerous individuals.

Senate Republicans proved again that regardless of how brutal the massacre or how reasonable the solution, ultimately—it doesn't matter; there is never a good time—their actions will be dictated by the National Rifle Association.

A CNN poll released yesterday said 90 percent of Americans support expanded background checks and 85 percent of Americans support legislation keeping guns away from suspected terrorists. There is one reason that these proposals are not already law—the National Rifle Association—because they oppose anything dealing with guns.

How can Senate Republicans side with the NRA against the American people? Ninety percent of Americans support expanded background checks. If you are a criminal or a crazy person, you shouldn't be able to get a gun. Eighty-five percent of Americans support legislation keeping guns away from suspected terrorists. But the NRA doesn't support that, and so Senate Republicans don't support it.

Here is a little secret for my Republican colleagues: The NRA doesn't care about you. It doesn't care about your constituents. It doesn't care about the constitutional rights of its followers. The NRA and its leadership care about two things: Making money for gun manufacturers and making money for the NRA—and selling more guns.

The NRA wants gun manufacturers to be able to make more guns. There are never enough. The NRA wants to have more firearms sold. More guns sold means more money and more donations for their bottom line.

During times of crisis when Americans should be coming together to find these commonsense solutions, what does the NRA do? They raise every dollar they can by spreading lies and fomenting these conspiracy theories. The mail is out, folks. Look in your mailbox. Direct mail is their specialty. They circulate false mailers to their followers.

For example, ''Congress is trying to take away your guns!'' or ''President Obama wants to confiscate your firearms!''

The NRA uses that money to fund ads against candidates who refuse to bow down to the gun lobby.

Taking a page from the Koch brothers' playbook, the NRA uses so-called dark money to influence elections through mysterious front groups awash in undisclosed campaign cash.

The NRA says they are spending money to protect gun owners. Well, it is clear what it is really about. It is about protecting the power of the National Rifle Association.

Since the Supreme Court's misguided Citizens United decision, the NRA has tripled its political spending to support their radical agenda, but Republicans in Congress have no knowledge of any of this. Senate Republicans pretend the NRA is simply a grassroots organization working for America's best interests. Nothing could be further from the truth. This is false.

The NRA used to advocate for mandatory background checks. It used to encourage reasonable legislation to keep guns away from dangerous individuals.

One month after the Columbine shooting in Colorado, where those two young men killed a lot of innocent people, Wayne LaPierre, the executive vice president of the National Rifle Association—the man who goes on TV all the time justifying what they do—testified before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime. Here is what he said:

> We think it is reasonable to provide mandatory instant criminal background checks for every sale at every gun show. No loopholes anywhere for anyone.

Wayne LaPierre said that.

Now, in 2016, it is a different story. Just yesterday this same organization pressured Senate Republicans to vote against closing loopholes he said should be closed.

Senate Republicans voted against the Murphy amendment that would have closed loopholes in our Nation's background check system.

Senate Republicans voted against Senator FEINSTEIN's amendment that would have closed the terror loophole, which simply allows suspected terrorists to legally purchase weapons and explosives. We believe it should be closed, but it is not. The loophole is still there because Republicans have always followed the NRA mandate.

That is how strong the NRA's hold is on Senate Republicans. Republicans won't even agree to keep guns away from terrorists.

The Republican Congress has become so thoroughly indoctrinated that it is now the legislative wing of the NRA. While the Republicans do the bidding of the NRA, innocent Americans are being gunned down in schools, churches, and nightclubs.

How many more mass shootings will we have to endure before Republicans realize that they are being used by the NRA? How many more people have to die before Republicans come to grips with the fact that the NRA is only concerned about its bottom line?

The American people are looking to Congress for leadership. They are hoping we will do something substantive to protect our communities from gun violence, but the simple truth is, we cannot protect the American people and protect the NRA at the same time. Public safety demands a solution that prevents dangerous people from possessing weapons, while the NRA exists solely as a fundraising vehicle for more guns, more bullets, and fewer safeguards.

It is time for Republicans in Congress to defend the people who sent them to Washington in the first place, and put the personal safety of their constituents over the needs of the NRA. It is time for the Republicans to tell the NRA: Enough murder, enough carnage, enough guns.

Mr. President, there is no one on the floor seeking recognition. I ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. 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. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the whole world knows that on June 12, a gunman shot and killed 49 people and wounded 53 more in the worst mass shooting in modern American history, but what they may not know is, there has been at least 10 other mass shooting incidents in America since Orlando. By mass shootings, I mean incidents where at least four people were injured or killed by gunfire.

Two of those mass shootings were in Chicago, in my home State of Illinois. On June 13, five men were shot in the East Garfield Park neighborhood, and on June 18, four people were shot in the middle of the afternoon in the South Shore neighborhood. Fortunately, none of the victims in these two Chicago mass shootings were fatally wounded, but since the Orlando shooting, there have been many other gunshot victims in Chicago who have lost their lives.

Last Friday, Yvonne Nelson, a city worker, was shot and killed walking out of a coffee shop on the South Side in the middle of the afternoon. The shooter was aiming for someone else in an apparent gang dispute, but Ms. Nelson was shot in the chest and killed. She was 49 years old, a member of the New Life Covenant Church, and beloved by friends and family. She was described as a beautiful person, hardworking, loving, kind. She was taken from us last Friday.

Last Thursday, Denzel Thornton, who worked for the Chicago Public School System, was shot and killed outside the entrance of McNair Elementary School in the South Austin neighborhood shortly after noon. He was 25 years old, a graduate of DePaul University, and aspired to be a chef. He was a promising young man with a bright future ahead of him. He was taken from us in the middle of the day as the elementary school children looked on.

This past weekend, 13 people were shot and killed in Chicago, and at least 41 others were injured by gunfire. The youngest shooting victim was only 3 years old.

So far this year, over 1,700 men, women, and children have been wounded or killed by gunfire in the city of Chicago. I will keep the victims and their families and loved ones in my thoughts and prayers, but thoughts and prayers are not enough. As lawmakers, it is our responsibility to do everything in our power to protect the people we represent and to stop the killing in the neighborhoods of America.

Last Friday, I visited the city of Chicago and went to several different spots to get a perspective on this gun violence and killing. I met for an hour with the superintendent of police, Eddie Johnson. He has 28 years on the Chicago police force. This is man who started as a patrolman. He understands the violence on the streets. We talked about so many different things.

They have identified 1,300 who they suspect are most likely to be shooters or victims. By and large, these are men with a history of gun violence. Over the Memorial Day weekend, approximately 66 people were shot in the city of Chicago, and 80 percent of them came from the list. So we have a finite list of suspects whose names pop up more often than not when it comes to this gun violence. We talked about ways to address it, and there are many people thinking about how to deal with it in the right way, in a constitutional way but with a specific strategy to end this gun violence.

The superintendent told me a story. He said: You know, after you have been a cop in Chicago for a while, you get pretty tough. There aren't many things that make you emotional, but I do remember when there was a shooting in a home and a grandmother was killed and a toddler next to her was killed. We arrested the 15-year-old.

The superintendent said: I looked in his eyes, and I said: What were you thinking to spray that gun into that home and killing that grandmother and that toddler, and he said that young man looked him in the eye and said: They shouldn't have been there. They should have known better.

The superintendent said: I was crushed with that comment.

I talked to him about a visit I made to the juvenile facility about 6 weeks ago in Chicago to meet some of the young people who were waiting to stand trial. They had been charged with adult crimes. They are in the juvenile facility being held until the date of the trial. Some of them wait 1 year to 2 years. They take on a life in this juvenile center. There is a high school, a gym, activities, and there is also counseling. For many of these young people, this is the first time ever that someone with professional credentials sat down with them and tried to figure out what was going on in their minds and why they would commit these crimes of violence.

Afterward, I asked one of the counselors: What kind of mental condition do you find in these young people who are engaged in this random violence? He said they find everything—a spectrum of mental illness, from bipolar to schizophrenia, to acute depression, and on and on and on—but he said there is one recurring finding: 92 percent of these juveniles have a recurring issue. I asked: What is it? He said that 92 percent of them have either been the victims of or witnessed violent trauma.

When we think about PTSD—men and women who take on the uniform of the United States and go off to war and who either hurt themselves or witness violence that occurs on the battlefield—and they come home troubled and needing counseling and help. By and large, these folks are over the age of 18, but now we are talking about teenagers and adolescents having gone through the same or similar experience with violence. What impact does that have on the human mind of an adolescent? Are we dealing with some form of post-traumatic stress disorder that makes them so hardened and callused that they don't even appreciate the violence of their own lives and their own acts? I think that is a very real concern.

Let me quickly interject that struggling with mental illness does not mean you are going to be a violent criminal at all. It is more likely that you are going to be the victim of a crime with your mental illness or mental condition, but we have to take an honest look at this aspect of what we are dealing with when it comes to violence.

Friday night, I went to visit a friend—a controversial friend, to some a radical Catholic priest in Chicago but from where I am standing, the man who has given his life to a neighborhood who desperately needs it. His name is Mike Pfleger, and he is a Catholic priest at St. Sabina in Chicago. He had a peace march on Friday night. Father Mike brought out 400 people—300 African American and 100 White and Hispanic. We had a rally and at that rally mothers stood up and read the names of those under the age of 20 who have been killed this year in the city of Chicago. They read 150 names ranging from 20 years of age to zero, babies who were shot and killed.

There were a lot of tears that night over the losses, and a reminder that the statistics we read every single day in a newspaper are real human lives causing real human pain and suffering to the families who survive. Then, Father Mike rallied everybody and took them out on a march through the neighborhood there, trying to reclaim one of the toughest, most challenging areas in the city of Chicago.

So what are we going to do about it—the U.S. Senate right here in Washington, DC? Last night, it was a disappointment.

Many of us took to the floor to join Senator MURPHY last week in his filibuster. He was the leader, and I give him the credit for his steely determination to stand here—literally, stand here for, I believe, 15 hours in a filibuster—to force the votes we had last night. Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, agreed to have those votes, and after they were finished, all four amendments were defeated. I am sure many people across the country said: What a waste of time that the Senate would acknowledge the problem, yet not find a solution to move forward. Well, I would add quickly that we haven't given up and we shouldn't. Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine is working on an amendment right now relative to the question of whether a

suspected terrorist should be able to buy firearms in America. I think that is a pretty clear question and answer. Most Americans, 90 percent, say for goodness' sake, stop suspected terrorists from getting their hands on weapons. Yet the Senate defeated Senator FEINSTEIN's effort last night to do just that. I voted for it, but it didn't get the 60 votes needed.

Senator COLLINS has picked up the banner, and she is trying to put together a bipartisan measure. We haven't seen it in its entirety, but I encourage her, and I have tried by working with her to plug in some of the gaps and answer some of the questions about her approach. I hope she is successful, and I hope a bipartisan measure emerges from the Senate and puts pressure on the House of Representatives. There is absolutely no excuse for us not doing everything in our power to keep semi-automatic weapons out of the hands of suspected terrorists, convicted felons, and those who suffer from serious mental instability.

How deadly are these weapons? There is something called Snapchat, which I am not an expert on by any means, but it is a video that lasts about 10 seconds. One of the victims at Pulse nightclub in Orlando turned on her Snapchat video as the firing started, and in the span of 9 seconds, you can count 17 rounds that were fired into the crowd, one of which killed the woman who was taking the video. That is the kind of weapon this crazed man was able to buy and take into a nightclub and kill 49 innocent people and injure more than 50.

Why would we make that easy for someone who is a suspected terrorist? Does that really reflect what we feel in America? I don't think so. Ninety percent of Americans think we should do just the opposite and stop these suspected terrorists from having easy access.

There was an amendment offered yesterday by Senator CORNYN of Texas, supported by the National Rifle Association. It did not pass. I voted against it. It was not a valid approach to dealing with this issue because Senator CORNYN required, if a suspected terrorist was going to buy a firearm, that the burden was on the U.S. Government to go to court if they challenged their being on the terrorist list. The burden was on the government, within 72 hours, to come up with a lawsuit, a criminal action, to stop the person from buying a firearm. If the same person wanted to get on an airplane in the State of Texas and was on a no-fly list, they wouldn't get on the airplane. It wouldn't be a question of the government going to court to prove it. For the safety of the other passengers, we would keep the suspected terrorist off the airplane. Why not when it comes to semi-automatic weapons? Shouldn't the burden at least be in favor of security and safety for the people of the United States?

That is still an issue for us to resolve. Is Congress doing all it can to stop the daily toll of gun violence and the involvement of guns with suspected terrorists? Not even close. So many shootings are preventable. They never would have happened if our laws did a better job keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous people. But too many Members of Congress are too afraid to stand up to the gun lobby. They are afraid to vote for commonsense reforms, supported by 90 percent of the American people, for fear that the NRA will come after them in the next election.

Remember, the gun lobby fights laws that make it harder for them to sell guns. First and foremost, they are not constitutional scholars. They are sellers of firearms, and they want to sell increasingly large volumes of their product so they make more profits. The National Rifle Association and gun lobby groups are constantly working to weaken laws on the books and prevent any new laws that might prevent gun sales. As a result, we have a ludicrous set of loopholes in our laws that allows criminals, the mentally ill, and even suspected terrorists to buy guns. We can't let this continue. As lawmakers, we have a responsibility to protect Americans from gun violence. After last night's votes, it is clear we haven't done our job.

Last week, the American Medical Association declared in an official statement that gun violence in America is ''a public health crisis requiring a comprehensive public health response and solution.'' This was the first such declaration that has been made by our Nation's largest medical association, and I commend the AMA for their leadership.

The numbers behind their decision are staggering. Every year, almost 32,000 Americans are killed with guns. On an average day in America, 297 Americans are shot, and 91 of those shootings are fatal. Communities across the Nation are affected by this violence. In cities like Chicago, the daily toll of these shootings is devastating.

Last week, when I joined Senator MURPHY and almost 40 other Democratic colleagues, we spoke out or tried to speak out to get the Senate to debate this issue—not just a quick driveby vote of four amendments, take it or leave it, but a meaningful debate with real alternatives brought to the floor. The filibuster lasted 15 hours and caught the attention of the Nation. Having been in this business for a while, I can tell whether our activities here are even noticed. They were. That filibuster was noticed. People came up to me and said: Thank goodness you are finally going to say something, do something, and vote on this issue of ending gun violence.

Well, words are not enough, and the votes last night are not enough. We need to start with commonsense reform supported by the overwhelming majority of Americans. Keeping firearms out of the hands of suspected terrorists shouldn't even be debated; it is so obvious. We should prevent suspected terrorists from buying guns and make sure an FBI criminal background check is conducted every time a gun is sold.

There is no excuse for what is going on now in Northern Indiana. Gun shows take place there regularly. Guns are sold in volume out of those gun shows with no background checks on the buyers. So the gangbangers of Chicago and the others head over to Northern Indiana—it is just across the border—fill up their trunks with guns and bring them into the city of Chicago.

The police department in the city of Chicago has confiscated one crime gun per hour for every day this year, and we still have a huge backlog of guns that are floating through the community in the hands of those who have no business owning or using a gun. The Chicago Police Department is trying to keep up with this wave of firearms flooding our city. They have confiscated more guns than the cities of New York and Los Angeles combined, and they still can't keep up with it.

There is no excuse for the gun show loophole. We should have serious, meaningful background checks of everyone purchasing firearms. The conscientious, self-respecting gun owners of America agree with this. They went through a background check to buy their guns. They think people should do that as well to avoid selling guns to the wrong people.

We must never forget our obligation to do everything we can to keep America safe. Our first obligation is to provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and insure domestic tranquility in the United States. If that is our obligation, there is much more that needs to be done—keeping America safe from gun violence.

Thousands of Americans are shot and killed each year in shootings that could have been prevented. There are steps we can take that are consistent with our Constitution. With our tradition of supporting hunting, sports shooting, guns for self-defense, we can still take meaningful steps to avoid tragic death, and we shouldn't be afraid to do that.

I am not going to quit on this issue, and many of my colleagues will not either. I ask the American people, don't quit and don't get discouraged. Keep speaking out for commonsense reforms as the American Medical Association did last week. When people ask me what they can do, I say: In our democratic form of government, it is very basic. It is called an election. If this issue of gun safety means something to you, ask that Member of Congress or the congressional candidate, that Senator or the Senatorial candidate, where they stand. If it is important enough, make your vote follow the answer. Join us and stand together. We can beat back the gun lobby and start saving lives and protecting the innocent across America. We can do this, and we must.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPROMISE GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to announce my support and my hope that all of us will support the bipartisan compromise that will be proffered this afternoon by Senator COLLINS, myself, Senator HEITKAMP, and others on the Democratic side to actually put something on the floor that is not designed to fail but is designed to pass.

Many of us have been concerned that we use lists that actually mean something. We believe that somebody who is not allowed to fly, somebody who is on the no-fly list, should not be allowed to purchase a weapon but that those people who find themselves in that position should be afforded due process protections as well, as is necessary under the Constitution.

The problem with the broader watch list that there was an amendment on last night is it is a broad watch list with more than a million people. There are bits and pieces of information from many of our intelligence agencies. It isn't really designed for this purpose. So what we have done with this compromise piece of legislation is taken the no-fly list, as well as what is called the selectee list, which is a slightly broader list of those who are allowed to fly but are retained for additional screening. These are defined lists, much smaller, and affect a much smaller group of Americans.

If you find yourself on these lists, then the Attorney General would have the ability to block that gun purchase, but you would be given robust due process protections as well, where you could challenge it. The presumption of innocence would be there, and it would be the government's job to actually prove that you belong on that list and should be denied the purchase of a weapon. If the government could not prove their case, the government would actually pay the attorney's fees as well. So there are strong, robust due process protections here as well.

But this is simply based on the principle that if you are denied the right to fly, it stands to reason that, without additional checks, you should not be able to purchase a weapon.

That is what this compromise piece of legislation is all about. A lot will be said outside of this body—that it is intended for other purposes—but I would encourage everyone to look at the legislation we are offering this afternoon. It has bipartisan support—unlike most of what has been put forward so far—and it has growing support as well.

We actually believe we ought to put something on the floor that will pass, not just protect one party or the other in terms of an election coming up. We want to actually have an impact on the situation.

With that, I urge support for the bipartisan compromise we are going to offer this afternoon.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED KINGDOM AND THE EUROPEAN UNION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on September 2, 1939, the House of Commons convened to debate whether to declare war on Germany for having invaded Poland. Prime Minister Neville Chamberland seemed ambivalent and didn't immediately call for a declaration. Clement Atlee, the Labor Party leader was absent that day. When his deputy rose and declared that he would ''speak for Labor,'' Conservative MP Leo Amery famously yelled from across the floor: ''Speak for England!''

I am here today to speak for England, for Great Britain, indeed for all of the United Kingdom. This Thursday, June 23, the British people will answer a momentous question: Should the United Kingdom remain a member of the European Union or leave the European Union?

I have not stated nor will I state today a position on this question. The British people alone should decide their policy toward the Continent. What I will defend is their sovereign right as a people to decide this question free of external influences, foreign threats, and hysterical fear-mongering.

The ''great and the good,'' the Davoisie elite, are united in horror at the prospect of a British exit from the EU. According to these Eurocrats, if the British people choose to leave the EU, then the people must be punished. Some have called for immediate tax increases and budget cuts should the ''Leave'' campaign win. Business leaders threaten to move jobs out of Britain and to the Continent. Many economists speculate that recession is the best possible outcome, with depression the more likely outcome.

Most disappointing of all, foreign governments have made egregious threats of retaliation in trade, financial matters, and other economic matters, both to punish the British people for exercising their sovereign right of self-government and to intimidate the other peoples of Europe from doing the same. I would say the only thing they aren't predicting is war and pestilence—but they are. Indeed, one leading Eurocrat said a British exit could mean ''the end of Western civilization.''

If the Davoisie elite were doing even a passable job of governing their own countries, perhaps their unsolicited advice might be heeded. But let's face it. Europe is beset by its own problems, not the least caused by the democracy deficit in the European Union. With no coordination or democratic accountability, the Eurocrats last summer allowed migrants to overrun their continent. Most of these migrants lack the job skills and education to contribute meaningfully to European economies. Some migrants went on rampaging crime sprees, and terrorists infiltrated the migrant flows to enter France and commit the Paris attacks. Meanwhile, the migrant flow continues across the Mediterranean, with hundreds dying en route. What is the Eurocrats' policy? ''If you survive the trip, you can stay.'' How is that moral? How is that wise?

The economies of Europe aren't much better. Many countries are trapped beneath unpayable mountains of debt, saddled with austerity plans merely to make the next repayment and avoid default. Unemployment is high, and for young people it is rampant and chronic. Growth is negligible. In fact, the only continent with lower growth than Europe is Antarctica.

I am amazed, maybe even a little amused, that despite these and other manifest failures, the Eurocrats presume to lecture the British people. Perhaps they hope ''Project Fear'' will sufficiently intimidate the Brits into voting for ''Remain.'' After all, if the EU loses Great Britain, Europe will lose 350 million pounds a week, and it will lose a dumping ground for a quarter million migrants a year. The stakes are pretty high for Brussels.

But that doesn't justify their flagrant interference with Britain's domestic politics. Since the Davoisie elite are threatening to punish the Brits if they leave the EU, let me say in response that the American people will stand with our British cousins no matter what they decide. If the Continent dares to retaliate against Britain, I will do everything in my power to defend and strengthen the Anglo-American alliance that built so much of the modern world and on which it still depends.

The Eurocrats may want to pressure Britain, but perhaps they might recall that Britain is not the only land where pressure can be brought to bear. On my last trip to Europe, I heard from many political and business leaders who were eager—desperate, even—to consummate the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. The Paris and Brussels attacks vividly reminded us that the small continental countries depend heavily on American intelligence to support their counterterrorism efforts. Of course, need anyone be reminded which NATO country underwrites the independence and security of

Europe, particularly in the face of a revisionist Russia?

It would be regrettable if a continental temper tantrum imperiled these important relationships with the United States. One would hope that cooler heads will prevail in the capitals of continental Europe should the British people elect to leave the EU. One would hope that Brussels, Berlin, Paris, and other capitals will realize that Britain, in or out of the EU, is a NATO ally, a trading partner, and a friend in freedom. One would hope that a British exit, if that is Britain's choice, would be followed by the spirit of magnanimity, generosity, and continued friendship. But hopes aside, one should know this: The American people will stand with Britain, in or out of the EU, and will stand against punitive retaliation against the British people.

Of course, I must admit that, unfortunately—though not surprisingly—our own government is also sticking its nose where it doesn't belong. President Obama traveled to London last month to say that a newly free Britain would go to ''the back of the queue'' in trade negotiations with the United States. U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman has cautioned: ''We're not particularly in the market for [free trade agreements] with individual countries.'' This strange combination of arrogance and ignorance is all too typical of the Obama administration. The United States has a bilateral trade agreement with Oman, after all. But negotiate a new bilateral trade agreement to support the special relationship with Great Britain, our ancestral ally? No, sir, we will have none of that nonsense.

So, for the record, let it be noted that the American people will stand up to the ''great and the good'' not only on the Continent, but also here in Washington if this or any future administration tries to punish Britain should it leave the EU. Just as I will do everything in my power to preserve our special relationship against continental meddling, so will I do the same with any administration that doesn't fully appreciate that relationship. I suspect many other Senators feel the same.

Put simply, there will be a new bilateral trade agreement, NATO will survive, our Five Eyes intelligence partnership will continue, and the special relationship will remain a bedrock for the prosperity and security of both our nations. The British people can cast their votes certain of those things.

The British people deserve nothing less. Were it not for them, Europe—indeed, the world over—might still be a mere plaything of kings and tyrants. Of all the peoples of the world, surely the Brits have earned the sovereign right to govern their own affairs, free of external influence or threats of retaliation. Like most Americans, I stand in admiration of Great Britain, and I stand with the British people, in or out of the EU.

I also call on the Davoisie elite, on the ''great and the good,'' to spend a little less time fulminating about British democracy in action and a little more time looking in the mirror at their own failures. Populist insurgencies are raging on both sides of the Atlantic, on both the left and the right. Rather than obsess about Great Britain, rather than keep the populists at bay one desperate election at a time, these leaders should consider why these insurgencies are gaining in every election—stagnant wages for the working class, uncontrolled migration without regard to economic need or cultural assimilation, Islamic terrorists massacring our citizens, and a loss of national honor around the world.

This record is not pretty. In politics, as in medicine, it is usually better to address the cause than the symptom. If our leaders addressed these challenges more creatively, more forthrightly, more effectively, perhaps neither the British people nor so many other people would be disappointed in their leaders to begin with. Let the British people manage their own affairs, whether right or wrong in your eyes. In the words of Scripture, whatever you may think of their mote, take care of your own beam first.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO JOEL SPENCER

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Joel Spencer of Little Rock, AR, as this week's Arkansan of the Week for his dedication to educating the next generation of computer coders, teaching students computer coding skills, and training other teachers as well.

Studies show that students who learn coding and computer science at a young age are more successful later on, and Joel Spencer wants to make sure each child who comes through his classroom has the opportunity for that success. Joel is an elementary science specialist and teacher in the Little Rock School District and each week teaches over 500 students. But his dedication to learning doesn't end there. Joel also conducts an afterschool computer Science First club, a Lego MINDSTORMS robotics club, and various other day camps around the State to introduce Arkansas students to programming. To say he is passionate about computer science education is an understatement.

Children aren't the only ones Joel teaches. He is also dedicated to helping his fellow teachers become better educators. Joel serves as an affiliate trainer for Code.org, a nonprofit dedicated to expanding access to computer science and increasing participation by women and underrepresented groups. Through his work with this organization, Joel has trained over 1,000 teachers in code curriculum. He was also part of the committee that developed and adopted the K–8 computer science standards in Arkansas.

Joel's dedication in computer coding education hasn't gone unnoticed. He received the Arkansas Association of Instructional Media Technology Teacher of the Year Award for the State of Arkansas and is also a nominee for the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching. And during National Teacher Appreciation Week earlier this year, he was one of the computer science teachers recognized by President Obama at the White House.

While he was in town for that ceremony, Joel made some time to visit my office and share his passion for computer coding education. I am proud that Arkansas has teachers like Joel, who are making students' futures brighter each day.

It is my honor to recognize Joel Spencer as this week's Arkansan of the Week, and I am confident that the future of our State and Nation is brighter because of his work to inspire students to rise to the challenges of the 21st century.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISIS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I came to the Senate floor to discuss the numerous foreign policy failures of the Obama administration. While there has been no shortage of examples over the past 7 years, I wish to revisit one particular subject from the litany of this administration's errors—the very serious national security threat that President Obama once called a JV team.

Last November, President Obama participated in an interview with the host of ''Good Morning America,'' George Stephanopoulos, who asked him the following question: ''But ISIS is gaining strength, aren't they?''

The President's reply:

> Well, no. I don't think they're gaining strength. What is true is that from the start, our goal has been first to contain, and we have contained them.

Just 1 day later—1 day later—ISIS gunmen and suicide bombers attacked Paris and killed 130 people. Less than a month after that, 2 ISIS-inspired terrorists killed 14 people in the first

homegrown ISIS attack on American soil. Now there is Orlando, the worst terrorist attack on America's homeland security since 9/11—so much for ''we have contained them.''

Unfortunately, despite these attacks, President Obama continues to paint an unrealistically rosy picture of our success against ISIS. Emerging from a meeting last week, the President declared that ''we are making significant progress'' in the fight against ISIS. He went on to say, ''ISIL's ranks are shrinking. . . . Their morale is sinking.''

Two days later, however, the President's CIA Director painted a very different picture. Testifying before Congress, CIA Director John Brennan stated: ''Unfortunately, despite all our progress against ISIL on the battlefield and in the financial realm, our efforts have not reduced the group's terrorism capability and global reach.''

Let me repeat that: ''Our efforts have not reduced the group's terrorism capability and global reach.'' That is something the President neglected to mention 2 days earlier.

That is not the only thing he forgot to bring up. The President discussed the anti-ISIS coalition's efforts to target ISIS's funding. But he neglected to mention that those efforts still left ISIS with a robust revenue stream.

The CIA Director noted that ''ISIL . . . continues to generate at least tens of millions of dollars in revenue per month, primarily from taxation and from crude oil sales.''

The President hailed accomplishments on the ground in Iraq and Syria, but he didn't mention that those successes are doing essentially nothing to reduce ISIS's ability to attack abroad.

This is again a quote from Director Brennan:

> The group's foreign branches and global networks can help preserve its capacity for terrorism regardless of events in Iraq and Syria. In fact, as the pressure mounts on ISIL, we judge that it will intensify its global terror campaign to maintain its dominance of the global terrorism agenda.

That, again, is from Director Brennan.

The President noted that ISIS is losing ground in Libya, but he forgot to mention ISIS's Libyan branch is perhaps its most dangerous and poses a real threat to Africa and to Europe. Director Brennan testified again:

> ISIL is gradually cultivating its global network of branches into a more interconnected organization. The branch in Libya is probably the most developed and the most dangerous. We assess that it is trying to increase its influence in Africa and to plot attacks in the region and in Europe.

If there is one thing that Director Brennan's testimony made clear, it is that we are not doing enough to confront the threat posed by ISIS. Unfortunately, that is not something President Obama seems to understand. As his remarks last week made clear, the President is more interested in explaining why he doesn't like the term ''radical Islam'' than he is in offering a concrete plan to actually defeat ISIS.

It is difficult to understand why the President so resolutely avoids this term. The fact is, ISIS and its adherents are driven by their radical interpretation of Islam. How can we hope to confront this terrorist ideology if we can't actually call it by its name?

On the same note, what was the administration hoping to accomplish when it redacted references to ISIS in its initial release of the 911 transcripts from the Orlando attack? Was it hoping to somehow distract from the fact that this was a terrorist attack? Do they want to play down the fact that ISIS is now inspiring attacks in the United States?

Unfortunately, our Commander in Chief's disturbing reluctance to identify our enemy by its name is emblematic of the fundamental lack of seriousness that has characterized the President's foreign policy. The attack in Orlando was a terrorist attack, yet the President's response was a formulaic call for gun control. All the gun control laws in the world are not going to stop a terrorist bent on wreaking havoc in our country. France's strict gun control laws didn't prevent terrorists from slaughtering 130 people last November.

To stop ISIS-inspired attacks, we need to stop ISIS. And to do that, we need a serious, comprehensive plan from the President. What I wish we had heard last week from the President are concrete proposals to counter the threat of homegrown terrorism. He could have talked about ways to make sure our intelligence agencies have the resources they need to track and counter ISIS efforts to communicate with its recruits in the West. He could have discussed ways to address the threat of lone wolf terrorists. He could have talked about ways we can improve our ability to monitor terrorists' communications to disrupt their plans. He could have called on Senate Democrats to support Senator CORNYN's amendment to give the Attorney General the authority to act on probable cause against would-be terrorists while protecting due process to protect Second Amendment rights, but he didn't. Instead, he issued a brief call for gun control and spent a large chunk of his speech defending his refusal to use the term ''radical Islam.''

When President Obama was elected, we were told he would restore America's standing in the world. In fact, he received a Nobel Peace prize in the first year of his first term based solely on people's belief that he would promote peace and bring stability to world affairs. I thought of that when I saw this statement from CIA Director Brennan toward the end of his testimony last week. The Director said: ''I have never seen a time when our country faced such a wide variety of threats to our national security.'' Again, that statement was stated by CIA Director Brennan during his testimony just last week.

President Obama is certainly not responsible for all the unrest in the world today, but the unfortunate truth is, his foreign policy failures have contributed to a lot of it. His politically motivated decision to withdraw our troops from Iraq and announce the timetable to our enemies created the vacuum that ISIS quickly moved in to fill. His decision not to act when Syrian President Bashar al-Assad crossed the redline the President himself had drawn sent a message to tyrants and dictators the world over that America could be ignored at will. The President's nuclear deal with Iran has left that country better equipped to acquire advanced nuclear weapons down the road.

President Obama is nearing the end of his term, but there is still time for him to commit to working with Republicans to take the steps that are necessary to not just contain but to actually defeat ISIS. There is still time for him to focus on controlling our borders so terrorists don't slip across without our knowledge. There is still time for him to take measures to strengthen our counterterrorism capabilities, and there is still time for him to focus on supporting Federal and local law enforcement in their efforts to stop terrorism.

I hope in the coming days, the President will see his way to offering some serious solutions to the danger ISIS poses to our Nation. It is high time that happen.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITIES ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I rise to speak about the changing nature of globalization. Everyone is aware globalization has changed how economies work. Some people have embraced globalization while others are fighting to slow its effects. In America, most people are familiar with the modern, multinational corporation. These corporations are privately owned by shareholders and operate in countries around the world. However, there is a new trend that is becoming increasingly evident in commerce today. We are now seeing entities that are owned by governments competing with private companies in the automotive, food, and airline industries that represent more traditional commerce.

Over the last several decades, governments, through entities called state-owned enterprises, have become highly involved in international commerce. We have seen state-owned companies and enterprises buy the assets of private companies, such as Smithfield Foods, and start up completely new

companies, such as the new airlines in the Middle East. There is nothing inherently wrong with state-owned enterprises paying a premium on market value to purchase a company. However, the actions of the company and its legal obligations after the transaction is complete are what I intend to focus on today.

In a 2014 report, the United Nations estimated there are over 550 state-owned transnational companies with cumulative assets of over $2 trillion. Many would argue the estimate of $2 trillion in assets under management is a conservative number. There are many differences between state-owned companies and companies that are publicly traded.

First, state-owned companies are not subject to the same transparency requirements as publicly traded companies. Publicly traded companies must adhere to GAAP accounting standards and file quarterly and annual reports, such as 10–Qs and 10–Ks, with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Second, state-owned enterprises have the implicit backing of the various governments, giving them access to credit oftentimes at cheaper rates than individual private companies could hope to find. The most valuable companies in America, based on market capitalization, are worth between $500 and $600 billion on any given day. While Fortune 100 companies are large, their resources then pale in comparison to government wealth.

Finally, state-owned enterprises report their strategies, profits, and losses to governments. They are not accountable to shareholders in the way publicly traded companies are. Therefore, it is prudent we take time to consider how foreign, state-owned enterprises are participating in this American economy.

In agriculture, state-owned enterprises have started to buy publicly traded American companies. Smithfield Foods was sold to China's Shuanghui in 2013 for $4.7 billion in cash. ChemChina is currently trying to buy the Swiss-based seed and chemical company Syngenta for $43 billion. About one-third of Syngenta's $12 billion in revenue comes from North America, which is what makes this transaction very concerning for me. While some could argue these investments are similar to foreign direct investment, what these foreign, state-owned enterprises are really buying are our resources and expertise in food production, including the intellectual property that fuels development and growth of the agricultural sector. Even if these transactions function seamlessly for the first 10 or 15 years, there are strategic questions we need to consider before approving the sale of any more of our agricultural assets to another government. For that reason, Senator STABENOW and I asked the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, commonly referred to as CFIUS, to thoroughly review the proposed Sengenta acquisition with the help of the Department of Agriculture. CFIUS is responsible for reviewing the national security implications of transactions that result in foreign control of U.S. businesses and critical infrastructure. There is a shared sentiment among lawmakers, military officials, and everyday Americans that protecting the safety and resiliency of our food system is core to American national security. The food security of our country is not something we can take for granted, and as I have said before, at any given time we are only nine meals away from revolution.

As I mentioned, I also have concerns about the legal obligations and accountability of foreign, state-owned companies, particularly as they relate to those companies' interactions with American companies and consumers.

Now, I have heard several recent reports noting cases where companies owned by foreign governments have claimed that they are immune to lawsuits by American companies or American consumers in our very own courts.

They have made this claim even when a foreign, state-owned company or one of its corporate affiliates has been engaged in normal commerce with American consumers or other American companies.

In making this argument, these foreign, state-owned companies would try both to take advantage of our market and to avoid the rules and potential liability that every other market actor must face. Of course, that doesn't seem right to me, and it is not the way our laws are set up to work.

It is an age-old rule of international law that one sovereign nation should not subject another country acting in its sovereign capacity to the authority of domestic courts.

Our courts recognized this principle long before Congress wrote it into statute.

The theory developed at a time when personal sovereigns ruled foreign powers rather than democracies. The sovereign was the same as the State. Chief Justice John Marshall acknowledged it in an 1812 Supreme Court opinion when he explained that our courts had no jurisdiction to hear America's claim against France to recover a ship seized by order of Napoleon.

But there have long been important exceptions to the doctrine of foreign sovereign immunity. One of those is the so-called ''commercial activity'' exception. Just 12 years after his opinion about Napoleon's ship, Chief Justice Marshall explained that ''[w]hen a government becomes a partner in any trading company, it divests itself . . . of its sovereign character, and takes that of a private citizen.''

For that reason, over the last several decades, both the State Department and the Supreme Court have recognized that the original purposes of foreign sovereign immunity—respect for the person and governmental acts of a foreign sovereign—are not served when the doctrine is invoked to protect a sovereign's private acts.

This development resulted from the need to ensure stability and predictability in international commerce after state monopolization in industries like transportation and communication.

It is based on the notion that when a sovereign nation enters the competitive marketplace, it no longer acts as a sovereign at all, and it must follow the very same rules as every other market participant.

So in 1976 we codified those principles in statutory law by enacting the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, referred to as FSIA. Under the FSIA, foreign sovereign immunity extends not only to foreign sovereigns but also to political subdivisions and even corporate entities owned by foreign sovereigns.

But, importantly, the FSIA also codifies exceptions to the foreign sovereign immunity principle, including—very importantly—the commercial activity exception.

As I said, I have seen reports noting cases where companies owned by foreign governments have claimed that they are immune to suits by American companies or American consumers in our very own courts when they are suspected of doing something wrong. Sometimes, their arguments have succeeded, which raises concerns that the exception may not be working as designed.

Let me give one example. America bought much of the drywall used to rebuild New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina from Chinese manufacturers. Thousands of homes built with that drywall turned out to be uninhabitable because residents said the drywall made them sick.

So these Americans tried to sue the Chinese manufacturers, including a manufacturer's parent company, China National Building Materials Group, or CNBM.

The problem for the consumers is that the Chinese Government is heavily invested in these manufacturers, among many other commercial enterprises.

Under the general principle of foreign sovereign immunity, a foreign government selling Americans a product is not acting as a sovereign but as a market competitor. One would assume that the ''commercial activity'' exception to foreign sovereign immunity applies, but the state-owned manufacturer argued otherwise.

Here is how it works under statute. Foreign companies are sued in our courts all the time. Commonly, these lawsuits, like the drywall case, involve claims of American consumers or companies that the foreign company engaged in some behavior that harmed them.

When a foreign company is sued in one of our courts, it has a chance to show at the beginning of the case that a foreign government owns a majority

of its shares. If the foreign company makes that showing, it then enjoys a presumption of immunity under the FSIA, meaning that the plaintiffs' lawsuit will be dismissed.

But before that happens, the plaintiffs have one more chance to save their case from early dismissal. This is where the ''commercial activity'' exception comes into play. The plaintiffs can defeat the presumption of immunity by showing that the foreign state-owned company was acting as a market participant—that is, engaging in commercial activity that takes place in or affects the United States—when it caused the harm the plaintiffs complained about.

This principle—the ''commercial activity'' exception—saves a case from early dismissal and gives plaintiffs a chance to move forward and try to prove their claims against a foreign, state-owned corporation behaving like a market actor.

But as it turns out, that can be a complicated showing for plaintiffs to make at such an early stage in the case. Here is why. Companies owned by foreign states are often governed through very complicated corporate structure.

Take, for example, the large Chinese insurance company backed by the Chinese state bank in its recent attempt to purchase an American hotel chain. In describing the attempted takeover, the Wall Street Journal described the Chinese company's ownership structure as ''opaque.''

Yet in implementing the FSIA, courts require plaintiffs to meet the commercial activity exception at every level of corporate organization or they must show that various levels of organization acted only as corporate pass-throughs and, therefore, can be ignored.

Here is why I think that may be a problem. Corporate parents can exercise an extraordinary level of control over subsidiaries without concluding that the subsidiary is a mere pass-through.

Requiring plaintiffs to show commercial activity at every level of corporate organization—at such an early stage in the lawsuit—runs the risk of ignoring high-level involvement in the conduct that allegedly hurt the plaintiffs. If plaintiffs don't satisfy this showing against a parent company at an early stage in their case, they may lose the chance to establish their claims.

Now, what this means, as a practical matter, is that this mechanism puts foreign companies that happen to be owned by sovereign states at a distinct advantage over private foreign companies. A private foreign company has no mechanism for early dismissal of a lawsuit on these grounds. A private foreign company would be required to respond to the plaintiffs' allegations, and it would have to produce evidence during the course of the lawsuit relating both to its control over other parts of the conglomerate and also to its involvement in the activities alleged.

As a result of this early dismissal mechanism, the plaintiffs' case in New Orleans could only proceed against one subsidiary, and that happens to be CNBM. The case against CNBM itself was dismissed.

Now, it may be that these plaintiffs still wouldn't have been able to establish liability on the part of CNBM in the end, but they didn't even have that opportunity.

This is something that I want to consider carefully. If a foreign, state-owned company is able to shield parts of its organization behind the FSIA to avoid having to answer a lawsuit entirely in a way that the FSIA doesn't contemplate, when a privately owned foreign company wouldn't enjoy the same luxury, then a fix may be in order.

The point of the commercial activity exception to foreign sovereign immunity is to treat foreign governments like any other market actor when they enter into commerce. Nothing about the principles of foreign sovereign immunity or the FSIA is designed to afford extra early defenses to foreign companies' commercial actions just because the companies happened to be owned by foreign states.

But, currently, foreign, state-owned companies will argue that many of their affiliates don't have to answer the claims of American companies and American consumers, even when it is clear that at some level the company engaged in market activity that may have harmed Americans. Sometimes, like in the New Orleans case, the companies are succeeding.

So I think that may be a problem. That is why I took the time to speak now on the floor of the Senate, and I intend to look at it very carefully and possibly seek legislative remedy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

GUN VIOLENCE

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, last week—let's start with last weekend—Americans woke to the news of a horrific mass murder in Orlando, FL. The gunman, a U.S. citizen inspired by terrorists, legally purchased a weapon of war and turned it upon members of the LGBT community on Latin night at a nightclub in Orlando, FL—49 dead, 53 wounded.

Senators returned from their home States last week to express thoughts and prayers and to observe moments of silence. Many of us resolved that while important, those sentiments were not enough and that we needed to follow up those thoughts, those prayers, and those moments of silence with action.

I joined with my colleagues on the floor when Senator MURPHY of Connecticut held the floor for 15 hours to draw attention to two commonsense amendments that would have limited that easy access to a weapon of war by closing a loophole that allows so many of our firearms purchases to occur without a proper background check and to close something we are calling the terror gap, which would allow the FBI the authority to deny gun purchases to people who are on a watch list, suspected of connections with terrorism. Those measures gained a vote in the Senate last night, but both failed to advance.

I don't think we can simply say that we tried and continue to accept shootings like the one in Orlando as the new normal and then move on to other business—especially, I might add, with our procedural posture right now, as the Senate has before it at this period in time the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill, a measure in which we can prioritize our response to this tragedy and the preceding tragedies through amendments perfecting the measure before us. Americans are demanding more. We can't just carry on as usual in the wake of these enormous domestic tragedies. Wisconsinites are demanding more. Just in this last week, I received heartbreaking communications from my constituents asking us to act. I will briefly share two of them.

A young mother wrote to me:

I am a young mother of two young children and every day that they go to school I say a silent prayer that they come home safely to me, that no one decides to walk into their school or onto their bus with a gun and an intent to kill.

Another young person wrote to me:

As a young LGBTQ person, I am devastated by this attack on my community. I am scared that this attack happened in what was supposed to be a safe place, a free space in a world that is often hostile for LGBTQ people. I am scared for my safety and for the safety of my community. I am also angry. I am angry that the United States is the only country where shootings like this regularly occur, and I am angry that our government is not doing enough to prevent this kind of violence.

The attack in Orlando was, as I mentioned, an act that allegedly was inspired by maybe ISIL or other terrorist groups, but it was also an act of hate, a hate crime. I have filed an amendment with my colleagues, Senator MIKULSKI of Maryland and Senator HIRONO of Hawaii, to increase funding to strengthen the prevention of hate crimes and the enforcement of our hate crimes laws and our civil rights laws. The amendment is now cosponsored by 18 other Members of the Senate.

I think it is important to understand what a hate crime is. A hate crime is an underlying criminal act—so it is not about hate thought or hate speech—wherein the victim of the crime or victims of the crime are targeted based on a particular characteristic. Sometimes we hear about hate crimes committed against the LGBT community because of their sexual orientation or gender identity, but hate crimes are often perpetrated against people on the basis of religion, race, ethnicity, or gender. Hate crimes targeted against people based on their characteristics are done

so because not only are the victims victimized, but it sends a message of terror and hate throughout a community to all people who share characteristics with the victim or who love people who share the characteristics of the victim. They are terrifying, and they deserve, as we have chosen to do in the United States, to be treated very specifically as hate crimes.

It is only recently that the United States recognized hate crimes against members of the LGBT community or against women or people with disabilities with the passage of the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

There are too many of these hate crimes in the news these days. We are still grieving the massive numbers of dead and injured in Orlando. It was not all that long ago that Charleston had a mass murder in a church. The African-American community was targeted. In Wisconsin, in another place of worship, in a Sikh temple in Oak Creek, WI, a gunman came and targeted the congregation during Sunday worship.

In America, hate crimes overall are declining. That is good news, and that says something about what we can do together when we pass strong laws and try to prevent these crimes, educate, and enforce our laws. But I am sad to share that while overall our hate crimes are declining, those against some groups—most notably Muslims and members of the LGBT community—are on the rise. LGBT people are more likely than any other group to be targeted for hate violence, and LGBT people of color, particularly transgender women of color, are at the very greatest risk.

The amendment I have offered, along with my colleagues, Senators MIKULSKI and HIRONO, would provide, in the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill, additional funding for the Civil Rights Division to focus on hate crimes prevention on the one hand but also enforcement and prosecution of those crimes when they occur. This amendment will provide important tools to the Justice Department that they need to combat discrimination and crimes of hate in communities across the country. I am pleased to have a large number of human rights organizations in this country endorse this as an important step forward.

We need to take action. We need to do more to address terrorism, to address gun violence, and to address hate crimes. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join me in calling for a vote on this amendment and supporting it when we get that opportunity.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ZIKA VIRUS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am on the floor to focus on some very frightening news we got late last week about the Zika virus, news that shows just how important it is that we get emergency funding to the President's desk right away.

Last week, three babies were born in the United States with birth defects linked to Zika. Three other pregnancies didn't make it to term as a result of this virus. As a mother and grandmother, my heart goes out to these families, and as a U.S. Senator, I am extremely frustrated that 4 months since President Obama first asked for a strong emergency funding package to respond to this frightening virus, Congress still has not sent anything to the President's desk because, unfortunately, the longer we wait to act, the more those numbers are going to grow.

In fact, Tom Frieden, Director of the CDC, has said in Puerto Rico alone, hundreds of babies could be born with birth defects related to Zika. There are already nearly 2,200 reported cases of Zika in the United States and the territories, and more than 400 expecting mothers are being monitored for possible infection.

Without question, this is a public health emergency. What makes it all the more frustrating is we have an agreement that could go to the President to be signed into law right away. While it shouldn't have taken so long, Senate Republicans did finally agree to work with us on a downpayment on the President's emergency funding proposal.

The agreement we have reached would give communities more resources for vector control. It would help accelerate development of a vaccine and, critically, provide much needed preventive health care, including family planning services, such as contraception, to families who ask for it.

This package has support from both sides of the aisle. All Senate Democrats and nearly half of Senate Republicans voted for it. It has now been a full month since that agreement passed in the Senate. Unfortunately, instead of acting on it, House Republicans chose to move to conference with their own underfunded, irresponsible proposal that offers just one-third of what is needed to combat this virus and drains much needed resources from the ongoing Ebola response effort.

With the health and well-being of women and babies on the line, now is not the time for nickel-and-diming. It is not the time for debates about taking from one health care priority to support another. This is the time to act because every infection prevented is a potential tragedy prevented, and there is no good reason why we cannot get a strong emergency funding proposal to the President's desk this week.

Families are looking to Congress for action on Zika. It is well past time that we delivered, and I hope we can get this done without any further delay.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for a few moments before the gavel comes down at 12:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to speak about three amendments to this bill that I think would help keep America safe from gun violence. After so many tragedies, including the mass murder earlier this month in Orlando, this Chamber has had one opportunity after another to do something about the gun violence crisis, and last night was our most recent chance.

The American people are watching us, waiting to see what we will do, wondering if this time, after yet another mass shooting, after yet another hateful, angry person was able to have such easy access to a weapon of war to use it to quickly kill a crowd of innocent people—maybe this time the Senate would act.

But, no, this Chamber did nothing. The Senate didn't pass a single bill, not even a bill to prevent someone on the terror watch list from buying an illegal gun—not one. How many innocent people have to be killed by guns in this country before Congress is actually convinced to act?

The Senate failed the American people last night, and there is no other way to put it. We aren't listening to our constituents who are desperate for Congress to act.

This Chamber hasn't done anything to help keep the American people safe in the aftermath of so much violence. Every time a mass shooting happens somewhere in America—just like the one that occurred in Orlando—we hear the same calls for stronger, better, tougher laws. The American people overwhelmingly support them and nearly every time the gun industry and its powerful lobby do whatever they can do to block these bills to protect their own profits.

It is the same cycle over and over again. Someone with no business handling a powerful deadly weapon of war has easy access to that weapon and then uses it to kill many people—quickly. We have to make it harder for hateful, violent, radicalized people to get their hands on weapons of war. The only way to change this—the only way—is if Congress fulfills its responsibility to protect the American people

and pass new laws that help keep us safe.

I have three amendments, new amendments, that have not been voted on this session. They are three amendments that actually could keep more Americans free of gun violence.

First is a law enforcement bill. It is a bipartisan gun trafficking amendment which would finally make gun trafficking a Federal crime. One would assume that bringing weapons up I–95 and selling them out of the back of a truck to a gang member in New York City would be illegal, that it would be a Federal crime. It is not. It is not a Federal crime to do that.

This bill is called the Hadiya Pendleton and Nyasia Pryear-Yard Gun Trafficking and Crime Prevention Act. It is named after two teenage girls who lost their lives because of gun violence in their neighborhoods. They were playing with friends, minding their own business, and a stray bullet shot them both down. Nyasia was killed in Brooklyn. Hadiya was killed in Chicago. These were two young girls. I met Nyasia's parents. They do not understand why their daughter had to die.

Right now, there is no Federal law preventing someone from loading up a truck in Georgia, driving it up I–95, and reselling those weapons in a parking lot in Brooklyn to a gang member or other dangerous people who aren't eligible to buy guns anywhere else. This amendment would change that. It would give our law enforcement the tools they need to get illegal guns off the street and to prosecute those who are trafficking guns.

The second amendment I would offer would require weapons dealers to keep physical inventories. This is something law enforcement has asked for. Without accurate inventory, it is impossible for law enforcement to know whether illegal gun sales are taking place or even if weapons have been stolen from that store.

There are just a small number—a very small number—of bad gun dealers, but our law enforcement officials have a right to be able to find out who they are, why they are selling these weapons out of the back of their gun sales places and then selling them directly to criminals who drive them up I–95 and sell them to gang members in Brooklyn or the Bronx or in Harlem or in Buffalo.

The third amendment is also a law enforcement amendment, something asked for by law enforcement. It would allow the ATF to ban foreign imports of military-style weapons, which tend to be used in crimes.

Right now, many weapons with military-style features not intended for hunting, including those with high-capacity magazines and laser sights, are being dumped into the U.S. marketplace by foreign arms manufacturers. This amendment would help prevent those dangerous, military-style weapons from flooding our streets and ending up in the hands of criminals.

No one in America should have to go through his or her daily life in fear of an angry, radicalized citizen who can easily buy a weapon of war and use it on innocent Americans. All of these amendments would help law enforcement do their jobs—be able to find criminals who are trafficking weapons, be able to find that small percentage of bad gun dealers and shut them down, and make sure foreign companies aren't flooding our market with illegal military weapons. These three changes would make a difference. They would help our law enforcement community keep our communities safe.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:34 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2578, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Shelby/Mikulski amendment No. 4685, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for McCain) amendment No. 4787 (to amendment No. 4685), to amend section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, to clarify that the Government may obtain a specified set of electronic communication transactional records under that section, and to make permanent the authority for individual terrorists to be treated as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

McConnell motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations for a period of 14 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah, the President Pro Tempore.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to complete my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIAL SECURITY TRUSTEES' REPORTS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I came to the floor to discuss the situation surrounding President Obama's nominees to serve as public trustees on the board of trustees for the various Social Security and Medicare trust funds. At that time, I noted that these nominations had become the center of a political firestorm. Sadly, that firestorm has continued in the weeks since I last spoke about this issue. While I have little desire to delve into what is a manufactured controversy, I do want to take some time to note how some events taking place this week should impact this particular debate.

Tomorrow, the Social Security and Medicare Boards of Trustees will release their annual reports, providing their assessment of the past, present, and projected future financial conditions of the trust funds. For decades, these reports have largely been devoid of politics, which is important because it allows policymakers and the general public to trust the numbers that are reported.

Currently, there are four senior Obama administration officials who serve as trustees on these various Boards. There are also two positions for public trustee—one from each party according to the law—that are currently vacant. While it is not unheard of for the Boards to issue their reports without confirmed public trustees in place, this administration has issued more trustees' reports with vacancies in the public trustee positions than any other administration.

In a recent article in the Huffington Post, Senators WARREN, SCHUMER, and WHITEHOUSE put forth some serious allegations of political tampering with recent Social Security trustees' reports, stemming, according to their arguments, from the supposed undue influence of one particular public trustee. That trustee, Dr. Charles Blahous, has been renominated by President Obama.

Specifically, these Senators alleged in their article that, due solely to the presence of this single public trustee on the Board, nefarious assumptions were somehow inserted into the trustees' report analysis, leading the report to overstate the financial challenges facing Social Security. My good friend, Senator SCHUMER of New York, echoed the very same allegations in a recent Finance Committee markup where we favorably reported President Obama's nominees for public trustee. And, I emphasize, these are President Obama's nominees.

In the words of these prominent and outspoken Senators, the 2014 Social Security trustees' report, ''curiously incorporated a number of assumptions playing up the potential of future insolvency of the program—a key talking point in the right-wing war on Social Security.'' Moreover, according to those Senators, the assumptions ''were so troublesome that the independent Chief Actuary for Social Security took the unprecedented step of writing a public statement of actuarial opinion disagreeing with the report.'' They go on to say that ''after similarly questionable elements appeared in the 2015

report, the Chief Actuary reported this extraordinary public rebuke.''

These assumptions—and Dr. Blahous's very presence on the Board—are, according to my colleagues, part of an effort funded and directed by the infamous Koch brothers to dismantle Social Security and further an anti-government agenda. In fact, their article was ridiculously titled ''The Koch Brothers Are Trying To Handpick Government Officials. We Have To Stop Them.''

These are serious allegations that call into question the integrity of the annual trustees' reports. Yet my colleagues have stated these allegations repeatedly in various forms, from committee hearings, to Twitter feeds, to campaign fundraising materials, all without any apparent regard for these implications. Worst of all, the charges are also patently false, and they cannot be supported by fact, reason, or even common sense.

Setting aside the almost paranoid and conspiratorial tone my colleagues have used when making these claims and even assuming, for the sake of argument, that supposedly questionable assumptions were baked into those trustees' reports, there is simply no remotely possible way that they were used solely because of Dr. Blahous's influence. Given the structure of these Boards, if a single public trustee were able to have such a pernicious influence on assumptions incorporated into reports that warranted some sort of alert from the Chief Actuary, then all of the other trustees—Treasury Secretary Lew, Labor Secretary Perez, Health and Human Services Secretary Burwell, Acting Commissioner of Social Security Colvin, the Democratic Public Trustee Robert Reischauer—and their staffs were either complicit in the perverse distortions or were too incompetent and powerless to detect them. Give me a break.

In other words, although they conveniently overlook these facts, when my colleagues publicly indict the integrity of the Social Security trustees' reports, they are implicitly and necessarily calling into question the competence and efficiency of senior members of President Obama's Cabinet and, really, that of President Obama himself, who renominated Dr. Blahous to serve a second term.

Of course, being honest about the makeup of the Board and the process by which these reports are compiled would make fundraising emails and campaign commercials, not to mention inflammatory entries on a Senator's Twitter feed, far less compelling. Recognizing this, my colleagues have opted to simply imply that Dr. Blahous—only one of the whole number of those on the Board—was solely responsible for allegedly questionable contents of the reports, apparently hoping no one will fact-check their assertions. I have to, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, fact-check these not so very honest assertions.

Sadly, no one from the Obama administration has stepped forward to defend the President's nominee and refute these wild claims. More curious, however, is the fact that no one from the administration has publicly come forth to defend themselves from these Senators' charges of apparent incompetence and powerlessness in the face of Dr. Blahous's dastardly influence. I think we need a clearer picture of what went on in the compiling of those reports.

In order to clear the air on this, I sent letters earlier today to the administration officials who sit on the Board to see if they agree with the claim that the reports they all willingly signed included some unwarranted assumptions designed to undermine Social Security and requesting that they provide me with a full briefing on the issue.

Of course, the absurdity of my various colleagues' claims goes beyond their implicit condemnation of members of President Obama's Cabinet because these senior officials were not the only line of defense standing between the report and the alleged conspiracy to take down Social Security.

If these reports included some pernicious assumptions, they not only slipped by the Secretaries of Treasury, Labor, and HHS, and the Acting Social Security Commissioner, they must also have had to slip the notice of 10 members of the 2015 Technical Panel on Assumptions and Methods, which was commissioned by the Social Security Advisory Board and contained many recognized and highly respected experts, including a Nobel Prize-winning economist.

In other words, the pernicious and allegedly billionaire-inspired assumptions that a single public trustee was somehow able to covertly insert into multiple trustees' reports in order to overstate Social Security's financial challenges were so cleverly advanced that they eluded prominent Obama administration officials, their staffs, 10 highly skilled, expert researchers, and the Social Security Advisory Board staff. That is ridiculous. And only the Chief Actuary was able to detect the skullduggery.

That is still not the end of it, however. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, CBO, has also produced forecasts of Social Security's finances, using some assumptions that differ from those used by the trustees for their reports but which identify even greater financial challenges to the Social Security trust funds than those concluded in the recent trustees' reports.

According to Senators WARREN, SCHUMER, and WHITEHOUSE, Dr. Blahous, serving as an agent for the Kochs, was able to skew with nefarious assumptions as part of ''the right-wing war on Social Security'' to play up the potential future insolvency of the program. Even so, he apparently wasn't diabolical enough because he ended up duping the other trustees into assigning lesser financial challenges to Social Security than those seen by the CBO.

Of course, perhaps my colleagues believe that this anti-government conspiracy has somehow infiltrated CBO, as well. If that is the case, perhaps they should come forward and reveal to the public just how deep the rabbit hole goes.

Needless to say, none of this is sensible. It doesn't even pass the laugh test. And Dr. Blahous's influence on the trustees' reports isn't the only thing my colleagues have overstated in their writings, tweets, and campaign materials. They also dramatically overstate the ''rebukes'' issued by the Chief Actuary for the 2014 and 2015 reports. It is actually shameful for my colleagues to do this.

In truth, there actually were no rebukes or disagreements included in the actuary reports. In fact, for both years in question, the Chief Actuary wrote that ''the assumptions used and the resulting actuarial estimates are, individually and in the aggregate, reasonable for the purpose of evaluating the financial and actuarial status of the trust funds, taking into consideration the past experience and future expectations for the population, the economy, and the program.''

There were caveats which largely reflected the Chief Actuary's own opinions but nothing that would call into question the integrity of the reports as my colleagues claim. As I have said in the past, these tactics are, in my view, shameful, and they have little to do with protecting the promise of Social Security. Instead, they are 100 percent political, designed to serve as a proxy for what political operatives hope will be an epic campaign battle over Social Security, something the other side constantly wages falsely. And, as is too often the case, the truth has taken a backseat to campaign talking points and fundraising efforts.

Rather than engage on the substance of their preferred Social Security policies—and those of their presumptive Presidential nominee—my friends have opted to put forward false assertions and allegations that cannot be supported by the facts in order to attack a nominee's integrity and further a twisted story about supposed Republican efforts to ''privatize'' Social Security and ''turn it over to Wall Street.''

It is not hard to see why some of my friends on the other side and their political allies in the activist community want to construct this type of conspiracy with regard to Social Security. After all, in recent years, the only meaningful advancement to prolong the life of any Social Security trust fund took place last year under a Republican-controlled Congress. Last year, Republicans put together a bipartisan package to avert benefit cuts for disability beneficiaries. At best Democrats only reluctantly came on board. That package, which President Obama

signed into law, contained no ''privatization.'' The only thing close to a ''benefit cut'' was a provision on retirement benefits claiming strategies based on provisions put forward in President Obama's budget.

Yet, rather than help avert benefit cuts for disabled American workers and improve the disability insurance program, many of my friends on the other side spent most of their energy last year raising campaign money by scaring Social Security beneficiaries and giving speeches claiming that Republicans wanted to do nothing more than privatize Social Security and turn it over to Wall Street. We have been seeing those kind of tactics in every election for decades. It is shameful. Even with these constant attacks and distortions coming from my friends on the other side throughout 2015, Republicans constructed a package that enacted the most meaningful reforms to Social Security in three decades and averted massive benefit cuts. We did so by dragging most Democrats along kicking and screaming. It is not surprising that my colleagues are feeling the pressure to reassert their claims of ownership of all things Social Security in this election cycle, which they seem to do every election cycle—falsely, by the way. It is shameful.

By the way, in the midst of that 2015 debate, a prominent Democratic Senator gave a speech at the headquarters of a leftwing advocacy group—one that happens to receive funding from a noted leftist billionaire—warning of ''attacks from the far right'' on Social Security and ''backdoor attempts to dismantle and privatize Social Security by discrediting disability insurance.'' Curiously, that same event was attended by the Chief Actuary of Social Security, who was also a speaker at the event, and it was live tweeted by the Social Security Administration. Yet no one from the Republican Party published any inflammatory articles accusing the Chief Actuary of using his title or position in association with a politically partisan event. No one accused him of ''burnishing his credentials'' by speaking at a highly partisan event. Certainly, no one made claims of a vast leftist conspiracy to plant progressive sympathizers in influential positions in order to advance a leftist view on Social Security or to capture the agency.

By contrast, let's consider what that Huffington Post article and three of my Democratic colleagues said about Dr. Charles Blahous. The article claims that he ''burnishes his credentials'' as a public trustee by daring to write articles outside of his role as public trustee that identify and analyze financial challenges facing Social Security and Medicare. Gee, I would think that would be part of his responsibility. The article decries his affiliation with his own workplace, calling it ''a Koch front-group,'' which zealously approves an ''anti-government agenda.''

Essentially, these Senators are saying that if you dare have ideas and thoughts with which they disagree, even if you offer them in reasoned writings and speeches, then you should be censored and deemed unfit to serve in any public capacity.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have unfortunately injected needless politics into Social Security trustee reports and have threatened the integrity of those very reports with their allegations, as well as attacking an individual based on false claims. Unfortunately, it seems that in an election year, Democrats are intent on constructing a ''privatization'' straw man and using it to scare seniors into sending checks and votes to Democrats—something we have become pretty used to, really. That is despicable, to say the least. On the altar of election-year politics, they are apparently more than willing to sacrifice the historic transparency and integrity provided by the trustees' reports. Indeed, they have gone out of their way to claim that the reports are already politically compromised despite having no credible evidence that such is the case—none, zero.

Thanks to a bipartisan desire to have the facts on Social Security's trust funds reported objectively and honestly, we have gone for decades with trustee reports that were largely free of political controversy. Unfortunately, some of my friends in the Senate, spurred on by their activist political operatives, seem no longer to have that political desire. It would truly be sad and not in the interest of current or future Social Security beneficiaries if trustees' reports now become mere political documents. While that is the road my colleagues apparently want to send us down—at least during this election year—I plan to do all I can to ensure that will not become the case.

I am really concerned when I see people of this dimension in the greatest legislative body in the world using the Social Security ploy again in such a despicable way. It is hard for me to understand. I think it is hard for anybody who looks at it carefully to understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I have a question for the distinguished Senator from Utah.

What are the Senator's proposals to stabilize the Social Security trust fund?

Mr. HATCH. I am sorry; I did not hear the question.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah said that we Democrats have politicized the debate.

Mr. HATCH. I didn't say all of you have.

Ms. MIKULSKI. No, but my friend did say that we have injected politics into the Social Security debate and then went on to talk about how others have written articles. I don't dispute what my friend said. But because he chairs the Finance Committee, I wondered what his five ideas are for the stabilization of the trust fund. Maybe we can find common ground because it is a troubling matter.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am willing to look at the trustees' reports on this. There are six trustees, including Mr. Blahous, who is the only Republican. I am not even sure if he is a Republican, but I think he is. They all signed off on these reports, and they all indicated we have to be careful about Social Security or we are going to have a rough time keeping it stable.

I don't think anybody in their right mind thinks that we can continue to keep doing what we are doing without finding some way of shoring this up.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Right. As the chair of the committee, my question is this: What are my friend's ideas so we can find common ground?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, my ideas are to not put out false information or false language.

Ms. MIKULSKI. OK, that is one we agree on.

Mr. HATCH. I have to say that our ideas are to find every way possible to stabilize the Social Security system.

Ms. MIKULSKI. What is an example of one?

Mr. HATCH. Who knows. All I can say is that we have held hearings on it, and we have had everything from more taxes to pay for it, which isn't very exciting to most people around here, to more government programs to pay for, to any number of other social programs to pay for, and, frankly, none of those have been picked up by either side, to be honest with you.

It is apparent that we are going to have to do something to shore up Social Security in the future, and the question is this: Are we going to just make it a sinkhole where all we do is put more and more money into it or are we going to live with the reality that we are spending ourselves blind in this country? I don't see any desire on the part of my colleagues on the other side to live with that reality right now.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I appreciate the response of the Senator from Utah, for whom I have a great deal of respect, but I want the record to show that the Democrats are not playing some kind of privatization card. The proposal to do that has come from the other party time and again.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we are not playing a Social Security card. We don't believe you should play with Social Security, and that is why many of us opposed the chained CPI. Everybody knows what chained CPI is. That is Washington talk that would dramatically and irrevocably lower the cost of living that Social Security beneficiaries already get.

If speaking up to protect and make sure senior citizens are getting their

cost of living is playing the Social Security card, deal me in. Talking about Social Security solvency and trying to find common ground and identifying what are the basic proposals that we could at least discuss is not playing a card. I don't believe in playing the card, and I don't believe in playing the game.

Let's not go around implying that Democrats are somehow or another making Social Security a political football. It is a political football, but what I worry about is, in the game of political football on Social Security, who gets kicked around but the seniors. That is who gets kicked around in the game of political football on Social Security.

Yes, the stability of the trust fund is a very real issue, and I note that the ranking member on the Finance Committee is here, and I ask if the Senator wishes to speak.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would like to respond.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, does Senator WYDEN wish to speak at this time?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I say to my colleague that I just walked in and I am prepared to speak on another subject, whenever it is convenient for my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I haven't yielded the floor yet. I asked because the distinguished Senator from Utah is the chair of the Finance Committee. The ranking member has arrived, and I didn't know if they planned a colloquy. That is why I turned and asked my colleague if he wished to make a comment, but I was not giving up the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is not permitted to yield, apparently, but is certainly permitted to speak.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio, who is the Presiding Officer.

We have been in session for over a half-hour, and I have spoken for only 5 minutes. I just want to reiterate that the solvency of Social Security and its trust fund is indeed of significant national interest. We have had a variety of commissions. We have had a lot of proposals. We have had a lot of meetings. We now need to have the will to act, but the will to act goes in pinpointing solutions and not pointing a finger at someone because of the political party they belong to.

Mr. President, I am now going to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was just explaining that we just fixed the disability insurance fund last year. I wish to also point out that the last time I recall anybody talking about the privatization of Social Security was President Clinton. The last time I heard, he was a Democrat.

All I am saying is this: I don't know anybody on our side who is advocating right now that we should privatize Social Security. I think everybody is advocating that we should shore it up and somehow or another strengthen it. I am one of those people. Yet we have a number of Senators here alleging that one of the six trustees—it is so out of line to say that—has all the evidence to sign off on a report that Social Security needs some help, and they are saying that this man, who happens to be the only Republican on the board of trustees, is trying to push a privatization schedule. That is all I am bringing up. I can say that I have heard Democrats talk about privatization as well. It is one of the subjects that I suppose has to come up in conjunction with this: Are we going to save Social Security? Will we do what is necessary here? Are we just going to keep talking about it like we do year after year? Are we going to allow one side to continue to distort what Social Security is all about? And are we going to do it to the detriment of every Republican in this body who feels completely otherwise? That is what I am talking about.

I think most Democrats want to help secure Social Security, as I do, but to use that as a political ploy every time we turn around every 2 years is just plain not right. That is what I am decrying here today. We ought to all look and see what we can do to strengthen Social Security, and we ought to look at every possible way of doing so and choose the best approaches we possibly can. But to have false allegations thrown out there just for political reasons to scare the people out there who are on Social Security, unjustly scare them, I think is despicable, and I think we ought to put a stop to it and quit making Social Security the paddle ball for Democrats in our political process.

I am chairman of the Finance Committee. I have every desire to work with Democrats to resolve all of these issues, and I am open to whatever will help to resolve them. Our senior citizens deserve that type of treatment. I want to make sure we don't just make this a big political issue, as has been done here.

Blahous is a very important person, a strong personality, a strong, highly educated person who has given great service in this area. I just don't think it is proper to make him a symbol in what really is a false set of accusations. I am not going to put up with it, and I don't think anybody else should either. And I don't think my colleagues on the other side, if they really understand the situation, will put up with it either.

We have a body that works together in many good ways. I have total respect for the distinguished Senator from Maryland. She is somebody I do work with, whom I want to work with. She is thoughtful. She has done a great job on her committee—her committees, I should say—and she has a friend in me, and so do the three who have been doing this. They are friends, but they shouldn't be doing that. That is all I am saying.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 4787

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I believe the next vote will take place on the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Arizona that would allow for the issuance of what are called national security letters, or NSLs, which are administrative subpoenas, and there will be an additional provision on what is called lone wolf. I am going to direct most of my comments for colleagues on the national security letters because the lone wolf provision was reauthorized for another 4 years as part of the USA FREEDOM Act.

I want colleagues to understand that this tool, which certainly has been debated, while never used—it wouldn't have applied to the Orlando or San Bernardino cases—I want colleagues to understand that it is the law of the land today, and in the USA FREEDOM Act, it was extended for another 4 years.

What I would like to do, though, is focus my remarks on the amendment from the senior Senator from Arizona as it relates to national security letters. In effect, what the senior Senator from Arizona is seeking to do is add back a provision that the administration of George W. Bush—not exactly an administration people would accuse of being soft on terror—the senior Senator from Arizona is seeking to add back this provision that was rejected by the administration of George W. Bush.

Here is how the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Arizona would work. Under his amendment, which we will vote on tomorrow, national security letters, which are called NSLs, could be issued by any FBI field office to demand records from a company without going to a judge or without any other oversight whatsoever. So let's repeat that because what colleagues have wanted to know is exactly what this would cover. The McCain amendment would allow for the government to demand email records, text message logs, Web browsing history, and certain types of other location information without any court oversight whatsoever.

As I have indicated, this had been on the books for a number of years, and the administration of George W. Bush said it was unnecessary—in effect, that it was unnecessarily intrusive.

In addition, since the Bush administration acted, I want to make mention of the fact that in the USA FREEDOM Act, the Congress adopted something I have been working on for a number of years—since really 2013—to, in effect, give the government additional authority in the case of emergencies.

In other words, I have always felt the Fourth Amendment and the warrant process was something that was very

special in our country, but we live, of course, in a very dangerous time. We are all concerned about the security and the safety and the well-being of the people we represent. So I said, in section 102 of the FREEDOM Act, let's make sure the FBI has all the authorities necessary to protect the American people in the instance of an emergency. So the USA FREEDOM Act gave the FBI the authority to demand all the records they deemed necessary and then, in effect, after the fact—after the fact—come back and settle up with the court. So unless you are opposed to court oversight after the fact, unless you are opposed to court oversight altogether, there is no reason to support the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Arizona.

A number of colleagues have also asked about the history of these national security letters. There is a long history of abuse and misuse, a long and very undistinguished record of abusive practices.

The Justice Department inspector general has issued four separate reports over the past few years—four separate reports—documenting a number of serious problems. The inspector general found that data collected pursuant to the national security letters was stored indefinitely and used to gain access to private information in cases that weren't relevant to an FBI investigation, and the national security letters were used to collect tens of thousands of records at a time.

Some have also made mention of the fact that a company that gets one of these national security letters could challenge it in court. That is technically right. Big companies that have the resources can challenge them. The small companies invariably say they can't afford to do that. So, again, no oversight. No oversight—particularly striking given the fact that, as I have noted, in the FREEDOM Act—something I felt very strongly about—we gave the government additional authority in the instance of emergencies.

So we have now, by virtue of the amendment we will vote on tomorrow from my friend and colleague—we certainly have agreed on plenty of issues over the years. This is one where we see it differently. You have something the Bush administration rejected. The administration of George W. Bush—hardly one that we would say is sympathetic to the idea of weakening the government's stance against terror—they thought this was a mistake. They thought the amendment that there will be an effort to add back in was a mistake, and it was taken out. This would not have beefed up the fight against what happened in San Bernardino and Orlando.

The FBI says it would help them with paperwork. I am not going to quibble with that. I have great respect for the FBI. But we are going to abandon court oversight in an area where the inspector general has documented abuses because it is convenient?

Colleagues, I will close with this: It is a dangerous time. If you sit on the Intelligence Committee, as I have for a number of years, you know that is not in question. The American people want policies that promote their security and their liberty. That is what we are aiming for. What is being advanced in this amendment is an idea that really doesn't do either. It doesn't advance the security and well-being of the American people, and it certainly erodes their liberties.

So I hope tomorrow, when we have the vote on this amendment, that colleagues will look at the history. It was rejected by the Bush administration. Now we have emergency authority, I say to my colleagues, for the government to get information when it needs it. After the fact, the government can come back and settle up.

I think this amendment is a very substantial mistake. There has been a long history documented by the inspector general of abuses with these national security letters. I urge my colleagues tomorrow to oppose this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the White House approved the FBI's request for this fix and sent forward a proposal, and then FBI Director James Comey, who I think is well respected—in fact, probably one of the most respected men in America—summed up the importance of this amendment, the Director of the FBI. No one who I know of has accused the Director of the FBI of trying to adopt some unconstitutional practices or gather power upon himself and his agency. Here is what he said: This amendment ''would be enormously helpful.'' That is despite what the Senator from Oregon says. He said this is essentially ''a typo in the law that was passed a number of years ago that requires us to get records, ordinary transaction records that we can get in most contexts with a non-court order, because it doesn't involve content of any kind, to go to the FISA court to get a court order to get these records. Nobody intended that.'' That is what the Director of the FBI says. That is what the record shows, as is important. As the Director of the FBI says:

> Nobody intended that. Nobody I've heard thinks that's necessary. It would save us a tremendous amount of work hours if we could fix that, without any compromise to anyone's civil liberties or civil rights.

I agree with the Director of the FBI.

This amendment—I am astounded, very frankly, that there is not a unanimous vote on this. It is simple. If the FBI is able to go into your financial written records, if they are able to go into your telephone records, then, pray tell, what is the difference between those and electronic records? It just so happens electronic records are much larger.

So don't take my word for it, I say to my colleagues, but I would listen to the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association—that renowned ''corrupt'' organization. The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association—the Nation's largest nonpartisan professional association which represents Federal law enforcement officers from every Federal law enforcement agency, including the FBI—strongly supports this amendment.

They go on to say—again, contrary to what the Senator from Oregon says, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association says that this amendment ''would correct an oversight in the law that has impeded the FBI's ability to obtain these records in national security cases on a timely basis.'' They go on to say that ''for over fifteen years—including the eight years after 9/11—the FBI continued to use''—what they are talking about now is they want ''to gather electronic communications transactional records. Significantly, this authority was never used to acquire these records indiscriminantly.'' They go on to say that the amendment ''is necessary to protect America from terrorist threats and transnational criminal organizations.''

This is what those men and women—thousands of them are members of this organization. The list is incredibly long. The Federal law enforcement agencies believe this amendment is necessary to protect them and America from terrorist threats and transnational criminal organizations. It is clear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following letters of support be printed in the RECORD: the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association letter, the National Fraternal Order of Police letter, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT
OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2016.

Hon. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Ranking Member, Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRASSLEY AND RANKING MEMBER LEAHY: The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA)—the nation's largest non-partisan professional association which represents federal law enforcement officers from every federal law enforcement agency, including the FBI—strongly supports Senator Cornyn's effort to address issues related to Electronic Communication Transactional Records (ECTRs) during the Senate Judiciary Committee's consideration of S. 356, the Electronic Communications Privacy Act Amendments Act of 2015. The amendment, referred to as the ''ECTR Fix,'' would update electronic privacy laws and would help the FBI effectively investigate and thwart terrorist plots.

The ECTR amendment would correct an oversight in the law that has impeded the FBI's ability to obtain these records in national security cases on a timely basis. In Counterterrorism and counterintelligence

investigations, telephone toll records and electronic communications transactional records are key components. It's important to distinguish that these electronic communications are metadata, not content. Section 2709 of Title 18 permits the FBI to collect this data with a national security letter so long as the information is ''relevant to an authorized investigation to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities.'' The metadata from these records are critical when the content of terrorist communications are increasingly beyond the reach of lawful process because of the widespread deployment of strong encryption software.

As originally enacted, Section 2709(a) established a duty for wire and electronic service providers to comply with an FBI request for ''subscriber information and toll billing records information, or electronic communications transactional records,'' and subsection (b) provided the means by which the FBI could make such requests. Section 2709(b), however, did not specify the information that the FBI could request. Instead, it referenced ''any such information and records'' as described in subsection (a).

Congress amended Section 2709(b) in 1993 to specify that the ''subscriber information'' that a certification could request consisted of ''name, address, length of service, and toll billing records.'' No changes were made to the authority to obtain electronic communications transactional records. However, while Section 2709(a) still required production of electronic communications transactional records, removal of the phrase ''any such information and records'' left subsection (b) without any specific reference to the electronic communications transactional records referenced in subsection (a). Nonetheless, Congress clearly intended Section 2709 to continue to serve as a means of obtaining electronic communications transactional records, as subsection (a) continued to refer to a duty to produce such records on request, and the title of the provision continued to reference ''transactional records.''

For over fifteen years—including the eight years after 9/11—the FBI continued to use Section 2709 to gather electronic communications transactional records. Significantly, this authority was never used to acquire these records indiscriminately or in bulk. However, the recently-passed USA FREEDOM Act specifically prohibits doing so. In 2009, however, some electronic communications service providers began refusing to comply with these requests, citing the scrivener's error referenced above. The number of providers refusing to do so has increased over the years. In certain cases, the FBI has sought the records using other authorities, but those authorities take significantly more time and resources than using Section 2709.

This section of the bill would amend Section 2709 to reflect the original intent of Congress by clarifying the types of ''telephone toll and transactional records'' that the FBI used it to obtain for many years, while explicitly prohibiting the collection of communications content.

In December 2015, FBI Director James Comey summed up the critical importance of the ETCR amendment when he testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee. He said, clarifying this authority ''would be enormously helpful. There is essentially a typo in the law that was passed a number of years ago that requires us to get records, ordinary transaction records that we can get in most contexts with a non-court order, because it doesn't involve content of any kind, to go to the FISA court to get a court order to get these records. Nobody intended that. Nobody I've heard thinks that that's necessary. It would save us a tremendous amount of work hours if we could fix that, without any compromise to anyone's civil liberties or civil rights.''

The ECTR amendment is necessary to protect America from terrorist threats and transnational criminal organizations. I strongly urge you to consider adopting the ETCR Fix as part of S. 356 the Electronic Communications Privacy Act Amendments Act.

Respectively,

NATHAN R. CATURA,
FLEOA National President.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL
ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, June 21, 2016.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY M. REID,
Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS MCCONNELL AND REID, I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for S. Amdt. 4787 which will be offered to amend H.R. 2578, the ''Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016.''

The amendment will provide Federal law enforcement with the tools they need to investigate and prevent terrorist attacks by clarifying Section 2709 of Title 18 with respect to Electronic Communication Transactional Records (ECTRs). Under this statute, Federal law enforcement authorities have been able to request and then collect metadata, not content, from service providers as long as they have a national security letter and the data request is ''relevant to an authorized investigation to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities.'' However, despite 15 years of regular cooperation, recent requests made to some service providers have been rejected and these companies have cited ambiguity in the existing statute.

The amendment would make clear Congressional intent that such requests do not allow access to any content but that name, email, Internet Protocol (IP) and physical addresses, telephone me/instrument number, account number, login history, length and type of service as well as the means by which the service is paid for be made available to law enforcement. This meta data can be crucial in counterterrorism and counterintelligence investigations. The FOP believes the amendment merely clarifies the existing statute and does not give law enforcement any new authorities or access to data previously unavailable to them. In fact, the recent resistance to such requests was described to the Committee on the Judiciary as ''essentially a typo'' and the amendment better defines Congressional intent with respect to ''telephone toll and transactional records.''

I urge you and the Members of the United States Senate to support S. Amdt. 4787 to ensure the timeliness and effectiveness of our nation's counterterror and counterintelligence operations. Our nation's security and defense should not be held hostage or investigations jeopardized because of a ''typo.''

Thank you as always for your consideration of the views of the more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police. If I can provide any additional information on this or any other issue, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in my Washington, D.C. office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
AGENTS ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, June 8, 2016.

Re: Electronic Communication Transactional Records.

Hon. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRASSLEY AND RANKING MEMBER LEAHY: On behalf of the FBI Agents Association (''FBIAA''), a voluntary professional association currently representing over 13,000 active duty and retired FBI Special Agents, I write to express our support for addressing issues related to Electronic Communication Transactional Records (''ECTRs'') during the Senate Judiciary Committee's consideration of S. 356, the Electronic Communications Privacy Act Amendments Act of 2015. The relevant amendment, referred to as the ''ECTR Fix,'' would be wholly consistent with the effort to update electronic privacy laws, and would help the FBI more effectively investigate and thwart terrorist plots.

Notwithstanding the well-funded efforts by technology companies and activists to misrepresent the ECTR Fix, the truth is that clarifying the language of §2709 would strike a familiar and effective balance between privacy and security. ECTRs provide information abut the IP addresses, routing, and sessions times for electronic communications, and electronic service providers have complied with FBI requests for ECTRs pursuant to §2709 for years. This cooperation furthered the protection of the public, as ECTRs are used to identify patterns of communications in the course of national security and terrorism investigations. At the same time, access to ECTRs does not represent a threat to the privacy identify patterns of communications in the course of national security and terrorism investigations. At the same time, access to ECTRs does not represent a threat to the privacy of Americans because the FBI can only request ECTRs for a limited scope of investigations, and because ECTRs do not include detailed information about the specific web pages visited by internet users or the content of web pages or electronic communications.

Despite these facts, and as a part of their privacy-focused marketing strategies, technology companies recently began refusing to cooperate with the FBI on ECTR requests, and have pointed to statutory ambiguity as a justification for their actions. This choice has undermined national security and counterterrorism investigations, and necessitates Congressional action.

Given the importance of protecting the public from terrorist threats, we support an amendment to include the ECTR Fix in S. 356, as well as the efforts to address the issue through other legislative vehicles. We hope that Congress will make these reasonable and common-sense changes in a timely manner.

If you have any questions, please contact me at *rtariche@fbiaa.org* or 703–247–2173, or FBIAA General Counsel Dee Martin, *dee.martin@bracewelllaw.com*, and Joshua Zive, *joshua.zive@bracewelllaw.com*.

Sincerely,

REYNALDO TARICHE,
President.

Mr. MCCAIN. I will go on.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association says that it is a voluntary professional association currently representing over 13,000 active-duty and retired FBI special agents.

Here are 13,000 FBI agents, active and retired, who believe this amendment is essential for them to be able to do their job and protect America.

By the way—hello—we just had an attack in Orlando where 49 Americans were slaughtered, and we are arguing whether we should allow the FBI to find out not the information in electronic communications, but just find out about electronic communications. That is what this is about.

I will quote from the 13,000 active-duty and retired FBI special agents:

I write to express our support for addressing issues related to Electronic Communication Transactional Records (''ECTRs''). . . . The relevant amendment, referred to as the ''ECTR Fix,'' would be wholly consistent with the effort to update electronic privacy laws, and would help the FBI more effectively investigate and thwart terrorist plots.

After Orlando, do we want to help the FBI more effectively investigate and thwart terrorist plots or do we want to restrict their ability to do so? Is that what the Senator from Oregon wants? I don't think so.

Notwithstanding the well-funded efforts by technology companies and activists to misrepresent the ECTR Fix, the truth is that clarifying the language [of subsection 2709] would strike a familiar and effective balance between privacy and security. ECTRs provide information about the IP addresses, routing, and sessions times for electronic communications, and electronic service providers have complied with FBI requests . . . for years. . . . Given the importance of protecting the public from terrorist threats, we support an amendment to include the ECTR Fix . . . as well as the efforts to address the issue through other legislative vehicles. We hope that Congress will make these reasonable and common-sense changes in a timely manner.

It is signed by Reynaldo Tariche, the president of the Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association.

So we have a choice here. We have a choice here. We have those who are so worried about privacy and those whose job and whose solemn duty is to protect this Nation—Federal law enforcement officers, the FBI, 13,000 of the FBI agents, and then, of course, we have those who are under assault on a daily basis—our police.

This is a letter from the Fraternal Order of Police ''writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support'' for this amendment which will be offered. ''The amendment will provide Federal law enforcement with the tools they need to investigate and prevent terrorist attacks.'' It isn't any more complicated than that.

My remarks probably will be a little longer.

The Fraternal Order of Police has it right. This will provide an ability to prevent and counter further terrorist attacks.

How many attacks do we need? I would ask my colleagues who are opposed to this simple amendment, how many attacks? Another San Bernardino? Another Orlando? Two or three more attacks before we give the Director of the FBI the tools he says he needs and wants to protect this Nation? That is what this is all about.

The Fraternal Order of Police goes on to say that ''the amendment would make clear Congressional intent that such requests do not allow access to any content but that name, email, Internet Protocol (IP) and physical addresses, telephone/instrument number, account number, login history, length and type of service as well as the means by which the service is paid for be made available to law enforcement.''

The Senator from Oregon, if I got his remarks right, says: Well, there has been corruption of it. There has been abuse. There has been misapplication.

One of our jobs is oversight, if that is happening. But I also would say that is a damning indictment of these men and women who are putting their lives on the line every single day and are begging for this tool to defend this Nation.

The Fraternal Order of Police says:

I urge you and the Members of the United States Senate to support [the amendment] to ensure the timeliness and effectiveness of our nation's counterterror and counterintelligence operations. Our nation's security and defense should not be held hostage or investigations jeopardized because of a ''typo.''

Thank you as always for your consideration of the views of the more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police.

These are the views of more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police. I think maybe we ought to listen to the will of 330,000 men and women who are out there every day defending this Nation. Maybe we ought to listen to them. Maybe they are the ones whose lives are in danger. They are the ones who are the first targets of the terrorists. Maybe we ought to listen to their views rather than some misguided view that somehow this invades our privacy, to find out simply whether an address has been used and for how long—not content. If content is involved, that requires going to the FISA Court.

Last week the Director of the CIA appeared before a rare open session of the Senate Intelligence Committee to deliver a stern warning to the American people: ISIL has built a global apparatus with the intent to plot and incite attacks against the West. He explained that despite our 2-year air campaign in Iraq and Syria and despite our efforts to build and fight with local forces and despite the best work of our special operators, ISIL and other terrorist groups continue to evolve and plan to kill innocent Americans who reject their hateful ideology.

That is the warning of the Director of the CIA. The CIA's warning obviously comes after the attack. It is remarkable. The CIA's notice about ISIL's continued strength followed years of warnings by the Director of the FBI and others in law enforcement who have explained to policymakers time and time again that the use of advanced technologies by our enemies is making it increasingly difficult for law enforcement to uncover and stop attacks. That is their view.

We give these people the responsibility to defend this Nation, particularly against these attacks, and they are telling us they can't adequately defend against these attacks because of a provision we have that they can't even look at the fact that a site was used.

By the way, if the Senator from Oregon and others believe this is an invasion of privacy, then why don't they propose an amendment that telephone and financial records should also be in that same category? Of course, that has the problem of being consistent.

The law allows the FBI to request telephone billing information, financial transaction records, but terrorists don't radicalize by phone and they don't listen to ISIL propaganda through financial transactions. They radicalize through the Internet. I repeat: They radicalize through the Internet. So if they are radicalizing through the Internet, shouldn't we gain as much possible information as we can by monitoring their use of the Internet?

Reports indicate that in 2013 the Orlando terrorist was removed from a terrorist watch list because there was insufficient information showing he was radicalized and therefore a threat. Perhaps—and I emphasize ''perhaps''—if the FBI had more effective authorities that would allow them to more easily determine Internet activity of those suspected of radicalization, he would have remained, perhaps, on the watch list. Currently, the FBI can only receive electronic transactional records information by going through the FISA Court process, which is a time-intensive court process that often takes over a month. With the thousands of potentially radicalized individuals already in the United States, we need to make it easier, not harder, for the FBI to receive the critical evidence they need so they can focus their investigations.

Let me state again clearly for the benefit of my colleagues what this provision does not do. It does not allow the FBI to see the content of emails or conversations in Internet chat rooms. As I said before, this provision is narrowly drawn and carefully limited.

The administration, Congress, and national security experts from both sides of the aisle have spoken repeatedly about taking on ISIL's Internet radicalism. This provision, according to the Director of the FBI, is a most important tool to give the FBI valuable data points to do just that.

We face a threat from individuals who have been radicalized by the words, actions, and ideology of terrorist groups. These individuals may act alone, without clear direction from terrorist groups, but they fulfill the intent and desire of these groups.

We must ensure that our law enforcement authorities keep pace with the tactics and methods of our adversaries. If our adversaries seek to attack us by inciting lone-wolf violence, we have to

make sure law enforcement has the authorities they need to investigate and, we hope, stop those attacks.

Our intelligence and law enforcement officers are the best in the world, but as terrorist networks grow and metastasize around the world, we ask them to bear an increasingly difficult—some even say impossible—burden. We ask them to uncover threats by individuals who are hidden among millions of law-abiding citizens. We ask them to determine which of us has been inspired by evil to do harm to our fellow citizens, and we ask that they do this difficult task with little or no impact on anyone's privacy. We have to recognize this threat for what it is.

As our enemy evolves, so, too, we must evolve and strengthen our counterterrorism tools and authorities. Let's stop tying the hands of those who wish only to keep us safe and on many occasions are ready to make themselves unsafe in order to protect our fellow citizens.

I guess my colleagues are presented with a choice. As the Senator from Oregon, with great skill and oratorical tools, will talk about rights of privacy, will talk about constitutional protections, all of those things—this is simple. This is a simple amendment. It has nothing to do with going into these sites and finding out information. That requires going to court.

All it does is tell the FBI, whose Director has pled for this capability—does anyone assume the Director of the FBI wants to act in an unconstitutional fashion? Of course not. But you must accept the fact that it is his responsibility to protect the Nation and, therefore, when he asks for the tools to protect this Nation, then maybe we ought to pay attention and give them to him. I know of no one who is an objective observer who believes it would be unconstitutional to adopt this amendment.

I don't know about abuses in the past that the Senator from Oregon says have taken place. I know abuses have taken place in the past on almost any aspect of American life. But I also know that when you have all of our police—330,000 of them, representing them—13,000 in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Federal law enforcement agencies from all over America—the list is incredibly long—all asking for the ability to defend this Nation, by God, I think we should give it to them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Arizona—whom, as I mentioned, I have worked with often—has said, in effect, if you oppose his amendment, you are interested in privacy.

The reality is, my interest is in privacy and security. I believe it is possible to have both, and I want to explain how that is the case.

Something I worked on for a long time, the USA FREEDOM Act, we included section 102. Section 102 very explicitly said that if the government—if the FBI, in a situation like Orlando or San Bernardino, for example—if the government believed it needed information immediately—immediately—the government could get the information and then go back to the court after the fact. In effect, after the government had been able to get the information of its own volition, settle up immediately so as to protect the American people.

This debate is about are we going to have policies that advance both our security and our liberty. I have felt very strongly—I see my seatmate, the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. We sit next to each other on the Intelligence Committee. We talk about these issues very often. As part of the USA FREEDOM Act, I pushed very hard to make sure the government had those emergency authorities.

This is a dangerous time. Nobody disputes that. If you have been on the Intelligence Committee, as Senator MIKULSKI and I have been for so many years, that is not in question. This is a dangerous time.

No. 1, the question is, Are we going to have both security and liberty? In my view, that is where the amendment from the senior Senator from Arizona comes up short.

No. 2, the Senator from Arizona has said the problem he seeks to correct was just a typo, kind of a clerical error—not even close.

The debate back in 1993—we have the record, the House, the Senate, the FBI. It was very carefully crafted in a way to ensure that there would not be abuse in the digital area. When you look at that specifically, that is very clear. This was not a typo. This was carefully crafted—House, Senate, FBI—in 1993.

When my friend from Arizona says it was a typo—not even close. I hope colleagues will avail themselves of our offer to look at the record.

Right now, nobody from the government, the FBI, has said, if it had the power the Senator from Arizona seeks to give the government—nobody in the intelligence field or in the government said it would have prevented Orlando.

The fact is, the government has the authority, the emergency authority, and it was something I pushed very hard for. It was right at the core of my belief that we ought to be pushing for both security and liberty at a dangerous time and that the two are not mutually exclusive. So we added to the USA FREEDOM Act that emergency authority for the government.

It is also true, the administration of George W. Bush specifically rejected the idea the Senator from Arizona is calling for. They specifically said this has created problems. There have been four separate inspector general analyses that support that.

As we continue this discussion, I hope colleagues will see that we ought to keep the focus on both security and liberty. That is why the emergency authorities we got in the USA FREEDOM Act are so important. They are intact. They can be used for any situation—Orlando, San Bernardino, any other—that the government, the FBI, feels the security and safety of the American people are at stake.

With respect to the lone-wolf provision, which I heard my colleague mention, we reauthorized that for 4 years in the USA FREEDOM Act. I supported that as well.

I just hope colleagues will think through the implications of the amendment from the Senator from Arizona because under what he is talking about, a national security letter, what is called an NSL, can be issued by any FBI field office to demand records from a company without going to a judge. To support this, in effect, you basically are saying you don't support oversight, you don't support court oversight, because we have given the court and the government the ability to move quickly.

I hope tomorrow we don't conclude that the FBI ought to be able to demand email records, text message logs, Web-browsing history, and certain types of information without court oversight.

The Senator from Arizona said: Well, you are not going to get all the content of those emails.

That is true, but the fact is, in a lot of instances, when you know who emailed whom, you know a whole lot about that person. If somebody emailed the psychiatrist four times in 48 hours, you know a whole lot about the person. You don't have to see all of the content of the emails.

Colleagues, we will discuss this some more, but I hope Senators will see this is about ensuring there is both security and liberty. The government has not said or intimated that if they had the power the Senator from Arizona seeks to put back—that the Bush administration rejected—the government has not said or intimated this would have prevented the horrific tragedy in Orlando.

I hope my colleagues will oppose the McCain amendment tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we have heard a spirited debate between two distinguished Senators, two distinguished Americans, who are very passionate about defending America, and I know there will be more debate on this.

The Senator from Arizona and those who cosponsor his amendment want to add more authority to the FBI.

I rise to say that in the next day, when there is an opportunity to offer another amendment, I will be offering another amendment to give the FBI more money to do the job with the authority it does have. Working on a bipartisan basis, the distinguished Senator from Alabama and I tried to produce a very good bill to fund the Justice Department, one of which is the FBI.

We did do a good job, there is no doubt about it, but we operated within the budget caps. Within that, we did the best we could, but there is no doubt that the FBI could use more resources to be able to enhance its counterterrorism efforts and also increase its surveillance by tracking the terrorist threats.

So when the opportunity arises, I will be offering an amendment that gives more money to the FBI, that also gives more money—working with the Senator from Wisconsin, Ms. BALDWIN—to deal with hate crimes, one of the other significant issues here. Also, while we are talking about, again, the more authority issue, this amendment would include a section by Senator LEAHY, the vice chair of the Judiciary Committee, that would have tough penalties for those who knowingly transfer or receive a firearm or know or have reasonable cause to believe it will be used to commit a crime of terrorism, violence, or drug trafficking. It will reduce the threat.

We can debate all we want about more authority for the FBI. I think it is a good debate, the tension between security and civil liberties. The distinguished Presiding Officer is also a member—an active, diligent member—of the Intelligence Committee.

These are not easy issues, but my amendment should be an easy issue. My amendment would add $175 million dedicated to the FBI's counterterrorism efforts that would raise funding for the FBI above what the House suggested. It would strengthen the FBI's counterterrorism workforce. The FBI would be able to restore—remember, not add—restore more than 350 positions, including 225 special agents for critical FBI investigations related to counterterrorism and counterintelligence. It would also give the FBI new tools to be able to go where these bad guys have access to new technology and new ways of avoiding detection.

The number of terrorism threats disrupted by the FBI grew from 214 in fiscal year 2014 to 440 in fiscal year 2015. In one fiscal year, it actually doubled. As the threat goes, the FBI needs increased resources to hire and sustain the agents and intelligence analysts who interrupt these plots.

Again, while we are talking more authority—and that debate will go on—I am saying, if you are going to give them more authority, and whether you are giving them more authority, the FBI is stretched thin.

We did the best we could under the budget caps, but my amendment would be emergency funding. We don't look for offsets in order to take from one important Department of Justice function to give to the FBI or take from other Federal law enforcement to give to the FBI, or take from local law enforcement to give to the FBI. And it would be a tremendous boost.

It would also boost the FBI's surveillance capabilities and add critical personnel, including special agents. Additional funds would be provided for 36 new positions, 18 fully dedicated to tracking terrorist threats, and it would certainly help to gather evidence on high, high priority targets.

Again, while we are working at more authority, please, regardless of where you are on the lone-wolf debate, the Mikulski amendment offers the opportunity to add more funding.

Mr. WYDEN. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Certainly, to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I appreciate my colleague yielding, and I am a very, very strong supporter of her amendment because I think the idea of adding more resources is absolutely essential.

As I look at these cases—and she and I have talked about this on the Select Committee on Intelligence—we know that the workforce is aging in the intelligence community. We are going to need more dollars for the personnel we are going to need and certainly a lot of resources in a variety of areas. Is that my colleague's intention, to make sure we get the resources to, in effect, get out in front of these upcoming threats?

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator has identified my rationale and its actual underpinnings in a most accurate and precise way.

You see, I am from the school of thought—along with, I know, the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, also a member of the Committee on Appropriations—that the defense of the Nation and the protection of its people doesn't rely only on the Department of Defense. There are also other muscular ways of protecting it, some of which are, first of all, response and surveillance and so on in existing, constitutionally allowed authorities and giving more money to the FBI to operate under the law as we have currently defined it.

But you know what, we need to do prevention. Prevention really comes from the kind of intervention that would occur with the State Department—again, a tool of diplomacy. And what they have is a whole effort underway to deal with the recruitment and radicalization of Islamic jihadist terrorists on the Internet. Well, we have to support that. When they were going for more money for defense, we made that argument. But I am not going to relitigate old arguments.

We have before us Orlando. We have before us those who want to curtail the terrorist threat. I want to curtail that terrorist threat. And some of the ways I want to do it are, No. 1, add more money for the FBI; No. 2, join with our colleague from Wisconsin, Senator TAMMY BALDWIN, in adding more money to deal with hate crimes—hate crimes—because often those are the aegis and the incubator and so on of future violence; and the other is to close the loophole to keep guns out of the hands of terrorists, violent criminals, and traffickers that our distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee mentioned.

Mr. WYDEN. If my colleague will continue to yield, just briefly, what my colleague has stated—and I strongly agree with—is that she is trying to assure that the resources are there for the future.

I am not going to drag my colleague into the earlier discussion, but what I am concerned about, and have been, is that the Senator from Arizona is relitigating the past. In effect, when the Bush administration took away the power because it was too intrusive, he wanted to go back to it.

But apropos of my colleague, isn't that the heart of her case—that she is looking to the future—FBI resources, resources to deal with hate crimes, resources to deal with prevention? It seems to me she is trying to lay out a plan for the future.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. This would be funding that would begin October 1. Given no cute tricks around shutdown and slam-down politics as we go into the fall—that we could actually move our appropriations—this would provide money starting October 1 with these additional resources to help the FBI be more effective than what it is, and also to help our Justice Department be even more effective than what it is in fighting hate crimes.

I will be discussing my amendment in even more detail, but I know there are other colleagues on the floor, and I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2328

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I have come to the floor once again, as I have time and again, with a simple message. For Puerto Rico, time is of the essence. For the 3½ million United States citizens who live there, time is of the essence, but getting it right is also of the essence.

There are only 8 business days left until Puerto Rico defaults on approximately $2 billion in debt. Congress needs to act immediately to prevent this fiscal crisis from becoming a full-blown humanitarian catastrophe. And while the House has attempted to address this issue by passing a legislative proposal called PROMESA—''promesa'' in Spanish means ''promise''—it lacks the promise that really would help 3½ million U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico.

There are Members on both sides of the aisle who believe the bill is fundamentally flawed. So instead of simply rubberstamping an inferior solution, the Senate needs to follow the Founding Fathers' intent and thoroughly debate this critical issue, which will have such a profound impact on so many Americans. I would note that calls for a thorough debate on the Senate floor are bipartisan in nature, and I thank my colleague Senator WICKER for joining me in a letter to the leadership asking for a full and open process to consider this bill.

I would remind my colleagues that each one of us was elected to this very

Chamber to debate and enact legislation to improve the lives of Americans. But I fear that, instead of a robust debate and thoughtful consideration of amendments to improve this bill, those who wish to see the House bill signed into law as drafted are going to delay and delay and delay until the last possible minute. Just as they did today, they are going to prevent us from debating this until next week, and then they will tell us it is too late to make any improvements to this bill. As a matter of fact, every article I have read suggests that is exactly the tactic which is being pursued.

I come to the floor because it is not a new or novel tactic to quell dissent with the threat of a deadline, but just because it has been done before doesn't make it right. How can we as Senators shirk our responsibility when the people of Puerto Rico are at the edge of an abyss? They need our help, and they need it today. The bill will affect a generation of Puerto Ricans, and we owe it to them and their brothers and sisters who live in our States—half a million in my State of New Jersey, 5 million throughout the country—to get this right.

Let me once again remind every one of my colleagues how deeply flawed this legislation is. First, the fate of 3½ million American citizens will be determined by 7 unelected, unaccountable members of a so-called oversight board that will act as a virtual oligarchy and impose their unchecked will on the 3½ million U.S. citizens on the island of Puerto Rico.

As the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office states:

The board would have broad sovereign powers—

Sovereign words have meaning—

to effectively overrule decisions by Puerto Rico's legislature, governor and other public authorities. . . . [It] can effectively nullify any new laws or policies—

Any new law or policy—

adopted by Puerto Rico that did not conform to requirements specified in this bill.

So the elected representatives of the 3½ million U.S. citizens on the island of Puerto Rico just don't get listened to. They can have their decisions overruled by a nonelected board, for which there is no guarantee there will be any representation by those who are elected to recommend to this board anyone to be placed on it.

Even the bill's own author noted in the Interior Committee's report:

The Oversight Board may impose mandatory cuts on Puerto Rico's government and instrumentalities—

Mandatory cuts—

a power far beyond that exercised by the Control Board established for the District of Columbia.

If the board, in its sole discretion—and those words have enormous meaning. If my colleagues take the time to read the bill, as I have twice, fully, from the beginning to the end, 29 times the bill says that the board, in its sole discretion—not the Congress's discretion, not the bankruptcy court, not the Legislature of Puerto Rico, not the Governor of Puerto Rico—no, the board, in its own sole discretion—29 times. If the board uses the superpower this bill allows it to have to close more schools, shutter more hospitals, cut senior citizens' pensions to the bone; if it decides to hold a fire sale and put Puerto Rico's natural wonders on the auction block to the highest bidder; if it puts balanced budgets ahead of the health, safety, and well-being of children and families—similar to how the control board travesty unfolded in Flint, MI—without their voices represented on the control board, there is nothing—nothing—the people of Puerto Rico will be able to do.

Think about this. How many in this legislative body would allow such a board to take control over their State, no matter what their economic woes? The people on the island deserve a transparent oversight board where their voices and concerns are heard, not muted, and where the deals made with creditors are in the best interests of the people, not just hedge funds. The fact that the Puerto Rican people will have absolutely no say over who is appointed or what action they decide to take is blatant—blatant—neocolonialism.

Second, I have said this before and I will say it again: Any solution needs a clear path to restructuring. That is the only reason to do this legislation anyhow—to give Puerto Rico a clear path to restructuring in the bankruptcy court under the edicts of the bankruptcy law. The unelected control board created in this bill will have the authority to decide whether Puerto Rico's debts are worthy of restructuring.

Let's not fool ourselves into believing it is a sure thing that this bill guarantees the island the ability to restructure its debts in the first place. Instead, it would take a supermajority of this 7-member board—a 5-to-2 vote—in order for any of the island's debts to be restructured. What does that mean? It means that three people—a minority of the board—could derail the island's attempts to achieve sustainable debt payments. Without any authority to restructure its debt, all this legislation will do is take away the democratic rights of 3½ million Americans and leave the future to wishful thinking and a prayer the crisis will somehow be resolved.

I am afraid we are opening the floodgates for Puerto Rico to become a laboratory for rightwing economic policies. Puerto Rico deserves much more than to be the unwilling host of untested experiments in austerity.

I am not advocating to completely remove all oversight power. To the contrary, I support helping Puerto Rico make informed, prudent decisions and put it on the path to economic growth and solvency. But despite its name, the oversight Board envisioned by this bill doesn't simply oversee. It directs, and it commands. It doesn't assist; it controls. The Senate has an opportunity to change that situation. We have a chance to improve this bill and strike the right balance.

Now, I would like to have the opportunity—and I welcome others as well—to offer a number of targeted, commonsense amendments to restore a proper balance and ensure the people of Puerto Rico have a say in their future. By the way, since they are going to have to live with the tough consequences that are coming, no matter what, it is always better when stakeholders are engaged in the process and have a say about their future. This tempers the powers of the control board and gives the people of Puerto Rico more of a say in who is on the board. I encourage my colleagues to do the same—to offer amendments they feel will improve the bill. I know, as all of us know, that success is never guaranteed, but at the very least, the people of Puerto Rico deserve a thorough and thoughtful debate on the Senate floor.

I do not take lightly, nor should my colleagues, a decision to infringe upon the democratic rights of the people of Puerto Rico. The 3.5 million American citizens living in Puerto Rico, and 5 million family members living in our States and in our districts—in New Jersey, New York, Florida, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Connecticut, just to name a few—deserve more than the Senate's holding its nose to approve an inferior solution.

So I hope the majority leader stands true to his word when he said we ''need to open up the legislative process in a way that allows more amendments from both sides''—well, both sides are calling for amendments to this bill—and allows us to call this bill up for debate so we can do what we were elected to do—fix problems and make the lives of the American people better—and do what the Senate, as an institution, should do, particularly as viewed by the Founding Fathers; that is, to take the passions of the moment, to think about it, morally and logically, and at the end of the day hopefully to refine and make proposals much better.

There is no reason that this has to wait until next week, on the verge of the Fourth of July recess. But I will say this. I want to give my colleagues notice now that I am not ready to rush to celebrate independence and create a situation of colonialism for 3.5 million of my fellow citizens. I hope we will get an early opportunity to debate this bill, offer amendments, and we will see how it falls then.

Mr. President, in view of that desire, I ask unanimous consent to lay before the Senate the House message on S. 2328; that the motion to concur with an amendment be considered made and agreed to with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would say to our friend from New Jersey that it is the plan, publicly announced by the majority leader, to bring this legislation that was passed by the House to the floor of the Senate next week. Obviously, we are working on the CJS appropriations bill, and our deliberation on that has been delayed by a number of the other amendments and other matters that have been voted on this week. But it has always been the intention of the majority leader to allow Senators to offer amendments, unlike, frankly, when Democrats controlled this Chamber. But I do think it is going to require some cooperation and maybe even some consent agreements to agree to amendments that can be resolved in time to meet the July 1 deadline. To me, one of the best arguments in favor of this legislation is that we want to avoid a taxpayer bailout. We want to avoid a taxpayer bailout. This legislation from the House does that. I understand the Senator may have some objections to it and some better ideas in his mind, but we are going to have that opportunity next week.

If we want to see what the effect of leftwing fiscal policy is, what we see is the bankruptcy occurring in Puerto Rico now. I think they need to try something else, some fiscal responsibility and restraint. Frankly, I worry for the rest of the country that if we don't do something to get our own fiscal house in order here in the United States Senate, the rest of the country is going to find itself in dire straits at some point in the not too distant future.

So I would say that we are going to have a chance to have that debate and those votes next week. This is not the time to do it because we have other important work that is pending before the Senate. Nor are the rest of us 99 Senators going to agree to a unanimous consent request to legislation we haven't even read or had time to consider.

So under those circumstances, I would be compelled to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I am disappointed but not surprised. I do hope that the remarks of the Senator from Texas that there will be time and opportunity for amendments are real, because every published report I have seen suggests this will be brought up next Thursday on the verge of everybody trying to go on recess. My advocacy or my unanimous consent request wasn't to bring a bill to the floor that isn't already known. That bill has been out there for some time. It is to create the process to debate and begin to amend the bill—the bill passed by the House of Representatives that has been out there for some time now. So I wasn't offering a bill of my own vision. It was to create the process.

Of course, I respect the importance of the present appropriations bill that we are discussing, but the urgency of the time limit as it relates to the default that can take place in July is not as pressing on that appropriations bill as it is for the people of Puerto Rico. So I think there can be a reasonable opportunity to move to PROMESA—a false promise, from my view—and a real opportunity to have a debate on it, and more than debate, amendments—amendments to make it better.

So I hope that is going to happen. But I want to signal now that if we are jammed on Thursday and it is an up-or-down vote—take it or leave it—that I have every intention of doing whatever I can procedurally to make sure we have amendments on this.

As it relates to the question of bankruptcy and bailout, we are not bailing anybody out here. That is why we want Puerto Rico to have access to restructuring. Restructuring is a provision under the bankruptcy code that you take your debts—whether you are an individual, a company, or, in this case, a government—and you go before the bankruptcy court and you say: Here are all of our debts, and here is our income. We want to be able to restructure this in such a way that we can be solvent and at the same time be responsible to those debtors. And they will live with the dictates of the bankruptcy court. But this bill doesn't even guarantee that the bailout my colleague is concerned about doesn't happen, because it guarantees no absolute road to restructuring.

As it relates to leftwing policies, I would just note—as someone who has been an advocate and a voice for the people of Puerto Rico for the 24 years I have been in the Congress, since they have no elected representatives here who have a vote, at the end of the day—that there have been leaders of that government in Puerto Rico, many who have been Republican in nature and others who have been Democrat in nature. The policies that have taken place and that have accrued to this moment are a combination of some bad fiscal policies by leaders on both sides of the aisle but also by policies that treat the 3.5 million U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico inferior to any one of them if they took a flight to any State in the Nation, for which they would have full rights, obligations, and benefits.

So we have been part of creating the process here, and we have been part when we took away section 936, which was an inducement to the private sector to help build jobs and economic opportunities. We just took it away. They had provisions to elements of the bankruptcy code. Somehow, in the middle of the night, that was taken away from them. So we have treated them like a colony, and now we are worried.

As it relates to leftwing policies, let me just say that, if raising incomes of people, if saying to people there should be a minimum wage that can sustain your family and help you realize your hopes and dreams and aspirations, if you are working overtime and you ultimately should have some protections that you should be paid overtime—if those are leftwing fiscal policies, then I think most Americans believe that they should get a living minimum wage to be able to sustain their families, help their children be educated, take care of their health care, and think about their retirement.

So I don't think this is about that at all. If we are going to lose a fight for the people of Puerto Rico, it is going to be because we are going to have a fight at least to have amendments and to consider what that future should be. But we are not going to take it that it is an up-or-down vote on a House-passed bill that has no voice of the Senate, no imprint of the Senate. That is not what I got elected to the Senate for.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

AMENDMENT NO. 4787

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, tomorrow we will have a chance to begin to talk about the real cause of what happened that horrible night in Orlando at the Pulse nightclub—that is a homegrown terrorist attack inspired by the poisonous ideology of ISIS, the Islamic State. We will have a chance to revisit the total lack of any coherent plan coming out of the White House to deal with the threat of the Islamic State over in the Middle East and the consequences of failing to deal with that here at home.

The poisonous fruit of that failure and previous ones is already self-evident: the massacre of American soldiers at Fort Hood, TX, in 2009 that took the lives of 13 people and an unborn child; a deadly attack on 2 military facilities in Chattanooga, TN, in 2015 that took the lives of 5 U.S. servicemembers; an attempted attack in Garland, TX, about a year ago that—but for a vigilant police officer was thwarted—could have been disastrous; and then, of course, the shooting in San Bernardino where 14 people were killed. Add to that poisonous fruit of the failure to have a coherent policy to deal with the Islamic State and its poison, the 2013 Boston Marathon bombing, where 3 persons were killed and many more wounded—not by a gun but by pressure cooker bombs made by the terrorists. Most recently, the worst terrorist attack in our country since 9/11 was in Orlando, where a jihadist pledged his allegiance to ISIS and then viciously gunned down 49 people in that Orlando nightclub.

It is telling that the Attorney General sought to withhold from the American people the 911 calls of the Orlando shooter to excise out—to rewrite history—and to diminish the terrorist influences that motivated him in the first place. It is further evidence that the Obama administration fails to see what is plainly right in front of its face when it comes to the threat, and it continues to refuse to deal with it in a

way that would crush ISIS and discourage people from becoming radicalized because they feel like ISIS is winning. If ISIS were crushed and destroyed, which should be our goal, I don't believe we would have radicalized Americans here pledging allegiance to the leader of a crushed or destroyed Islamic State.

So jihadi terrorism on American soil is not just some one-off, freak occurrence. It is now an undeniable pattern. How many ISIS-inspired attacks do we need in this country before we start talking about and taking the threat seriously and begin targeting the evil ideology ISIS is selling?

Typically, in an investigation, law enforcement has to work hours on end to answer the question of who did it. But that is not the case with these examples of Islamic extremism. We know who the enemy is. But the Obama administration has failed to call it for what it is, and the President has failed to offer any strategy to root out and exterminate it. Promises to ''defeat and degrade'' appear just about as hollow as the President's threat of retaliatory action if redlines were crossed with the use of chemical weapons in Syria. When that happened, there were no consequences.

So the result is that ISIS isn't contained, and it is surely not retreating. Don't take my word for it. The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency just last week suggested that ISIS would continue to ''intensify its global terror campaign.'' They are not giving up, and they are not going away. They are doubling down. Like the terrorist in Orlando, ISIS is actively using every tool at its disposal to recruit, train, and radicalize individuals here in America and in other parts of the world.

This terrorist army figured out a long time ago that it could accomplish its objectives of inflicting death and destruction on innocent Americans without even having to send its operatives from the Middle East into the United States. All it had to do was to export, not its soldiers, but its ideology and poisonous ideas to the United States via the Internet with the propaganda that it uses to, again, poison susceptible minds, those who are sympathetic to the cause and willing to swear allegiance to it and carry out the horrific acts like we saw in Orlando.

Over the weekend, the House Homeland Security Committee chairman noted that ISIS and its supporters are posting an estimated 200,000 tweets a day—200,000 separate messages a day on Twitter. How long will it take before the administration recognizes that this propaganda poses a growing national security problem? Once they acknowledge it, how much longer will it take them before they do something about it?

In fact, we heard from FBI Director Comey that there are open investigations on individuals suspected of being radicalized in all 50 States. I don't see the administration doing anything at all to effectively counter this terrorist propaganda popping up all over the Internet, turning some susceptible Americans into cold-blooded jihadist killers. We can fight back by equipping our law enforcement personnel with the tools they need to keep us safe. The fact is, you can't connect the dots unless you can collect the dots, and that means robust intelligence consistent with our Constitution, including the Fourth Amendment.

Too often law enforcement officials have to operate with one hand over their eye or one hand behind their back, however you want to characterize it, because they can't access key information in a timely manner, and because of that they are not able to discern the pendency of an attack or the motivations of somebody who is planning an attack. If they could collect the information, maybe—just maybe—they could then go to the FISA Court and get a search warrant. Maybe—just maybe—they could get a wiretap upon the showing of probable cause in court. Those, of course, are consistent with the Fourth Amendment protections against unreasonable searches and seizures, and the burden should be on law enforcement to produce probable cause evidence in order to justify collection of the content of those communications.

We saw the consequences of our flying blind in Garland, TX, just last year. On the morning of the attempted terrorist attack, the two men who came from Phoenix dressed in body armor with semiautomatic weapons sent more than 100 messages overseas to suspected terrorists, and vice versa, but, unfortunately, FBI Director Comey—at least the last time he testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee—said the FBI still doesn't have access to that information because of encryption. This means our law enforcement authorities could be missing critical information that could uncover future terrorist attacks or identify the network of terrorists here so we can stop them before they kill again.

The Garland case isn't unique. The FBI is regularly slowed down by outdated policies that make their job of protecting the homeland much more difficult—more difficult than it needs to be. We saw that in San Bernardino too. We have to address this gaping hole in our legal authorities and do all we can to give the FBI and our other law enforcement officials the tools they need, and a good place to start would be tomorrow morning by allowing the FBI to use national security letters to obtain key information about what suspected terrorists are doing on the Internet and whom they are communicating with online in counterterrorism investigations. This is not for content, as the Presiding Officer knows. This is information about Internet and email addresses, much as national security letters are currently authorized to collect telephone numbers and financial information. In fact, the FBI Director said the omission of this authority years ago, he believes, was an oversight, but it now provides a gaping vulnerability and has blinded the FBI to information that could well allow them to have detected the intentions earlier of jihadists like the one in Orlando.

I don't know for a fact, but I just wonder if the FBI, back when they were vetting the Orlando shooter on two separate occasions because things he said and did put him on the watch list, if they would have been notified immediately when he purchased his firearms. Well, as we now know, the FBI investigations were inconclusive and he was taken off the watch list. I wonder if the FBI had access to a national security letter that would allow them to gain information about the IP addresses he had been visiting from his Internet service provider, along with email addresses—again, not content because you can't do that without a warrant issued by the FISA Court and a showing of probable cause—and what he might have been viewing, such as YouTube videos of Anwar al-Awlaki, who was responsible for radicalizing MAJ Nidal Hasan at Fort Hood and others, and the information was sufficient enough that the President of the United States authorized the use of a drone in order to kill him on the battlefield so he could not kill other innocent Americans—well, you get my point. We need to make sure the FBI has access to all the information they can legally get their hands on, and a good place to start is voting on the McCain-Burr amendment tomorrow so the FBI can obtain information about what they are doing on the Internet and who they are communicating with, and if it is justified, to be able to then go to court and demonstrate probable cause sufficient to actually then look at content in order to prevent terrorist attacks.

I want to be clear about one thing. The FBI already has the power to review financial records like Western Union transfers and the FBI already has the power to review telephone records. They can access telephone numbers, not the content of the conversation, again, unless there is further authority issued by a court of law, but because of an inadvertent omission in the law, the FBI can't readily access the exact kind of information ISIS is using to recruit and radicalize violent extremists lurking in our midst.

We have seen how difficult it is to identify these people before they kill. Why in the world wouldn't we want to make sure we provide all the information under our constitutional laws that could be available to law enforcement to identify these people before they kill?

I introduced a similar proposal to the McCain-Burr amendment a few weeks ago in the Judiciary Committee that would address this and provide access

to this counterterrorism information. I am glad our colleagues, the senior Senators from Arizona and North Carolina, have now offered this amendment to the underlying legislation.

As the Presiding Officer knows, this provision, or one very similar to it, was contained in the Intelligence reauthorization bill that had the bipartisan support of everybody on the Intelligence Committee, save one.

This is long overdue. It is bipartisan, and I think our failure to act to grant this authority, particularly in the wake of this terrible tragedy in Orlando, would be inexcusable. This is something the FBI Director, appointed by President Obama, has said he needs. He said this is their No. 1 legislative priority. President Obama's administration—beyond just the FBI Director—supports it. What is stopping us from providing this authority?

The truth is, these threats are at our doorstep. ISIS is using every tool it has to spread fear and chaos, and we owe it to those on the frontlines of our counterterrorism efforts to get them what they need in order to more effectively counter these terrorists' efforts. It is our duty to do something about it. Unlike some of the provisions we voted on last night that would do nothing to stop people like the Orlando shooter, this could actually stop them.

I am all ears if there are other ideas when it comes to advancing commonsense proposals to fight terrorism at home and make our communities safer, but this is a good place to start. I hope going forward we can do a better job of providing the FBI and law enforcement officials the resources they need to keep us safe. This is within our grasp, and all we need to do is to take advantage of this opportunity and have a strong bipartisan vote to adopt the McCain-Burr amendment tomorrow morning.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, after voting down sensible gun measures earlier this week, Republicans want to change the subject. They want to resort to scare tactics to divert the attention of the American people. Now, they are offering an overbroad proposal that they argue is needed to keep this country safe.

Let's be clear about what we need to stay safe. We need universal background checks for firearms purchases. We need to give the FBI the authority to deny guns to individuals suspected of terrorism. Senate Republicans rejected those sensible measures last night, but we still have the chance to give law enforcement real tools to fight terrorism and violent crime. We should strengthen our laws to make it easier to prosecute firearms traffickers and straw purchasers who put guns in the hands of terrorists and criminals. And we need to fund the FBI and the Justice Department so they have the resources they need to combat acts of terrorism and hate. Those are the elements of the amendment that Senators MIKULSKI, BALDWIN, NELSON, and I have filed—and those are among the actions that Congress could take to protect this country.

Instead Republicans are proposing to reduce independent oversight of FBI surveillance of Americans' Internet activities and make permanent a law that, as of last year, had never been used. And I should note that this is the same law that the Republican leadership in the Senate allowed to expire just last year.

In case there is any confusion, I will state it clearly: The McCain amendment would not have prevented the Orlando attack.

The amendment would eliminate the requirement for a court order when the FBI wants to obtain detailed information about Americans' Internet activities in national security investigations. This could cover Web sites Americans have visited; extensive information on who Americans communicate with through email, chat, and text messages; and where and when Americans log onto the Internet and into social media accounts. Over time, this information would provide highly revealing details about Americans' personal lives. The government should not be able to obtain this information whenever it wants by simply issuing a subpoena.

Senator CORNYN and others have argued forcefully that we cannot prevent people on the terrorist watch list from obtaining firearms without due process and judicial review. They say we need an independent decisionmaker; yet at the same time, they are proposing to remove judicial approval when the FBI wants to find out what Web sites Americans are visiting. The FBI already has authority to obtain this information—if it obtains a court order under section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act. In an emergency where there is not time to go to court, the USA FREEDOM Act allows the FBI to obtain this information before getting judicial approval, so this amendment is unnecessary.

This amendment is opposed by major technology companies and privacy groups across the political spectrum, from FreedomWorks to Google to the ACLU. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from nearly 40 organizations and companies opposing this proposal be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Judiciary Committee also should study this proposal before it proceeds. The Judiciary Committee has not held a hearing to examine whether this expansion of the NSL statute is necessary or how it would affect Americans' privacy and civil liberties.

Rather than trying to distract us from their opposition to commonsense gun measures, Republicans should support actions that will actually help protect us, like those in the amendment filed by Senator MIKULSKI, Senator BALDWIN, Senator NELSON, and myself. They should support emergency FBI funding. They should support funding for the civil rights division to help protect the LGBT community, the Muslim American community, and the African-American community from hate crimes and discrimination. And they should support my proposal to make it harder for terrorists and criminals to evade background checks by turning to firearms traffickers and straw purchasers. This is a provision that I have developed with Senator COLLINS and that has been strongly supported by law enforcement.

As we saw in San Bernardino, terrorists can acquire assault rifles by simply using a friend to purchase the guns for them; yet prosecuting such individuals for firearms trafficking has proven to be an extremely difficult task. My proposal will fix these laws. It will provide law enforcement the tools it needs to deter and prosecute those who traffic in firearms, and it will help to close another glaring loophole in our gun laws that allows terrorists and criminals to easily acquire powerful firearms.

I urge Senators to oppose the McCain amendment and to support these measures that will actually help keep our country safe.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 6, 2016.

DEAR SENATOR: The undersigned civil society organizations, companies, and trade associations strongly oppose an expansion of the National Security Letter (NSL) statute, such as the one that was reportedly included in the Senate's Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and the one filed by Senator CORNYN as an amendment to the ECPA reform bill. We would oppose any version of these bills that included such a propsal expanding the government's ability to access private data without a court order.

This expansion of the NSL statute has been characterized by some government officials as merely fixing a ''typo'' in the law. In reality, however, it would dramatically expand the ability of the FBI to get sensitive information about users' online activities without court oversight. The provision would expand the categories of records, known as Electronic Communication Transactional Records (ECTRs), that the FBI can obtain using administrative subpoenas called NSLs, which do not require probable cause. Under these proposals, ECTRs would include a host of online information, such as IP addresses, routing and transmission information, session data, and more.

The new categories of information that could be collected using an NSL—and thus without any oversight from a judge—would paint an incredibly intimate picture of an individual's life. For example, ECTRs could include a person's browsing history, email metadata, location information, and the exact date and time a person signs in or out of a particular online account. This information could reveal details about a person's political affiliation, medical conditions, religion, substance abuse history, sexual orientation, and, in spite of the exclusion of cell tower information in the Cornyn amendment, even his or her movements throughout the day.

The civil liberties and human rights concerns associated with such an expansion are compounded by the government's history of

abusing NSL authorities. In the past ten years, the FBI has issued over 300,000 NSLs, a vast majority of which included gag orders that prevented companies from disclosing that they received a request for information. An audit by the Office of the Inspector General (IG) at the Department of Justice in 2007 found that the FBI illegally used NSLs to collect information that was not permitted by the NSL statutes. In addition, the IG found that data collected pursuant to NSLs was stored indefinitely, used to gain access to private information in cases that were not relevant to an FBI investigation, and that NSLs were used to conduct bulk collection of tens of thousands of records at a time.

Given the sensitive nature of the information that could be swept up under the proposed expansion, and the documented past abuses of the underlying NSL statute, we urge the Senate to remove this provision from the Intelligence Authorization bill and oppose efforts to include such language in the ECPA reform bill, which has never included the proposed NSL expansion.

Sincerely,

Access Now, Advocacy for Principled Action in Government, American Association of Law Libraries, American Civil Liberties Union, American Library Association, American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, Amnesty International USA, Association of Research Libraries, Brennan Center for Justice, Center for Democracy & Technology, Center for Financial Privacy and Human Rights, CompTIA, Computer & Communications Industry Association, Constitutional Alliance, Demand Progress, Electronic Frontier Foundation, Engine.

Facebook, Fight for the Future, Foursquare, Free Press Action Fund, FreedomWorks, Google, Government Accountability Project, Human Rights Watch, Institute for Policy Innovation, Internet Infrastructure Coalition/I2Coalition, National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, New America's Open Technology Institute, OpenTheGovernment.org, R Street, Reform Government Surveillance, Restore the Fourth, Tech Freedom, The Constitution Project, World Privacy Forum, Yahoo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

MASS SHOOTING IN ORLANDO

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to continue the discussion as to the tragedy that occurred on June 12 in Orlando, FL. The shooting occurred at a popular LGBT club, Pulse. The club owner, Barbara Poma, lost her brother to the AIDS epidemic. The club was named to remember a pulse that faded from this world far too early. Pulse was not just a place to socialize, it was a refuge and a place of acceptance and solidarity where members of the Orlando LGBT community could be themselves without judgment.

The fact that an attacker would target this venue, especially during Gay Pride Month, is a horrific tragedy and a senseless loss of human life. My deepest sympathies are with those killed and injured in this terrorist attack, along with their families and loved ones. My thanks go out to the first responders who saved lives in the midst of such danger.

This attack, and others like it in recent years, tears at our hearts and leaves us angry, frustrated, and confused. We, as a nation, must resolve to stop those who wish to do harm to Americans from committing and encouraging acts of terror.

The Orlando shooter apparently subscribed to an extreme system of beliefs that led him to carry out this heinous attack. No religion condones or encourages such violence and killing. We must reject any ideology that leaves room for discrimination and dehumanization to a point where someone can commit these types of acts. No one should ever fear for their life simply for being themselves or expressing who they are as an individual. America's values of tolerance, compassion, freedom, and love for thy neighbor must win out over hate, intolerance, homophobia, and xenophobia.

The time for talk is over. We, as a nation, as a community, and as an American family, must take actions to change minds, hearts, and, finally, change policies. The attack in Orlando was a terror attack and a hate crime. We can stop others and save lives by taking immediate action.

I was disappointed we missed opportunities to do that yesterday with sensible gun safety amendments. I cosponsored the Murphy amendment, which would have created a system of universal background checks for individuals trying to buy a gun. The amendment would have ensured that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System and would require a background check for every firearm sale. We know there are loopholes today. Why do we allow those loopholes to continue? It should not matter whether you buy a gun at a local gun store or at a gun show or on the Internet, you should have to pass a background check so we can make sure guns are kept out of the hands of people who should never have one. This amendment would have helped keep guns out of the hands of convicted felons, domestic abusers, and the seriously mentally ill, who have no business buying a gun.

Studies have shown that nearly half of all current gun sales are made by private sellers who are exempt from conducting background checks.

It makes no sense that felons, fugitives, and others who are legally prohibited from having a gun can easily use a loophole to buy a gun.

Once again, the use of a universal background check will have no impact on the legitimate needs of people who are entitled to have a weapon, but universal background checks could and would help us keep our communities safe by helping us keep weapons out of the hands of criminals and those who have serious mental illness and domestic abusers. We need to stop their ability to easily be able to obtain a weapon.

Universal background checks are strongly supported by the American people. Most background checks can be completed very quickly and do not inconvenience a purchaser at all.

To my colleagues who have reservations about this legislation, let me cite the Heller decision. In June 2008 the Supreme Court decided the case of District of Columbia v. Heller. The Court held that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to bear arms rather than a collective right to possess a firearm. The Court also held that the Second Amendment right is not unlimited, and it is not a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner and for any purpose.

Justice Scalia wrote for the Court in that case:

> Nothing in our opinion should be taken to cast doubt on the longstanding prohibitions on the possession of firearms by felons and the mentally ill, or laws forbidding the carrying of firearms in sensitive places such as schools and government buildings, or laws imposing conditions and qualifications on the commercial sale of firearms.

That was Justice Scalia for the Court.

Justice Scalia recognized Congress's right to make sure those who are not qualified to own a firearm do not get that firearm. We have an obligation to make sure that background checks are effective so as to keep out of the hands of criminals and those who have serious mental illness the opportunity to easily be able to obtain a firearm.

The legislation pending before us in the Senate is fully consistent with the Heller decision. That amendment would have been fully consistent with the Heller decision and Justice Scalia's opinion.

I know we can protect innocent Americans while still protecting the constitutional rights of legitimate hunters and existing gun owners. We should take that action on behalf of the American people.

There was a second amendment I cosponsored that unfortunately was rejected yesterday—the Feinstein amendment—that would close the terror gap. If you are not safe enough to fly on an airplane, you shouldn't be able to buy a gun. The Feinstein amendment would give the Attorney General the authority to block the sale of guns to known or suspected terrorists if the Attorney General has reason to believe the weapons would be used in connection with terrorism. The amendment would have ensured that anyone who had been subject to a Federal terrorism investigation in the past 5 years would have been automatically flagged with the existing background check system for further review by the Department of Justice.

Note that under this amendment, being included on a terrorist watch list is not by itself a sufficient justification to deny a person the right to buy a firearm. The Attorney General may deny that weapon transfer only if she determines that the purchaser represents a threat to public safety based on a reasonable suspicion that the purchaser is engaged or has engaged in conduct related to terrorism. So there is a standard there.

A recent GAO report concluded that approximately 90 percent of individuals who were known or suspected terrorists were able to pass background gun checks. This amendment would have closed this loophole and would have reduced the risk of a terrorist being able to legally acquire a firearm.

Under current law, individuals who are known or suspected terrorists and do not fall into one of the nine prohibited purchaser categories can legally purchase a weapon. While the FBI is notified when individuals on the terrorist watch list apply for a background check through the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, it does not have the authority to block the sale.

The Feinstein amendment contains remedial procedures so that individuals get the reason for denial, the right to correct the record, and the right to bring action to challenge the denial. In other words, there is due process in the Feinstein amendment.

So I was disappointed that the two amendment chances we had yesterday were not approved by the Senate. I think both would have helped in making our communities safer.

Congress has an obligation to act. As I have indicated before, we need to act. Inaction is not an option. The President of the United States has already acted to the extent he is permitted using his Executive authority. Many of our States have acted as well, including my own State of Maryland, but we need a national law that applies to all 50 States to stop criminals, terrorists, domestic abusers, and others who should not get their hands on a gun from simply driving to a nearby State with less restrictive gun laws and being able to legally acquire a weapon.

I encourage my colleagues to continue to work on compromise legislation on the issue of universal background checks and terror watch lists. Congress should also act to ban assault-type weapons, which have no legitimate civilian use, and we should ban the sale of high-capacity magazines which only increase the level of carnage in a mass shooting.

The time for action is now. We cannot wait.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

MINERS PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise today to express the urgent need to take up and pass a piece of legislation which has great meaning for me and my fellow West Virginians and which is important to our Nation's coal-mining community, and that is the Miners Protection Act.

Seventy years ago, in 1946, President Harry Truman secured an agreement committing the Federal Government to protect lifetime health and pension benefits for our Nation's miners. These men and women earned this care through their tireless and often very dangerous work to produce the coal that has powered our Nation and spurred economic growth for years.

Over the course of seven decades, Congress has kept their promise. In 1992, a bipartisan effort in Congress led by my predecessor, Senator Rockefeller, resulted in the passage of the Coal Act to address the health care needs of orphaned coal miners. Those are miners whose companies are no longer in existence.

In 2006, I voted for legislation that built upon the Coal Act and continued the bipartisan congressional tradition, fulfilling our promise to coal miners and their families and retirees and protecting their promised health care benefits.

In 2012, the bankruptcy of Patriot Coal placed the health care of more than 12,000 retirees and dependents at risk. A temporary solution, which has been going on for a couple of years, has preserved health care for these individuals, but that short-term solution is nearing an end.

Additional coal industry bankruptcies—and I feel like we hear about one a week, and they are major—have threatened health care benefits for more families.

If we don't act now, health care for more than 21,000 miners and families will be lost by the end of this year—just 6 months from now.

West Virginians really know what mining has meant to our State and to our Nation, and our miners have depended on these benefits. Every day I am reminded of this.

Char from Bob White, WV—and Bob White is the name of the little town he lives in—recently wrote to me:

> We are desperate. Our benefits are about to lapse unless we get this legislation passed. It cannot be ignored again. Many retired miners cannot afford to pay for their medications if we lose our health care.

Kenneth, who lives in Mullens, WV, said:

> It seems more and more that the attack on coal is no longer an industry attack but one that is personal on individuals.

He went on to ask this question: ''What about folks like me that worked hard their entire life?''

Recognizing the significance of this problem, I joined with Congressman DAVID MCKINLEY to introduce legislation in 2013 that addressed both the retiree health care and the looming insolvency of the mine workers' multiemployer pension bill.

Last year, Senator MANCHIN and I introduced the Miners Protection Act, a very similar bill. This bill demands immediate action. We need to follow through with our commitment to all the hard-working West Virginians and other coal miners across this country. In addition to addressing the health care needs of retirees through the same mechanisms supported by Congress in 1993 and 2006, the Miners Protection Act will ensure the solvency of the multiemployer pension plan that provides benefits to almost 90,000 retirees and surviving spouses. More than 27,000 of those—nearly one-third—live in my home State of West Virginia. The Miners Protection Act uses unobligated funds authorized by the 2006 AML reauthorization bill to support existing mine-working health and pension programs.

Let's be clear. Mining retirees do not receive lavish benefits. The average pension payment is only $560 per month. But these funds are vital to our retirees who live on very small fixed incomes. They are a key part of a local economy in West Virginia and other States where these retirees live.

If we fail to act, the pension plan will become insolvent, imposing projected liabilities of over $4 billion on the PBGC, known as the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. If we pass the Miners Protection Act, the pension plan will remain in good standing, benefiting taxpayers, beneficiaries, and coal communities.

In May, the trustees of the UMWA Health and Retirement Funds announced that contributions to the pension fund have dropped by nearly two-thirds from last year's level. This just shows you how devastated our coal communities are.

The continued regulatory assault on the coal industry has hastened this decline and threatened the retirement security of our miners. In 2001, the EPA finalized the mercury and air toxins rule for coal plants. Since that time, our Nation has lost more than 40,000 coal jobs, and 1,000 of those workers are West Virginians. Our State's unemployment is among the highest in the country for this very reason. The impact of other EPA proposals, like the Clean Power Plan, which has been stayed by the Supreme Court, and the stream protection rule that is currently being finalized, would make the situation even worse in our coal communities.

As I have said many times before, the negative regulatory impact on coal extends far beyond the tens of thousands of families who are most directly affected. A loss of coal severance tax revenue has triggered drastic budget problems for our State, which we just got a 1-year solution for, and a lot of our local governments are having to lay off county workers and school workers and schoolteachers.

The severe impact on the health care pensions of our miners is another consequence of the administration's War on Coal.

Given that Federal policies have played a major role in causing this problem, it is appropriate for the Federal Government to fulfill its commitment to retiring miners who will lose their promised benefits unless we act.

The Miners Protection Act is critically important to so many people in my State and across this country. We need to keep the promise of lifetime health care for those retired coal miners whose companies have gone through bankruptcy, and we need to

make sure our retirees receive the pension benefits they have worked so hard for.

The Miners Protection Act is a truly bipartisan effort. It is supported by Democrats and Republicans and Independents in the Senate. There are 72 cosponsors on the House bill, including 39 Republicans and 33 Democrats.

West Virginians understand that this need not be a political football. As Thomas from Shady Spring, WV, put it, ''This issue is not partisan; this is an easy fix to funding promised pensions.''

It is important this bill be enacted this year before the temporary solution expires and ends the health care benefits for so many retirees and before the continued downturn takes an even greater toll on the pension fund.

I will continue to work with my colleagues in the West Virginia delegation, including Senator MANCHIN, Congressman MCKINLEY, Congressman MOONEY, and Congressman JENKINS, and all of the other cosponsors of this legislation, to see it become law before it is too late.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. 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. MANCHIN. Mr. President, first of all, I thank my colleague, Senator CAPITO. We come from the same State, and we have known each other for a long time, and we basically represent the same people, who have given so much to this country. I want to thank her. This is truly bipartisan, and that is how it should be in this body. When you have something causing the people in your State and in the country to be hurting, you don't worry about the politics. Democrat or Republican, you reach across the aisle and do the right thing.

I thank her so much. Everything she said is absolutely correct. This thing goes clear back to 1946 under President Harry Truman. At that point in time, John L. Lewis basically was going on strike for the MWA. Every miner back in the 1940s belonged to the United Mine Workers. This Miners Protection Act basically fulfills the promise that a President of the United States made by Executive order. And what we have asked for now is to fix this.

We have a pathway forward. Democrats and Republicans on both sides of the aisle, as Senator CAPITO has said, have stepped forward, and I am so appreciative of that. If we don't do something quickly—by the end of this year—they will lose their health care, and in another year or two they are going to lose their pensions.

We are mostly talking about widows. Most of their husbands have passed away from black lung disease or other causes. These are widows who don't have much to begin with. These are stipends that assist with their medical and health care.

This is something that should have been done a long time ago, but we are taking it right down to the end of the wire. That is what we are concerned about.

We have asked everybody to look at the bill. We have found pay-fors.

Here is a really good pay-for. The 1974 fund was solid until the collapse of 2008. The collapse didn't happen because the MWA did something wrong with the miners' pensions. It happened because of Wall Street. Guess what. We have a $5 billion fine on Goldman Sachs. We said: Let's take $3.5 billion of it. That is what caused the problem; that is a pay-for. We are also using abandoned mine land money excess—not any of the mitigation we are responsible for.

Senator CAPITO has laid this out to the point, and we have worked together. Both of our staffs have worked closely together on this. This is the way things should have been done.

We hope that all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will encourage the leadership to take a position on this and put it up for a vote. We think it will pass. We know that it will pass if it gets its day in court. This is the body that will make it happen. I think on the House side they will do the same thing.

With that, I thank Senator CAPITO again for the hard work she has done. It is a pleasure working with her, and we will show that bipartisanship is alive and well in West Virginia and should be alive and well in the United States of America.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENDING U.S. AID FOR PALESTINIAN ACTS OF TERRORISM

Mr. COATS. Madam President, terrorist violence against civilians in Israel has been accelerating in recent years amounting to what is now called the silent intifada, the term meaning ''violent uprising.'' Perhaps it is called silent because we are not paying enough attention to the atrocities that are currently taking place in Israel.

The first intifada lasted from December 1987 to 1993, the second, from 2000 to 2005. This third uprising, the so-called silent intifada, began in Jerusalem in 2014. Last year, the latest intifada was characterized with a new name, ''knife intifada.'' Earlier, we witnessed media accounts of Palestinian terrorists slaughtering Israelis and others, including American citizens, by blowing up restaurants or schoolbuses or using automatic weapons. Breaking news on CNN or FOX, or whatever we were watching, showed us the scenes of body parts, pools of blood in the streets, ambulances, with sirens screaming, rushing to the nearest hospital or aid station with mutilated and badly injured victims of these attacks. Lately, though, the weapons of choice seem to be increasingly the knife. Apparently, in some ways, the Palestinians think the direct face-to-face bloody slaughter of a teenager or a grandmother by a knife-wielding thug makes it even more personal and horrifying. Americans may know, through recent media reports, about this wave of violence injecting new poison into the region, but I think what most don't know is that American taxpayers are supporting this with their tax dollars. Let me repeat that.

While we may be aware of some of what is going on in Israel through this knife intifada, through the continued horrors and the murders that are taking place, what Americans don't seem to know—in fact, what many of us have now learned—is that their tax dollars are supporting this effort. Since 1998, the Palestinian Authority has been encouraging such attacks by honoring and supporting Palestinian terrorists serving criminal sentences in Israeli prisons and rewarding the families of those who were martyred by their own violent acts.

Since then, the system of payments has been formalized and expanded by President Abbas in Presidential directives. Palestinian terrorist prisoners are regarded by the Palestinian Authority as patriotic martyrs, fighters, heroes, and actually as employees of the Government of the Palestinian Authority. While in prison for their crimes, they and their families are paid premium salaries and given extra benefits as rewards for their service—their service being a criminal act, an assault, and even a murder. It is interesting that they use that word. Under release from custody, the terrorists then become civil service employees. Shockingly, monthly salaries for both incarcerated and released prisoners are on a sliding scale, depending on the severity of the crime and the length of the prison sentence. Thus, the more heinous the crime, carrying a longer sentence, enables the criminal or his family to receive a much higher premium salary. For example, a prisoner with a 5-year sentence or his family receives about $500 a month; whereas, a more serious criminal serving a 25-year sentence will receive $2,500 a month—six times the average income of the average Palestinian worker. Where else in the world does a prisoner receive such benefits that actually increase with the severity and violence of the crime?

In May 2014, Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas issued a Presidential

decree that moved this payment system from the PA, Palestinian Authority, to the PLO, the Palestine Liberation Organization. The openly acknowledged reason for this shift was to sidestep the increasingly critical scrutiny of this payment system by foreign governments—including the United States—which are contributing much of the money that is keeping the Palestinian Authority afloat.

In 2014, I, along with Senators GRAHAM and KIRK, cosponsored an amendment to the fiscal year 2015 appropriations bill providing for the reduction of budgetary support for the PA by an amount the Secretary of State determines is equivalent to the amount expended by the PA as payments for acts of terrorism by individuals who are imprisoned after being fairly tried and convicted for acts of terrorism and by individuals who died committing acts of terrorism during the previous calendar year. That is something Senator KIRK, Senator GRAHAM, and I worked on to try to address this issue. Subsequent annual appropriations legislation continues now to include this provision. Once that prohibition was enacted and became law, PA President Abbas formally ended the program and transferred that support function to the PLO, by transferring to the PLO the exact amount that had been budgeted by the Palestinian Authority accounts for this prisoner support purpose; in other words, nothing but a shell game. Oh, we are getting a lot of criticism about providing support to these so-called martyrs, these criminals who have been convicted in Israeli courts. We are getting criticized for doing that—actually, people are telling us it is an incentive to do this. The sickness of this is that families benefit by having one member of their family actually go out and commit a crime, including a murder, getting sentenced to prison for a number of years, and then the family or the criminal is being rewarded for that very act.

So when criticism came and the language we passed in the Congress which enforced this came, Abbas simply pulled out a shell game and said: I will just shift the money and the authority over here, designating that the cutoff of aid by the United States and other countries now was going to a different authority. Now, the relationship between the two organizations, while complex, is also very intertwined. While the PLO claims it is an independent body, the PA receives its legitimacy and mandate from the PLO in agreements with Israel. In effect, the PA is subordinate to the PLO.

I am speaking on the Senate floor because I have become increasingly concerned that this payment issue is not receiving the public attention and criticism it deserves. People think, well, we have solved the problem through the language which we passed a couple of years ago but are now discovering that a shell game was simply in play and that money is simply fungible and then shifted over to another function under the PA called the PLO that is then now distributing the money to the families.

It appears some pro-Israel organizations may be hesitant to bring more pressure on the financially weak, dependent PA, believing it would deprive Abbas of what little remains of his authority and status as a negotiating partner, thus making a negotiated settlement with Israel less likely. It also appears that some Israeli officials have been reluctant to support the cutoff of aid to the PA, presumably to preserve the PA's stability as a West Bank security provider.

Our administration—the U.S. administration—is similarly not eager to enforce this issue. The Department of State's Bureau of Counterterrorism said in a report last month that this payment system was ''an effort to reintegrate released prisoners into society and prevent recruitment by hostile political factions.'' There is nothing in the PA Presidential directives establishing this system that justifies such an absurdly positive view of its purposes. The U.S. Government should not see this payment program in such a positive light at all, nor does the Palestinian Authority deserve immunity because of its fragility. These payments provide rewards and motivations for brutal terrorists, plain and simple. To provide U.S. taxpayer money to Abbas and his government so they can treat terrorists as heroes or glorious martyrs is morally unacceptable. To tolerate such an outrage because of concern for Abbas's political future or preserving the PA's security role for Israel amounts to self-imposed extortion. If the PA's fragile financial condition requires U.S. assistance, then it is their policy—not ours—that must change.

Let me be more specific as to why we need to take immediate action to stop the use of U.S. taxpayer dollars to reward the PLO for its barbaric acts. Since 2014, there have been at least 45 terrorist attacks in Israel killing 585 people, including Americans. Just this past March, Taylor Force, a U.S. Army veteran of Iraq and Afghanistan, was stabbed to death by a Palestinian terrorist in Jaffa. Taylor was a graduate of the U.S. military academy, and as a former U.S. military officer, he was buried with full honors. His attacker was killed by the Israeli police. This terrorist then received the honors of his own community and a burial ceremony that glorified him as a martyr, the highest religious achievement in Islam. The official Palestinian Authority spokesman said the celebration funeral was ''a national wedding befitting of martyrs''—a reference to the Islamic belief that a martyr marries 72 dark-eyed virgins in paradise.

The family who presumably paid for this celebration received substantial rewards from the Palestinian Government and will now receive a permanent monthly stipend. Some of that money is paid into the U.S. Treasury by American taxpayers and is given as assistance to the Palestinian Authority, which is then shell moved over to the PLO and then provided as a reward for killing an American soldier.

I, for one—and I am sure I am speaking for the American taxpayer—am not interested in paying for a martyr's funeral or his so-called wedding. I am also not interested in paying for what amounts to civil servant salaries for the two terrorists who shot four Israelis to death this past June in Tel Aviv or the two Palestinian boys who attacked customers in a supermarket in February or the 16-year-old terrorist who stabbed an Israeli mother of six to death in her own kitchen last January.

I could go on and on about these atrocities and murders, and to think that American taxpayer dollars are paying the families and criminals of those who committed the crimes, with our tax dollars.

As I said earlier, we need an immediate response to this outrage, and I am ready to lead the effort. First, I intend to work with my colleagues, particularly Senator GRAHAM and Senator KIRK, who are on the relevant committees and had joined me years ago to try to put a stop to this. I want to work with them to end American financial support for incarcerated terrorists or the families of these so-called martyrs who have earned that status by the brutal slaying of Jewish citizens, including some Americans. We will identify the amount of money that flows from the PA to the PLO for this purpose and cut U.S. assistance by at least that amount. If that partial cutoff of U.S. aid is not sufficient to motivate the PA to end this immoral system of payments to terrorists, I propose a complete suspension of any financial assistance to the Palestinian Authority until their policy has changed.

I am aware that suspending assistance to the Palestinians will have other consequences that we and Israel will have to address, but I believe the pressure that we and other like-minded governments could and should apply in this manner will bring President Abbas and other Palestinian officials to their senses. Whether or not this will occur, the moral imperative is clear: Payments that reward and encourage terrorism must stop. We have a moral obligation to do all that we can, as soon as we can, to stop financing the murder of innocent Israelis and Israel's friends and supporters.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have taken the floor many times to call to

the attention of the Senate abuses by for-profit colleges, an industry that enrolls 10 percent of all college students, receives 20 percent of all Federal aid to education, and accounts for 40 percent of all student loan defaults. That is 10 percent of the students and 40 percent of the student loan defaults. I have spoken about specific companies involved in this industry—for-profit colleges and universities—including Corinthian, the University of Phoenix, DeVry, ITT Tech, Westwood, and Ashford. It is a long list. I have spoken about Congress's responsibility and the responsibility of the Department of Education to reform higher education laws and be aggressive in overseeing these companies. Fortunately, things are starting to change at the Department of Education.

Today, I wish to speak about the accreditors and one in particular—the Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools, or ACICS.

Accreditors are, according to the Department of Education, responsible for ensuring that education provided by institutions meet acceptable levels of quality. In that role, they are, frankly, the gatekeepers of Federal dollars that flow to these colleges and universities. Without accreditation, the schools can't receive the money through the students for Pell grants and Federal loans. But, by law, the Department of Education decides which accrediting agencies are ''reliable authorities as to the quality of education or training provided by the institutions of higher education and the higher education programs they accredit.''

In order to be a gatekeeper of Federal educational student aid funds like loans and grants, these accrediting agencies must be approved by the Department of Education. The Department performs periodic reviews of federally recognized accrediting agencies to ensure that they are still ''reliable authorities.''

Here is where ACICS comes in. This outfit is currently undergoing one of those regular reviews by the Department and the Department's advisory board. It is a group called NACIQI, the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity and they will hold a hearing on ACICS this Thursday. Last week, in the first part of this review process, the Department of Education staff made its initial recommendation to NACIQI to revoke the recognition of ACICS, an accrediting agency responsible for about 25 percent of all for-profit colleges and universities.

This is the right decision. I commend the Department. I hope that NACIQI and ultimately the Secretary of Education, Mr. King, will follow the recommendation.

Last week, I joined Senators BLUMENTHAL, MURRAY, BROWN, and WARREN in writing to NACIQI to express support for their recommendation. For too long, this accrediting agency has acted as a rubberstamp for some of the worst for-profit colleges in America. Let's take one example to start with: Corinthian. Some will remember this company. It lied to the Federal Government and to the students who went to school there about its job placement rates. Listen to this. They used a scheme where they paid employers to hire recent graduates of Corinthian in temporary jobs so that Corinthian could report to the Federal Government that their graduates got employment. They were caught. The fraud was systemic at Corinthian and ultimately resulted in its bankruptcy. They were defrauding the government and, even worse, they were defrauding these students and their parents.

I wrote to the Department of Education asking them to look into these allegations of fraud about Corinthian in December of 2013. That same day I wrote to Dr. Albert Gray. He was the CEO of ACICS, which was the agency which accredited Corinthian. That was the agency that said to the Federal Government: This is a real college; you should let Federal funds flow to this college.

So I wrote to Dr. Gray and I said: What are you doing as an accrediting agency to hold Corinthian accountable and to ensure that they do not continue their fraudulent practices?

I received a response from Dr. Gray. His letter said the allegations were ''a source of great concern'' and that the council that he administered would review information submitted by Corinthian and ''make a determination of what actions to take regarding additional inquiries, compliance hearings or more serious sanctions.''

This so-called review of Corinthian by ACICS continued for more than a year, even as States like California, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin and Federal agencies such as the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau filed suit against Corinthian for their corrupt practices. Meanwhile, their accrediting agency was ''really looking into this''—really looking hard.

As the evidence of Corinthian's fraud and abuse mounted, ACICS—this accrediting agency—continued its wishy-washy ''monitoring'' that never led to anything. In fact, up until the date that Corinthian Colleges declared bankruptcy in May of 2015, they were still fully accredited by this ACICS accrediting agency. That is disgraceful.

But it wasn't disgraceful to ACICS. In response to an effort by Senator CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut in a 2015 Senate HELP Committee hearing to get Dr. Gray to admit that ACICS made a mistake by continuing to accredit Corinthian, Dr. Gray said:

> I will be the first to admit that accreditors like any other organization make mistakes. Corinthian was not one of those mistakes.

Incredible—here is a group that has defrauded students, defrauded the Federal Government, is being sued by at least three States and other Federal agencies, had declared bankruptcy, and the accrediting agency was still standing firmly behind it. Is this an organization that we can truly trust as taxpayers to be a reliable authority as to the quality of education? This is the gatekeeper—this agency, this accrediting agency—the gatekeeper for millions and sometimes billions of dollars to flow out of the Treasury from taxpayers through students and their families to lots of CEOs at for-profit colleges that are doing quite well, thank you. History tells us we can't trust ACICS.

Corinthian isn't the only embarrassment on the ACICS resume. According to the Center for American Progress, more than half of the $5.7 billion in Federal student aid awarded to ACICS-accredited schools in the past 3 years went to institutions facing State and Federal investigations or lawsuits. Twenty percent of the students at these for-profit schools accredited by this discredited agency defaulted on their Federal student loans. Does this sound like an organization that is a reliable authority when it comes to quality education schools provide?

In my home State of Illinois, Attorney General Lisa Madigan, who has been a real leader on this subject, settled a lawsuit last year against the notorious Westwood College. Westwood's practices were not all that different from Corinthian—lying to students about job prospects.

I remember meeting a young girl in Chicago. She had been smitten by all of these criminal investigation shows on television. So she signed up at Westwood, and she signed up to take courses in criminal justice. It took her 5 years to finish, to get her so-called degree from Westwood College in Chicago. Do you know what she found afterwards? Not a single law enforcement agency would even recognize her diploma. She spent 5 years and, even worse, she went deeply in debt—almost $90,000 in debt—for a worthless diploma from Westwood College. She moved back into her parents' home, living in the basement, and her dad came out of retirement to try to earn some money to help pay off the student loans at this worthless Westwood school.

Guess who accredited Westwood College. ACICS, the same agency. In fact, in the course of their investigation, the attorney general's office found that ACICS was not annually verifying even a sample of job placements reported by Westwood and other institutions they accredited.

There are so many other examples of negligence by this accrediting agency. That is why 13 State attorneys general, including Lisa Madigan of Illinois, have written to the Department of Education asking them to revoke ACICS' recognition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the attorneys general be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,

April 8, 2016.

Re Opposing the Application for Renewal of Recognition of the Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS).

Hon. JOHN KING,

Department of Education, Washington, DC.

JENNIFER HONG,

Executive Director/Designated Federal Official, National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY KING AND MS. HONG: We write in response to the notice of intent to accept written comments on the application for renewal of accrediting agencies, specifically, the Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS), as published in the Federal Register on March 18, 2016. We have carefully reviewed the Criteria for the Recognition of Accrediting Agencies, including §§ 602.16(a)(1)(i), 602.19(a) & (b), and 602.20(a), that are of particular importance to our consumers. We believe that stronger oversight by accrediting agencies is necessary to protect vulnerable students from predatory schools, ensure accountability to taxpayers, and level the playing field for career schools that are delivering quality, affordable programs. Given ACICS' failure to ensure program quality at the institutions it accredits, we oppose renewal of recognition and urge the Department to revoke its status as a recognized accreditor.

Because the Department of Education does not directly assess the quality of institutions of higher education, students depend on accreditors to ensure that schools provide an education that fleets at least minimum standards of quality. Accreditors, more than any other party charged with .he supervision of higher education, are responsible for protecting students from profit-seeking institutions offering training of no educational value. Today, when millions of students are defaulting on the student loans they incurred to attend subpar for-profit schools, it is clear that certain accreditors are failing to do the job.

Even in the crowded field of accrediting failures, ACICS deserves special opprobrium. According to a recent analysis by ProPublica, only 35% of students enrolled at ACICS accredited schools graduate from their programs, ''the lowest rate for any accreditor.'' Of students who actually did graduate, more than one in five defaulted on their student loans within the first three years after graduation. A full 60% had not yet paid down a single dollar of the principal balance on their loans.

As consumer advocates in our respective states, our offices have investigated many ACICS accredited schools based on complaints from students, and found a fundamental lack of substantive oversight for student outcomes by the accreditor. Lapses that we have encountered include a failure to take action when improper job placement statistics are reported, inadequate job placement verification processes, and a lack of transparency and cooperation with investigations into student outcomes.

ACICS' most spectacular failure was its decision to extend accreditation to several dozen schools operated by Corinthian Colleges. Corinthian's practice of offering extremely expensive degrees of little value to low-income students has been the target of more than twenty state and federal law enforcement agencies. Yet ACICS continued to provide accreditation to Corinthian's schools until the day Corinthian declared bankruptcy. The U.S. taxpayer provided approximately $3.5 billion to Corinthian, made possible by ACICS's accreditation.

ACICS has failed repeatedly to take action in response to public enforcement actions by state and federal law enforcement. In the Illinois Attorney General's investigation and subsequent litigation with Westwood College, the office found that ACICS was not annually verifying even a sample of job placements reported by the institutions it accredits. When asked by the attorney general's office, ACICS would not commit to formally outline their verification process in an affidavit. This type of obfuscation hinders regulatory cooperation between the ''triad'' that oversees higher education in the United States, the federal government, the states, and accreditors.

There are other examples of ACICS' failure to identify compliance problems and enforce its accreditation standards. In 2015, Education Management Company (EDMC), with campuses accredited by ACICS including The Art Institute and Brown Mackie College, settled with thirty-nine State Attorneys General and agreed to forgive $102.8 million in outstanding loan debt. ITT Tech has been sued by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and Attorneys General of Massachusetts and New Mexico and is under investigation by 19 other states. Daymar College employed dozens of unqualified faculty as determined by the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education and the Kentucky Attorney General, yet ACICS took no action to rebuke the school or require remedies for students. Daymar subsequently settled with the Attorney General and agreed to provide $11 million in debt relief and pay $1.2 million in student redress. National College of Kentucky, Inc. was fined $147,000 by a Kentucky Court for failing to fully respond to a subpoena from the Kentucky Attorney General. National College of Kentucky later admitted in litigation with the Kentucky Attorney General that it advertised false job placement rates yet ACICS has taken no action against the school.

Career Education Corporation, whose Sanford Brown schools are ACICS-accredited, settled with the New York Attorney General's Office in 2013 for $10.25 million based on findings that CEC fabricated job placement rates. ACICS failed to identify the placement rate inaccuracies and, when CEC's misconduct came to light, failed to terminate or suspend accreditation to any Sanford Brown Schools. In fact, ACICS did not even request that CEC recalculate inaccurate placement rates for several of the affected cohorts.

It should be noted that ACICS has representatives of these problem schools on its board and committees, raising serious questions about potential conflicts of interests and therefore ACICS's ability to impartially evaluate those and other schools. For example, ITT, Corinthian Colleges, and National College all had representatives on the ACICS Board of Directors/Commissioners during the pendency of these enforcement actions or the events leading thereto.

ACICS's accreditation failures are both systemic and extreme. Its decisions to accredit low-quality for-profit schools have ruined the lives of hundreds of thousands of vulnerable students whom it was charged to protect. It has enabled a great fraud upon our students and taxpayers. ACICS has proven that it is not willing or capable of playing the essential gate-keeping role required of accreditors. It accordingly should no longer be allowed to do so.

The state attorneys general appreciate this opportunity to comment and we urge the Department to exercise its appropriate discretion in refusing to renew recognition.

Sincerely,

Maura Healey, Massachusetts Attorney General; Brian E. Frosh, Maryland Attorney General; Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General of Iowa; Lisa Madigan, Illinois Attorney General; Andy Beshear, Kentucky Attorney General; Karl A. Racine, District of Columbia Attorney General; Janet Mills, Maine Attorney General; Stephen H. Levins, Executive Director, Hawaii Office of Consumer Protection; Lori Swanson, Minnesota Attorney General; Ellen F. Rosenblum, Oregon Attorney General; Eric T. Schneiderman, New York Attorney General; Hector Balderas, New Mexico Attorney General; Bob Ferguson, Washington Attorney General.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, ACICS has shown time and again that it is not a reliable authority when it comes to the quality of an education. It is not a responsible steward of taxpayers' dollars.

Follow the money in this case. Think of schools like Corinthian that took billions of dollars out of the Federal Treasury through loans that are assigned to students and paid into Corinthian so they can maintain their operations and pay handsome salaries to their CEO. Now they go bankrupt, and at that point the students of Corinthian have a choice. They can keep their worthless semester hours from Corinthian and keep their debt or they can walk away from both. Well, many of them choose to walk away. When they walk away, they have wasted years of their lives, but even more important, taxpayers have just taken a beating.

These are corrupt capitalist ventures that rely, for 85 to 95 percent of their revenue, directly on the Federal Government. These are not free market entities. These are not private corporations. It is crony capitalism at its worst.

So, today, I want to commend the Department of Education for making its recommendations to NACIQI to withdraw ACICS' federal approval. I hope this is the beginning of the end for this awful organization that has been complicit in defrauding students and the fleecing of taxpayers by major for-profit education companies for way too long.

I encourage the Department to continue to remain steadfast in its current position and to ensure that the students and institutions that ACICS currently accredits are well informed that this process is under way.

Finally, I will say that ridding our higher education system of ACICS is a good first step, but more needs to be done to reform it. In the coming weeks, I will be introducing an accreditation reform bill with several of my colleagues, and I hope this issue will be front and center during the Senate's consideration of a Higher Education Act reauthorization in the next Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for the 141st time to urge my colleagues to wake up, in this case more specifically to the political influence, particularly the dark money, that perpetuates the climate blockade in Congress.

In 1831, Alexis de Tocqueville traveled to the United States to write his famous ''Democracy in America.'' De Touqueville described our American style of government as ''quite exceptional.'' He wrote about it with affection and with fascination. He may have been the first American exceptionalist.

As the son and grandson of Foreign Service officers, I can personally attest to the importance of America as a paragon of government across the globe, as an aspirational model of self-governance, and as a country that others count on that comes to help, not to loot or conquer.

The roots of our American exceptionalism are found in the three simple words that introduce our Constitution: ''We the People.'' The notion that the government belongs to the people seems unremarkable now, but in its day, it was literally revolutionary.

Today, this proposition is under threat from few very well-heeled special interests and their shadowy front groups, all powered up by the Supreme Court's disastrous 5-to-4 Citizens United decision. In that decision, the Court's conservative bloc overturned long-standing laws of Congress, rejected the common sense of the American people, and gave wildly outsized influence over our elections to a little stable of Big Money interests, creating what one newspaper in Kentucky has aptly called a ''tsunami of slime.''

The evidence is in. The evidence is found in our elections, where the tsunami of outside cash has wiped out previous campaign spending records and created whole new campaign spending categories that never existed before, like dark money. And the evidence is found in this Chamber, where before Citizens United we had a thriving bipartisan debate on climate change. Now we have exactly the silence the polluters want from the Republican side. It wasn't very long after de Tocqueville published his famous book on American democracy that the physicist John Tyndall wrote about excess heat trapped by the buildup of certain gases in the atmosphere. He wrote:

> [T]o account for different amounts of heat being preserved to the earth at different times, a slight change in [the atmosphere's] variable constituents would suffice for this. Such changes in fact may have produced all the mutations of climate which the researches of geologists reveal.

Those ''variable constituents'' to which Tyndall referred included carbon dioxide, methane, and water vapor; he was writing about what we now call the greenhouse effect. We have understood this greenhouse effect for a century and a half. Abraham Lincoln was President when this was published. It is nothing new or controversial in real science, as I think every single one of our major State universities would attest, and it is starting to have a pretty pronounced effect.

NOAA just reported that the Earth passed what they call ''another unfortunate milestone.'' Carbon dioxide concentrations passed 400 ppm at the South Pole last month. That was a first in 4 million years. NOAA also announced that the globally averaged temperature over land and ocean surfaces for May 2016 was the highest for any May in the NOAA global temperature record. This marks the 13th consecutive such month, breaking its monthly global temperature record—the longest streak in NOAA's 137 years of keeping records.

We understand what is going on. So why is Congress stuck, asleep at the wheel? Why? Because since the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United, the big fossil fuel polluters and their network of front groups—a well-documented crowd now in academic literature and in journalism—have poured money and threats into our politics. Just one group, the Koch brothers-backed front group Americans for Prosperity, openly proclaimed that if Republicans support a carbon tax or climate regulations, they would ''be at a severe disadvantage in the Republican nomination process.'' It would mean their ''political peril.''

The threat is plain. It is funded by the very deep pockets and the highly motivated schemes of the fossil fuel industry, enabled by Citizens United, and much of it is largely hidden from public disclosure. Candidates get it; it is the public that doesn't see what is going on behind the scenes.

Every election since Citizens United has broken spending records, and this year is on track to do it again. Super PACs, anonymous so-called social welfare 501(c)(4) groups, and other outside groups have so far spent nearly $400 million in this election, and we are still nearly 5 months from election day. Politico has reported that donations to super PACs are expected to exceed $1 billion this election cycle. Gee, for $1 billion, what could they possibly want?

We know where this money will go. It will fund an onslaught of the ugly, noxious, negative campaign ads that Americans hate. They hate the negative messages smearing the ad's targets. But they also hate another message. They hate the message that this smear was paid for by some shadowy group that they know perfectly well has no role in their State or in their life and that they usually have never heard of but has suddenly commandeered their TV screen to deliver the smear attack. That secondary payload, which has delivered negative ad after negative ad, is piling up, and its message to the American viewer is clear: This has gotten weird. This has gotten out of hand, and you don't count.

Not surprisingly, Americans are becoming more and more disillusioned with our politics. According to a Bloomberg poll, 72 percent of Americans report being fed up with politics and politicians, and 59 percent feel the ''political system is broken.'' According to a recent Rasmussen poll, three-quarters of voters believe the wealthiest individuals and companies have too much influence over elections, and 8 in 10 agree that wealthy special interest groups have too much power and influence. They are not wrong. That Citizens United decision has even helped make Americans feel by a ratio of 9 to 1 that an ordinary American will not get a fair shot against a corporation in the U.S. Supreme Court.

It is a dirty circle. The strength of America lies in its people. Stoking distrust and contempt for our political system breeds cynicism, and that cynicism gives special interests more influence in their age-old battle to loot the public. That failure also jeopardizes the exceptionalism that has made America an example for good throughout the world—fat chance that we are an example for good on climate change when the fossil fuel industry has done what it has with its campaign spending.

It is a mess, and to clean it up a group of us have assembled a ''we the people'' suite of legislation. The ''we the people'' legislation is a collection of straightforward reforms designed to loosen the grip of big money on our elections, reduce the influence that wealthy special interests have over our government—often behind the scenes—and return America's democracy to its true owners, the American people.

How do we do this? Well, first, we bring transparency back to our elections with an updated DISCLOSE Act, a bill I have introduced in the last three Congresses. DISCLOSE would require every organization spending money in elections, including super PACs and tax-exempt 501(c)(4) groups, to promptly disclose donors who give $10,000 or more during an election cycle and to get the spending information online within 24 hours. It would prevent super PACs from acting as de facto extensions of a candidate's campaign, and it would reform the Federal Election Commission to break the partisan deadlock that cripples enforcement of existing campaign finance laws.

Second, we undo the Court's dreadful Citizens United decision. Citizens United was wrong in treating corporations as if they were people. It was wrong that corporate money will not corrupt. It was wrong not seeing that whatever special interests are allowed to do politically, they can threaten and promise to do, and those threats and promises are corrupting. Finally, it overlooked that a small class of special interests can actually make a bundle buying influence.

The fossil fuel industry, for instance, even when it spends $750 million in one

election, is still making a bundle protecting the massive subsidies that support fossil fuel in this country. According to the IMF, that number is about $700 billion every year in effective subsidies.

So ''we the people'' includes Senator UDALL's constitutional amendment to give Congress the power to once again pass commonsense measures regulating presently unlimited corporate cash in our elections. Finally, ''we the people'' includes proposals championed by Senators BENNET and BALDWIN to stop the spinning, revolving door that so often makes officials beholden to corporate special interests.

It was not long after Alexis de Tocqueville described our unique American democracy and it was about the same time John Tyndall described the basic science of the greenhouse effect that President Lincoln reminded a war-weary nation of the point of all that bloodshed—that ''government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.''

Allowing special interests to secretly buy elections and influence government officials gives away an American patrimony that was dearly bought. Make no mistake, without Citizens United, and without the maligned and dishonorable use of its weaponry by the fossil fuel industry, we would have had by now a bipartisan solution to climate change. A faction on the Court that unleashed that new political weaponry, an industry that took shameful and remorseless advantage of it, and a party that has willingly subordinated itself to that influence to keep the money flowing all share the blame for where we are today.

We need to clean this up. The polluters don't just pollute our planet; they are polluting our very democracy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, for months now I have been coming to the floor to talk about an issue that I know the American people want us to talk about, and that is the economy and the importance of growing our economy. I am highlighting what unfortunately has been a very anemic record of economic growth over the last 10 years, highlighting what is called the gross domestic product for the United States. I have been doing that because certainly the Obama administration doesn't want to do that. When we look at these numbers, we know that these are some of the weakest economic numbers, certainly in the last 7 years—some of the weakest economic numbers in U.S. history. The media doesn't want to talk about it, so I believe it is important that we come and have a debate on the economy because the American people want us to talk about this.

I want to remind my colleagues that the gross domestic product—what we have here on this chart—is really a marker of the health of our economy. It is a marker of progress, a marker of the American dream. Right now we have a sick economy by any measure.

Last quarter the U.S. economy grew at 0.8 percent GDP growth—barely grew.

To put that in perspective, what has made our country great year after year, decade after decade, has been an economic growth rate of about 3.7 percent, almost 4 percent.

If you look at this chart, it has many different administrations. This red line is the 3-percent GDP marker, which is considered OK, not great. Usually, most administrations are above that.

Year after year, decade after decade—Democratic administration, Republican administration—what has made the country great is economic growth. If you look at the Obama years right here, it never even hit 3 percent GDP growth. That is why they don't want to talk about it. When the President does talk about it, he doesn't remind Americans that this is the slowest, weakest recovery in over 70 years, but when he does talk about it, he still points fingers at those who came before him.

After nearly 7½ years, two terms, this economy is his. He owns it, and he should take responsibility for it.

As Michael Boskin, the well-respected Stanford economics professor, put it: ''Mr. Obama will likely go down as having the worst economic-growth record of any president since the trough of the Great Depression in 1933.''

Whether the President owns up to it, there is no doubt—just look at the charts. These are their numbers, by the way. These are the Obama administration numbers. There is no doubt we have experienced a lost decade of growth that is harming not only the economic security of our country and the national security of our country but—most importantly—American families who are experiencing this. The great engine of our economic growth, driven by the American worker, the most productive worker in world history, is now idle because we cannot grow our economy.

We had more evidence of this last month with the abysmal May jobs report. Again, nobody talked about it. The media didn't talk about it. Certainly, the White House didn't talk about it, but we should be talking about it, what happened in May. The report showed, in May, employers throughout the entire United States added 38,000 jobs. That is in an $18 trillion economy that employs 126 million Americans—38,000 jobs is nothing and everybody knows it.

As a matter of fact, today, Fed Chairman Janet Yellen talked about what a dismal report that was in May. In fact, that is the lowest monthly gain since 2010 in terms of jobs, and 2016 has seen the worst employment start since 2009, since the beginning of the Obama administration.

All of this is very bad news for the country, the economy, American families, and American workers. Every economist, including the Fed Chairman today, every pundit, even politicians who understand this issue, know this is a big problem. Yet the President and Members of his administration refuse to level with the American people about what is going on. You didn't hear anyone talking about the jobs report. In fact, right now they are calling our economy the strongest in the world. They are touting the fact that despite this economic jobs report, the unemployment rate actually ticked down. It went down from 5.1 percent to 4.7 percent. They are kind of bragging about that. That is normally good news. The unemployment rate going from 5.1 to 4.7 percent, they are talking that up.

What is going on? What is the real story behind these numbers? Because the people who know these numbers know what is going on. I thought I would try to explain a little bit about why this administration is not leveling with the American people at all. First, having the strongest economy in the world right now is nothing to brag about. The President used to brag about how we were growing more than Europe. That was last quarter. We are not growing more than Europe now. The EU grew at about a 2-percent GDP growth last quarter. As I said, we grew at about 0.8 percent, so even that comparison is not working.

An economist recently stated that bragging about having a strong economy right now globally is ''like having the best-looking horse in the glue factory.'' There is not a lot to brag about there.

Really, the only comparison that matters when the administration tries a spin, ''Hey, we are doing better than Japan or better than Brazil''—the only comparison that matters is this one: How are we doing relative to American history? That is all that really matters, not the spin of how we are doing relative to another country. This is what matters. Again, by any measure, we have been performing very poorly for the last 10 years.

Second, let's unpack the unemployment numbers. The 4.7-percent unemployment rate sounds pretty good, but what the President knows and what his administration knows but will not tell the American people, is that rate from the jobs report last year had numbers behind it that were very worrisome. If we only created 38,000 jobs, then how does the unemployment rate go down from 5.1 percent to 4.7 percent?

This is how. The standard measure of unemployment in this country, the unemployment rate, includes only people who are actively looking for work. That is a term called the labor force participation rate. So if the labor force participation rate goes down, then the unemployment rate will also go down, even if we have a weak economy.

So what happened in May? Why did the unemployment rate tick down to

4.7 percent? That is normally good news. Well, we know it is not because of robust job growth because there were only 38,000 jobs created. Nobody thinks that is robust.

What happened in May—and the White House isn't talking about it—the unemployment rate went down because almost 700,000 American workers quit working, quit looking for a job. Think about that. In 1 month, 664,000 Americans—in 1 month, almost 700,000 Americans who had been looking for work got discouraged. They said there is nothing out there. This economy is so weak so I am quitting even looking for a job. That is why the unemployment rate went down—not a strong economy, not strong growth—discouraged American workers saying: I am done. I am not even going to look anymore. Of course, that is nothing to celebrate, 700,000 Americans completely discouraged who said: I have had enough, I am not even going to try. Think about the families. Think about the workers who made that decision.

Unfortunately, this is one of the dismal, economic legacies of the Obama years. Year after year, as exhibited by this chart, millions of Americans have simply left the workforce. They just quit. This is a chart of the labor force participation rate at the beginning of the Obama administration and now.

Year after year, you can see more Americans say: I have had it. I give up. The economy is too weak. I am quitting, quitting even looking. Again, they are not counted in the unemployment rate.

The labor force participation rate is a rather ungainly term, but what it really measures is the hope of the American worker and his or her family. So we should call it the American worker hope index. Here is the hope index for the American worker.

As you can see by the chart, it has been crashing under this President with his economic policies year after year. Hope has been declining for American workers ever since the President got into office. In fact, it has not been this low since the economic malaise years of President Jimmy Carter.

If you see the right hand here, 62 percent—the Carter malaise years—Reagan, Clinton, Bush, and then the Obama administration years, back almost on par with the Carter years. That is not a strong legacy.

The last time we had an American worker hope index this low was in 1978, the height of the Carter stagflation, when so many Americans were discouraged from even trying to work. That is the legacy we have right now.

The most recent job numbers that came out in May was the day the President gave a speech to a bunch of high school students. To the children, the high school kids, the President painted a rosy picture of the economy. He told them the economy was strong and that he had cut the unemployment rate in half. We know that is not a fully accurate statement. If we had the same labor force participation rate today that we had at the beginning of the Obama administration, our unemployment rate would actually be 9.7 percent, almost unchanged from the beginning of 2009 when it was 10.1 percent.

So the bottom line, the main reason—indeed, almost the sole reason the official unemployment rate has been, ''cut in half,'' as the President said, is because millions and millions of Americans have left the workforce because the hope of the American worker has crashed, and it has now reached the same low levels it did during the Carter years.

The President did also tell these high school students that to create a better, stronger economy, we have to be honest about what our real economic challenges are.

Here, I agree with him. Let's start with an honest assessment made recently by former President Clinton. This is what he said about the Obama economy: ''Millions and millions and millions and millions of people look at the pretty picture of America [Obama] painted and they cannot find themselves in it to save their lives.''

That was former Democratic President Bill Clinton talking about the loss of hope over the last 8 years. President Clinton recently said:

> But the problem is, 80 percent of the American people are still living on what they were living on the day before the [2008 financial] crash. And about half the American people, after you adjust for inflation, are living on what they were living on the last day I—

Meaning President Clinton—

> was president 15 years ago. So that's what's the matter.

That is President Clinton. He is talking honestly about this economy. That is what honesty looks like. Family incomes have declined during the Obama years, wages have been stagnant, and the economic hope of the American worker has crashed to levels not seen since Jimmy Carter.

I close with a few words for the American people as we get to the final months of the Obama administration.

The President is going to make the claim—and some of his supporters and maybe even Secretary Clinton are going to make the claim—that the unemployment rate during the Obama years went from 10.1 percent to 4.7 percent. They are going to talk about this. They are going to make people believe that somehow this is a great accomplishment.

While technically true, what the President is not going to do, what Secretary Clinton is not going to do, is unpack the numbers to actually tell the whole truth because that unemployment rate decline is due primarily to the fact that so many American workers have simply quit looking for work. That is the full truth.

So when you hear this great number—10.1 percent unemployment all the way down to 4.7 percent—the real number is 9.7 percent. The real number is in this index. The real number is that the American workers' hope over the last 8 years has crashed.

So when the President and the White House continue to tell us that everything is fine, that jobs are plentiful, that the unemployment rate has been slashed in half, that our economy is strong relative to other countries, it is very important to look at what they are really saying. We shouldn't believe that. And the vast majority of Americans don't believe it because they are hurting. They are hurting because this economy is hurting. Millions of Americans want to work but can't find a job. Millions of Americans have quit looking for a job. And, as the President says, we need to recognize that fact and to be honest about it. Only then can we do what is one of the most important jobs this Senate can do, which is grow our economy again and create real job opportunities for the millions of American workers who want to work but have been so discouraged they have left the workforce.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider individually either of the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 357 and 358; that there be 30 minutes for debate only on each nomination, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time on the respective nominations, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination.

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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my friend from Arkansas, Mr. BOOZMAN, in cosponsoring a resolution recognizing the 70th Anniversary of the Fulbright Program on August 1, 2016.

Seventy years ago, Senator William Fulbright established this program for the ''promotion of international goodwill through the exchange of students in the fields of education, culture and science.'' The Fulbright Program receives funding each year with strong bipartisan support from Congress and is also supported by 50 binational commissions worldwide.

Since its establishment, the Fulbright Program has become the United States' flagship educational exchange program. There have been more than 370,000 participants from around the world and all 50 States since the program was established. Fulbright alumni include 33 heads of state, 54 Nobel laureates, and 82 Pulitzer Prize winners.

The Institute for International Education has administered the Fulbright Program since 1946 and has worked closely with the Department of State to ensure that the Fulbright Program is one of the most prestigious and effective international exchange programs in the world.

The Fulbright Program makes a significant contribution to the exchange of ideas, knowledge, and understanding between Americans and people worldwide. It awards 8,000 grants annually, including to 1,600 U.S. students, 4,000 foreign students, 1,200 U.S. scholars, and 900 visiting scholars, in addition to several hundred teachers and professionals.

Increasingly, it seems as if the world is being torn apart by intolerance, hatred, violence, and isolationism. I am convinced that academic and cultural exchange programs, like Fulbright, are more relevant today than ever because they provide a strong antidote to these trends. Exchanges between individuals from around the world who share ideas and work together on issues and problems confronting the world can build relationships that endure for a lifetime.

I congratulate the Fulbright Program, the alumni, and all who have supported the program for 70 years of promoting international goodwill, and I thank Senator BOOZMAN for this resolution.

TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM GLEN HOWLAND

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, after 17 years spent protecting Lake Champlain, Dr. William Glen Howland—Bill, to most of us—will retire this month as the director of the Lake Champlain Basin Program. We should all thank him and recognize his contributions to the conservation and restoration of Vermont's jewel, Lake Champlain, credit him for his many contributions to scientific research, and thank him for his commitment to the local community in which he lives and works.

Under Bill's steady and thoughtful guidance, the Lake Champlain Basin Program, LCBP, has flourished in its mission to coordinate and fund work by Vermont, New York, and Quebec to protect Lake Champlain's water quality, fisheries, wetlands, wildlife, recreation, and cultural resources. At the Gordon Center House on Vermont's Grand Isle, Bill has assembled and guided a team of exceptional scientists and dedicated public servants. Bill has led the Lake Champlain Basin Program to become nationally and internationally recognized in the fields of ecosystem monitoring, prevention of the spread of invasive species, water pollution control, cultural heritage resource interpretation and protection, and public education. It is a model to which other watershed and basin programs aspire.

I have often looked to Bill for his expert advice in developing and implementing Federal legislation and programs. Bill worked with me on the Daniel Patrick Moynihan Lake Champlain Basin Program Act of 2002, the Champlain Valley National Heritage Partnership Act adopted in 2006, and the Lake Champlain Ecosystem Restoration Authority, which was adopted as part of the Water Resources Development Act. Bill has testified more than once before Senate committees about the importance of environmental conservation programs and projects in the Lake Champlain and Great Lakes regions.

I have been impressed by Bill's ability to bring all types of partners to the table, including local citizens, recreation organizations, heritage organizations, county planning offices, the Governors of Vermont and New York, Federal agencies, and even the Premier of Quebec. Bill's greatest skill may be diplomacy, considering he has confirmed trilateral Memoranda of Understanding with New York, Vermont, and Quebec in 2000, 2003, and 2010, has helped to guide two International Joint Commission inquiries, and has contributed to international trans-boundary conservation work through LAKENET, UNESCO HELP, and NANBO international lake summits. Remarkably, year after year, he has been able to achieve consensus on the allocation of millions of dollars in Lake Champlain funds among multiple Federal agencies, Vermont, New York, many private organizations, and countless partners on the ground.

Bill's dedication to protecting Lake Champlain and the environment extends well beyond his tenure as director of the LCBP. During his many years as a faculty member and as a member of the research staff at Middlebury College, the University of Vermont, and McGill University, Bill has advanced the field of geography, particularly biophysical remote sensing and terrain modeling of northern ecosystems, which are critical tools as we track global climate change. He has been a role model and adviser to many young scientists, helping to shape their studies and their careers. He also served as the executive director of the Green Mountain Audubon Society for 5 years, before taking the reins at the LCBP.

Like so many great Vermonters, Bill's service to his local and regional community has been remarkable. Many of Bill's neighbors owe their health and well-being to his decades of service as an advanced emergency medical technician on the Richmond and Grand Isle rescue squads. Bill has been an active board member of the Lake Champlain Committee and served on the Burlington Barge Canal Superfund panel, receiving a U.S. EPA Environmental Merit Award in 1997.

Director Howland has my sincere gratitude for his years of dedicated service to his local community, to the Lake Champlain Basin, and all of Vermont, as well as to U.S. national and international conservation efforts and scientific research. I expect and hope that he will stay active on all of these fronts. Bill has much more to contribute. I wish him well in his retirement, and I hope that he and his wife, Betsy, will now get a chance to relax on the shores of Lake Champlain at their home in Isle La Motte.

TRIBUTE TO POLLY NICHOL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to recognize the achievements and contributions of a remarkable advocate and a celebrated leader in my home State of Vermont.

Later this month, Polly Nichol will retire from her position as director of housing of the Vermont Housing and Conservation Board. For more than 35 years, Polly's career in affordable housing and community development has stood as the gold standard of excellence to those in her field. Her effective leadership across Vermont has inspired countless new collaborations, new housing opportunities for our most vulnerable, and the preservation of historic structures that make up Vermont's unique character. It is not an exaggeration to say that the quality of life for many in the Green Mountains is greater as a result of Polly Nichol's legacy.

Polly joined the Vermont Housing and Conservation Board in 1988 as its first director of housing. There, she became known for establishing creative partnerships to bring together developers, preservationists, and advocates alike. This work was grounded in her prior experience at the local community action agency, where she led the establishment of two neighborhood reinvestment groups in nearby Barre and Randolph. These groups are now part of NeighborWorks America, a program I have long supported for its investments in rural communities across the country.

Polly's career in advocacy and leadership has been vast and multifaceted. In Vermont, the challenge of securing safe, affordable housing is far too familiar for many. Overcoming this challenge requires a strong network of advocates and experts ready and willing

to collaborate. During her tenure at the Vermont Housing and Conservation Board, Polly has channeled the organization's mission to improve the capacity of surrounding nonprofits dedicated to housing and conservation. Today Vermont's landscape of nonprofit developers and preservationists is uniquely integrated, much thanks to Polly's early efforts to instill value in the belief that building homes includes building community.

Polly's vision has also had a direct impact on thousands of Vermonters in nearly every corner of the state. Her leadership has contributed to the success of the Vermont Housing and Conservation Board as it has invested in and developed more than 12,000 homes and apartments. More than 1,300 homes with much-needed services and supports have also been developed for our most vulnerable friends and neighbors. Throughout, the organization has also enabled more than 1,000 individuals to become homeowners, further enabling them to become integrated within their local communities.

Polly's leadership and advocacy may also be witnessed in the other voluntary roles she has held throughout the last four decades. She is an active member of the city of Montpelier's Housing Task Force, the Vermont Affordable Housing Coalition, and is well known for her role as a founding board member of the Vermont Community Loan Fund. Her reach also extends to other important causes, including a most recent appointment to serve as the vice president of the board of Vermont Works for Women, an organization that supports disadvantaged women and those who pursue nontraditional careers.

We have also been fortunate to have Polly as a delegate to our region and national affordable housing communities, including the New England Housing Network and the Housing Assistance Council. In 1994, Polly received the Skip Jason Community Service Award from the Housing Assistance Council after being nominated by a host of Vermonters. As a leading national advocate for rural housing policy in the country, this award recognizes those whose efforts have improved the housing conditions of the rural poor in their communities and whose work ''in the trenches'' often goes unrecognized in their communities. Since then Polly's leadership, has continued, as she has served as both president and chair of the board of the Housing Assistance Council.

Polly has been well known to friends and colleagues as much for her gentle humor as her uncompromising dedication to preserve the unique beauty and quality of life found at home in Vermont. Her work will leave a lasting impression on those of us who have been fortunate enough to learn from and work alongside her. As she transitions to retirement, I do hope she finds opportunity to revel in her accomplishments both near and far.

HOLY AND GREAT COUNCIL OF THE ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN CHURCHES

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the historic events taking place in Crete, Greece. Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew of Constantinople has called the first Holy and Great Council of the various Christian Orthodox churches around the world since 787 CE.

The Holy and Great Council is the first meeting of its kind in over a millennium. The 14 Orthodox Christian Churches together have over 300 million followers around the world, including over a million Americans. These churches are self-governing but united by common dogma, faith, liturgy, and moral conviction, with the Ecumenical Patriarch serving as the ''first among equals.''

This meeting began on Sunday, June 19 and will continue through June 26. Three hundred and fifty leaders are attending this meeting where they will promote unity among the world's Orthodox believers. They will discuss key issues facing Orthodox Christians, including the church's mission in today's world, the Orthodox diaspora, and the relationship of Christian Orthodoxy with the rest of the Christian world.

The Patriarch has a record of reaching out and working for peace and reconciliation among all faiths and has fostered dialogue among Christians, Jews, and Muslims. His All-Holiness has received awards from the United Nations, the United States, and other nations for providing moral leadership throughout modern history's greatest tests. His efforts to convene this Holy and Great Council is a testament to his continued leadership at a time when it is greatly needed. After the September 11, 2001, attacks, the Patriarch organized a gathering of religious leaders, including Muslim imams, to condemn the attacks as an anti-religious act. He was also the first Ecumenical Patriarch to attend the inauguration of a pope.

With so much suffering taking place around the world, we need people to come together, like they are in this historic meeting, to work together to advance our shared values. I commend and thank Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew for convening this Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Christian Churches in Crete, Greece.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, once again, Greece, the home of democracy, the home of the fundamental principle of religious freedom that democracy has come to represent here in America, is making history, this time on the Island of Crete where Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew of Constantinople is leading a meeting of Orthodox Christian Churches, the Holy and Great Council, that occurs only once in a millennium. In fact, it has not happened since 787 CE, but it is happening now.

The 3 million Orthodox Christians across America, from all 14 national jurisdictions around the world with the largest number affiliated with the Greek Orthodox Church—the Church of the convener of the Council—Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew, are following this historic gathering with great anticipation.

It is the charge of the Holy and Great Council to deal with internal church matters, but Orthodox Christians are also deeply concerned with the opportunity this historic event presents for a wider ranging conversation about not only process within the confines of religion, but the prospects for peace and prosperity it represents for all members of the church and for all people around the world.

Orthodox Christians in America come from all walks of life and represent all opinions and points of view. They include personalities well-known to all of us in this Chamber and beyond: ABC journalist and host of ''Good Morning America,'' George Stephanopoulos; Huffington Post creator Arianna Huffington; and sportscaster Bob Costas. In the political world, they include former Governor of Massachusetts and Democratic nominee for President Mike Dukakis; Hillary Clinton's campaign chairman and former chief of staff to President Bill Clinton, John Podesta; and current Members of Congress—Representative DINA TITUS of Nevada and NIKI TSONGAS of Massachusetts, as well as Congressmen JOHN SARBANES of Maryland and GUS BILIRAKIS of Florida.

These are all respected, talented, accomplished Orthodox Christians whose faith and opinions are represented at the historic convocation of the Holy and Great Council. They are among the more than 1 million Greek Orthodox Americans who are led by their spiritual head, Archbishop Demetrios, who presides over seven metropolitans with regional jurisdictions that serve on the local Holy Synod. The archbishop and his predecessors have played a prominent role in American life, culture, and history that has been part of the fabric of this Nation. We all remember the famous civil rights march in Selma, AL, led by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., but we may not remember that at the march was also the late Archbishop Lakovos, marching shoulder-to-shoulder with Dr. King.

Greek Americans, hailing from 500 churches across this Nation, including many in my home State of New Jersey, believe deeply that this Holy and Great Council is a fateful gathering that can have a dramatic impact on their religion and civilization for 1,000 more years, that the council's deliberations will hold great meaning and great promise for a better life for all of us, for peace on this planet, and for the greater good of generations to come. They know and we in this Chamber know that the importance of Orthodox Christians will be measured not by the history made in Crete at this meeting, but the history Orthodox Christians around the world have already made.

I join all of my colleagues in hoping for a successful and productive once in

a millennium session of the Holy and Great Council. I join with all of my Orthodox Christian friends in New Jersey and around the world in celebrating this historic meeting.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BEVERLY ''JO'' HARRIS

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and commend the outstanding career of Dr. Beverly ''Jo'' Harris, one of the State of West Virginia's most respected educators, on the occasion of her retirement. During her tenure as the first president of BridgeValley Community and Technical College, Dr. Harris has shown tremendous passion and dedication to her students, colleagues, and her community. Her commitment to education has been an inspiration to many citizens of our State.

Dr. Harris obtained her undergraduate degree from Concord College and a master's degree from Marshall University. She then received a doctoral degree in educational administration from West Virginia University. Dr. Harris began her career in education at a proprietary school in Morgantown before being hired by West Virginia Institute of Technology in 1975 as an instructor in the school's newly created associate degree business program. She has continued to work in the same building in Montgomery throughout many changes to both the school and her role.

Under Dr. Harris's leadership, the school, formerly known as Bridgemont Community and Technical College, was nationally recognized as the fourth fastest growing small public 2-year college of 2010, was a finalist for the 2011 Aspen Prize for Community College Excellence, and selected as one of 2013's Top 50 Community Colleges in America according to ''Washington Monthly.'' Her efforts were later recognized when she received the WVCCA Leadership Award, the WVBEA Business Teacher of the Year award, and she was jointly named Upper Kanawha Valley Citizen of the Year, along with her husband, Carl.

In addition to her official role as president, Dr. Harris has also served on the boards of the SMART 529 College Savings Program, WV Workforce Development Council, New River Gorge Regional Development Authority, the Upper Kanawha Valley Economic Development Corporation, Region 4 Planning and Development Council, South Charleston Rotary, and the Fayette County and South Charleston chambers of commerce.

I have had the pleasure of working with Jo throughout my time representing the state of West Virginia in Congress. I am proud to call her my friend and trusted colleague whose counsel will be missed. I am thankful for Dr. Harris's dedication to West Virginia's higher education system and the many students she taught and mentored. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Beverly ''Jo'' Harris for her service.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION

● Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Mountain View Electric Association's 75th anniversary. On December 6, 1940, Mountain View Electric's 249 original members filed for incorporation of the cooperative. Since then, the company has provided power to Arapahoe, Crowley, Douglas, Elbert, El Paso, Lincoln, Pueblo, and Washington counties in Colorado. Its territory covers 5,000 square miles, powering homes, schools, churches, small businesses, and hospitals.

For more than seven decades, Mountain View Electric has been an important source of electricity for many of Colorado's rural counties. In particular, the company has worked diligently to help the residents who lost their homes in the Black Forest Fire in 2013. In the wake of this devastation, Mountain View Electric worked to quickly restore service to the area, at no additional cost to the property owners.

Rural electric cooperatives play an important role in communities around the United States, serving an estimated 42 million Americans. This business structure connects consumers directly to the operations of the company, keeping electricity prices affordable. Electric cooperatives also contribute to development and growth across the country's rural areas.

I commend Mountain View Electric for its decades of service to rural Colorado. Congratulations again on this significant anniversary.●

TRICENTENNIAL OF GEORGETOWN, MAINE

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the town of Georgetown, ME, which is celebrating its 300th anniversary this month. This small, coastal town, with just over 1,000 inhabitants, has a long and proud history dating back to the 18th century, and I am pleased to join them in celebrating their tricentennial and honoring the town's cherished place in the State of Maine.

Nestled among one of the many inlets of Maine's rugged coastline near the mouth of the Kennebec River, Georgetown has a long and storied past dating back to the end of the 17th century. During the King Philip's and King William's wars in the late 1600s, the Kennebec River Valley was a wartorn and volatile area, but a small settlement emerged after the conflicts. In 1716, the town of Georgetown-on-Arrowsic was incorporated and has remained an iconic landmark on the Maine coast ever since.

Today Georgetown is known for its picturesque landscape and quaint, smalltown feel. It is home to boat builders, fishermen, retirees, summer residents, and artists alike. Summer visitors can enjoy the town's famous Reid State Park, historic lighthouses, and the many land preserves protected through the community's dedication to preservation and environmental sustainability. Even when the winter comes and the summer residents leave, a cohesive and engaged year-round population remains. The town and its citizens represent the best of Maine's historic coastal villages: a close-knit and hard-working community surrounded by striking natural beauty.

Led by its dedicated tricentennial committee, Georgetown will commemorate its 300th anniversary with an all-day celebration on June 23. Scheduled events include the burying of a time capsule, a town parade, and presentation of special tricentennial products from local businesses and organizations. These events mark the culmination of over a year of collaboration between local government, nonprofits, and local businesses who have worked together to create a truly amazing celebration fitting of this tremendous milestone.

I commend all that the people of Georgetown have done to make their town such a special place to live and visit. Their shared love for their hometown and commitment to its success has made Georgetown one of Maine's greatest communities. I am proud to recognize this historic milestone and wish the town many more years of success.●

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES L. RICE

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wish to recognize a great American who has honorably served our country as president of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, USU, in Bethesda, MD, on the campus of the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center.

Dr. Rice began his service at USU in 2005. During the past 11 years as president of the University, he also served for 6 months as Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, March to August 2010.

During his tenure, Dr. Rice has worked to improve the USU's curriculum, research portfolio, external relationships, board, and physical plant. The results of these efforts are exhibited by the recent full accreditation of the School of Medicine and the Graduate School of Nursing. Dr. Rice recognizes the institution's unique military and public health care missions and has worked to ensure that lessons learned in a decade of conflict were incorporated into the curriculum and the fabric of the institution, along with the Department's fundamental humanitarian mission. These important lessons include advances in trauma care, developing strong leadership skills among Military Health System officers, and increasing diversity in the

medical corps of the three military services.

Dr. Rice has collaborated closely with the leadership of the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center and the leadership throughout the Military Health System. He has reached out to provide more support to the national network of Military Treatment Facilities to forge a ''unity of effort.'' Dr. Rice has also worked with the National Institutes of Health and other Federal agencies to advance education, research, and health care for our Nation's military beneficiaries and civilian communities.

As president, Dr. Rice founded the Post Graduate Dental College and created several new graduate degree programs, including public health educational activities. Through these efforts, Dr. Rice has helped USU to become a multidimensional health sciences university dedicated to advancing the mission of the Military Health System.

Prior to USU, Dr. Rice had a distinguished career in academic medicine and public service. He served as vice chancellor for Health Affairs and vice dean of the College of Medicine, University of Illinois at Chicago. Previously, he was professor and chairman of surgery at University of Texas Southwestern. Dr. Rice also was a Robert Woods Johnson Fellow for former majority leader Senator Tom Daschle from 1991 to 1992.

Dr. Rice was professor and vice chairman, University of Washington Department of Surgery. Before that, he was director of the intensive care unit at Michael Reese Hospital and Medical Center in Chicago. Prior to Michael Reese Hospital, Dr. Rice was assistant professor of surgery at the Pritzker School of Medicine, University of Chicago. Dr. Rice has had extensive training with the U.S. Navy Medical Corps in Bethesda and in San Diego.

Dr. Rice has deep experience with the Nation's civilian academic health community and the Military Health System. He has brought this knowledge to benefit the USU, and he leaves it a better place. I wish to commend Dr. Rice for his service to the Uniformed Services University and to the Nation.●

TRIBUTE TO RYAN DONNELLY

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Ryan Donnelly, an intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Ryan is a graduate of South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, having earned a degree in agricultural business. This fall, Ryan will attend the University of South Dakota to pursue a master's degree in business administration. Ryan is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Ryan Donnelly for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO LANE HASKELL

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Lane Haskell, an intern in my Rapid City, SD, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Lane is a graduate of St. Thomas More High School in Rapid City, SD. Currently, Lane is attending the University of Notre Dame where he is majoring in Spanish and political science. Lane is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Lane Haskell for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO GRAYSON KIELHOLD

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Grayson Kielhold, an intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Grayson is a graduate of O'Gorman High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, Grayson is attending the University of Nebraska-Lincoln where he is majoring in marketing. Grayson is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Grayson Kielhold for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO STERLING NIELSEN

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Sterling Nielsen, an intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Sterling is a graduate of St. Olaf College in Northfield, MN, having earned a degree in economics. Currently, Sterling is attending the University of South Dakota School of Law. Sterling is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Sterling Nielsen for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO BEN ROGERS

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Ben Rogers, an intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Ben is a graduate of O'Gorman High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, Ben is attending Creighton University where he is majoring in economics and political science. Ben is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Ben Rogers for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

RECOGNIZING BOBBY JOHNSON EQUIPMENT COMPANY, INC.

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, small businesses and entrepreneurs are known for their toughness and can-do attitude, understanding full well the importance of quality equipment and services to get jobs done right the first time. For their commitment to providing north Louisiana and the surrounding Ark-La-Tex region with the heavy machinery to keep the region moving, this week I am glad to announce Bobby Johnson Equipment Company, Inc., of Oil City, LA, as Small Business of the Week.

In 1973, Bobby Johnson opened his namesake equipment company in Oil City, LA, with the goal of serving the tristate Ark-La-Tex region with quality heavy equipment products and services. With a staff boasting over 100 combined years of engine and mechanical experience, Bobby Johnson Equipment quickly grew in sales and customer satisfaction. As a family-owned and operated truck dealer, Mr. Johnson and his employees work directly with Ark-La-Tex companies to provide heavy duty trucks, truck parts, trailers, and equipment.

Today Bobby Johnson Equipment Company has become one of north Louisiana's largest suppliers of new and used parts and services, servicing the transportation, construction, and oil and natural gas industries. Conveniently located in Louisiana's northwest region, Bobby Johnson Equipment Company provides services to folks in and around Little Rock, AR, Tulsa, OK, Jackson, MS, and Dallas, Fort Worth, and Houston, TX, in addition to their far-reaching online sales operation.

Congratulations again to Bobby Johnson Equipment Company, Inc., for being selected as Small Business of the Week, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

RECOGNIZING H2O, INC.

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, Louisiana is blessed to have an abundance of natural resources, and as a result, many folks work in the energy industry. In terms of creating jobs and supplying oil and gas, offshore drilling in the Gulf of Mexico provides a lot for families and businesses across the State, as well as the Nation. For those working on the offshore rigs, safety is always a priority. As we approach the sixth anniversary of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill that took the lives of 11 men and devastated our coasts, we must absolutely make sure the workers

out there are taken care of. One important aspect is ensuring they have reliable clean drinking water and sewage systems. This week, I would like to recognize H2O, Inc., from Lafayette, LA, as Small Business of the Week, for supporting Louisiana's offshore and marine industries by providing them with crucial water treatment solutions.

One of the key issues facing the crews on offshore oil rigs is access to clean and safe potable water, and in 1980, H2O used their southwest Louisiana ties to provide desalination units to the offshore and gas market. H2O grew considerably when it started producing marine and offshore potable water, sewage, and electrochlorination systems for companies all around the world. With this new range of products, H2O was able to provide more job opportunities and currently has many employees on staff. In 2013, H2O acquired Owens Manufacturing and Specialty Company, which allowed them to venture into the offshore wastewater treatment market. Just last fall, H2O brought in PEPCON systems in order to strengthen their electrochlorination services. Today H2O is known as the region's leading water system equipment provider and even holds patents.

Congratulations again to H2O for being selected as Small Business of the Week, and thank you for your commitment to providing clean water treatment solutions to folks in the Gulf of Mexico and around the world.●

RECOGNIZING JESCO

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, it is no secret that, among the many pressing issues facing our Nation, updating our Nation's crumbling infrastructure is one of the most important. Roads and bridges are quite literally the foundation of our daily lives, and those of us in Louisiana certainly recognize the importance of upgrading and maintaining our highways and levees. One small business based out of Jennings, LA, has been working to improve our State's infrastructure, and I would like to recognize JESCO as Small Business of the Week for their important progress supporting some of Louisiana's biggest infrastructure and environmental projects.

In 1994, a group of Louisiana-based professional engineers and scientists established JESCO to provide engineering, construction, disaster preparation and response, and environmental services to local and State governments along the Gulf Coast, as well as Federal agencies. Lead by Ms. Alvinette Teal, an experienced geologist and graduate of Louisiana State University, JESCO is a federally certified, woman-owned small business.

Over the last 22 years, JESCO has worked on some of Louisiana's vitally important water infrastructure projects, including necessary coastal restoration efforts. Louisiana's coastline play an important role in protecting our coastal communities from natural disasters, and coastal restoration is among our State's highest priorities. The engineers and scientists at JESCO have also worked on projects testing the salinity for levee construction materials, which in Louisiana is vital to building levees that will protect families, businesses, and homes during a storm. Additionally, JESCO has been contracted for soil and ground water remediation efforts in Breaux Bridge, LA, and hurricane and disaster management for Hurricane Ike.

Small businesses like JECSO are leading the way to improve our infrastructure and better protect our families, homes, and businesses. Congratulations to JESCO of Jennings, LA, for being selected as this week's Small Business of the Week, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the president of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13466 OF JUNE 26, 2008, WITH RESPECT TO NORTH KOREA—PM 52

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, expanded in scope in Executive Order 13551 of August 30, 2010, addressed further in Executive Order 13570 of April 18, 2011, further expanded in scope in Executive Order 13687 of January 2, 2015, and under which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13722 of March 15, 2016, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2016.

The existence and risk of proliferation of weapons-usable fissile material on the Korean Peninsula; the actions and policies of the Government of North Korea that destabilize the Korean Peninsula and imperil U.S. Armed Forces, allies, and trading partners in the region, including its pursuit of nuclear and missile programs; and other provocative, destabilizing, and repressive actions and policies of the Government of North Korea, continue to constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to North Korea.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 21, 2016.*

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13219 OF JUNE 26, 2001, WITH RESPECT TO THE WESTERN BALKANS—PM 53

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2016.

The threat constituted by the actions of persons engaged in, or assisting, sponsoring, or supporting (i) extremist violence in the Republic of Macedonia and elsewhere in the Western Balkans region, or (ii) acts obstructing implementation of the Dayton Accords in Bosnia and Herzegovina or United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 of June 10, 1999, in Kosovo, has not been resolved. In addition, Executive Order 13219 was amended by Executive Order 13304 of May 28, 2003, to take additional steps with respect to acts obstructing implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement of 2001 relating to Macedonia.

Because the acts of extremist violence and obstructionist activity outlined in these Executive Orders are hostile to U.S. interests and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, I have

determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to the Western Balkans.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 21, 2016*.

PRIVILEGED NOMINATIONS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On request by Senator HATCH, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nominations were referred to the Committee on Finance:

Robert D. Reischauer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years. (Reappointment)

Robert D. Reischauer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years. (Reappointment)

Robert D. Reischauer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years. (Reappointment)

The following requests for referral were submitted on Monday, June 20, 2016.

On request by Senator SCHUMER, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and Senator WARREN, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nominations were referred to the Committee on Finance:

Charles P. Blahous, III, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years. (Reappointment)

Charles P. Blahous, III, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years. (Reappointment)

Charles P. Blahous, III, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years. (Reappointment)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2816. A bill to reauthorize the diesel emissions reduction program (Rept. No. 114–284).

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. WARREN (for herself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 3078. A bill to increase portability of and access to retirement savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 3079. A bill to improve the management of the Federal coal leasing program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 3080. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain exchanged non-public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 3081. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain employees of members of Congress with access to case-tracking information of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. Res. 504. A resolution recognizing the 70th anniversary of the Fulbright Program; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. COTTON):

S. Res. 505. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding compliance enforcement of Russian violations of the Open Skies Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 506. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the NATO summit to be held in Warsaw, Poland from July 8–9, 2016, and in support of committing NATO to a security posture capable of deterring threats to the Alliance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. Res. 507. A resolution designating July 8, 2016, as Collector Car Appreciation Day and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 122

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 122, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the personal importation of safe and affordable drugs from approved pharmacies in Canada.

S. 391

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 391, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 590

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 590, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 1555

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1555, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

S. 1735

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1735, a bill to modernize the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988.

S. 1766

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1766, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes.

S. 2067

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2067, a bill to establish EUREKA Prize Competitions to accelerate discovery and development of disease-modifying, preventive, or curative treatments for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia, to encourage efforts to enhance detection and diagnosis of such diseases, or to enhance the quality and efficiency of care of individuals with such diseases.

S. 2230

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2230, a bill to require the Secretary of State to submit a report to Congress on the designation of the Muslim Brotherhood as a foreign terrorist organization, and for other purposes.

S. 2424

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2424, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

S. 2595

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2595, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 2622

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2622, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario in the State of New York.

S. 2680

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2680, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide comprehensive mental health reform, and for other purposes.

S. 2854

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2854, a bill to reauthorize the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act of 2007.

S. 2873

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2873, a bill to require studies and reports examining the use of, and opportunities to use, technology-enabled collaborative learning and capacity building models to improve programs of the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes.

S. 2890

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) 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. 2895

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2895, a bill to extend the civil statute of limitations for victims of Federal sex offenses.

S. 2921

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2921, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to improve health care and benefits for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 3023

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3023, a bill to provide for the reconsideration of claims for disability compensation for veterans who were the subjects of experiments by the Department of Defense during World War II that were conducted to assess the effects of mustard gas or lewisite on people, and for other purposes.

S. 3032

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3032, a bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2016, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3032, supra.

S. 3056

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3056, a bill to provide for certain causes of action relating to delays of generic drugs and biosimilar biological products.

S. 3060

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3060, a bill to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements.

S. CON. RES. 35

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 35, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to exercise its veto in the United Nations Security Council on resolutions regarding the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.

S. CON. RES. 38

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 38, a concurrent resolution reaffirming the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances as cornerstones of United States-Taiwan relations.

S. RES. 432

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 432, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

S. RES. 482

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 482, a resolution urging the European Union to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization and to increase pressure on the organization and its members to the fullest extent possible.

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 482, supra.

S. RES. 503

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 503, a resolution recognizing June 20, 2016, as ''World Refugee Day'' .

AMENDMENT NO. 4689

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4689 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2578, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4732

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4732 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2578, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4762

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4762 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2578, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4783

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4783 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2578, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4787

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4787 proposed to H.R. 2578, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice,

Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4787 proposed to H.R. 2578, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 3078. A bill to increase portability of and access to retirement savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today Senator WARREN and I have joined together to introduce the Retirement Savings Lost and Found Act. This important piece of legislation is critical to addressing key issues that exist in the regulatory framework for retirement plans.

Montanans are conservative folks who know the value of a hard-earned dollar. With the poor economic recovery and slow wage growth, working Montanans cannot afford to have money withheld from their paychecks and placed into retirement accounts, only to lose track of those accounts or have their retirement plans decline over time due to limitations placed on investment options. Now more than ever, our country needs the best laws to usher everyday Americans into a sound retirement.

Working Americans are losing hard-earned dollars up until the time when they need it most—their retirement. When an employee leaves a job, it is often hard for them to keep track of their retirement accounts during these transitional times. Our bill is a commonsense approach that will empower individuals to take control of their retirement futures. The Retirement Savings Lost and Found Act will allow Montanans to be that much more prepared to spend their golden years well with friends and family by providing a means to locate lost retirement accounts and allow better investment options to ensure those investments grow rather than erode over time.

I appreciate the work of Senator WARREN on completion of this important bill. Together, we can help individuals make the most of their retirement options by providing sound policy that has the potential to save billions over the years for those among us who need it most.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 3080. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain exchanged nonpublic lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act. This legislation directs the transfer of land between the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, the District, and the Bureau of Land Management in San Bernardino, California, BLM.

The bill is the culmination of years of collaboration between numerous federal and state agencies, private industry and municipalities representing mining, flood control, water supply and wildlife conservation, among other interests.

Included among the supporters of this land exchange are: County of San Bernardino; City of Redlands; City of Highland; San Bernardino Water Conservation District; San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District; East Valley Water District; Endangered Habitats League; CEMEX Construction Materials Pacific; Robertson's Ready Mix; and Inland Action.

In 1993, representatives from this diverse group formed the ''Wash Committee'' to address mining issues in the upper Santa Ana River wash area.

The role of the Committee subsequently expanded in 1997 to consider the broad range of land uses in the area, including natural resource conservation.

The Wash Committee developed a strategy that focused on ''best uses'' for more comprehensive planning and not focusing on private property boundaries that would segment the area. The result is a project expected to produce a Land Management and Habitat Conservation Plan covering 4,500 acres.

The land exchange takes place in a designated region within the Santa Ana Wash, at the junction of the Santa Ana River and Mill Creek.

Currently, land within the Santa Ana Wash is owned by both the District and BLM.

The land parcels owned by the District are currently used for recharging the local groundwater aquifer through the use of more than 77 basins, and also provide rare Riversidian sage scrub habitat for a number of State and federally listed species. In addition, under this plan, new land would be set aside for conservation purposes near land already managed by BLM.

The exchange of land between the District and BLM will connect a current patchwork of separately owned land parcels into a consolidated open space for conservation purposes and will optimize mining efficiency and water conservation efforts.

The land transfer resulting from this legislation will lead to more protection efforts for habitat, improved connectivity in the wildlife corridor, expanded groundwater recharge for water supply, and the future establishment of public access and trails.

Additionally, the legislation will allow the continued use of land and mineral resources while maintaining the biological and hydrological resources of the area in an environmentally sensitive manner.

I want to applaud diverse members of the Wash Committee that worked together, including the Cities of Highland and Redlands, East Valley Water District, the County of San Bernardino, Robertson's Ready Mix, CEMEX, the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, and the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, along with the Federal, State and local stakeholders for their continued work on the Wash Plan.

This group has demonstrated that while it takes significant time, funding and cooperation, it is possible to simultaneously protect the environment and support local jobs, business and community interests.

I would also like to thank my colleagues, Representatives PETE AGUILAR and PAUL COOK, for introducing similar legislation in the House.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 504—RECOGNIZING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 504

Whereas August 1, 2016, marks the 70th anniversary of President Harry S. Truman signing into law the Act of August 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 754, chapter 723) (commonly known as the ''Fulbright Act of 1946'');

Whereas the Fulbright Program was established by Senator James William Fulbright of Arkansas for the ''promotion of international good will through the exchange of students in the fields of education, culture, and science'';

Whereas the Fulbright Program is sponsored by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State;

Whereas the Fulbright Program provides approximately 8,000 grants annually and, as of 2016, operates in more than 160 countries, including 50 that have established cost-sharing binational commissions;

Whereas approximately 1,300 institutions of higher education in the United States, both public and private, host students at home and send scholars abroad;

Whereas current Fulbright students and scholars hail from all 50 States and 2 United States territories, and approximately a quarter are from minority or underrepresented populations;

Whereas more than 370,000 individuals from across the globe have benefitted from this unique opportunity;

Whereas alumni of the Fulbright Program include 54 Nobel Prize laureates, 82 recipients of the Pulitzer Prize, 33 heads of state, 16 Presidential Medal of Freedom recipients, 8 members of the United States Congress, and a former Secretary-General of the United Nations;

Whereas, on April 21, 2016, an American Elm was planted on the grounds of the United States Capitol in recognition of the 70th anniversary of the Fulbright Program; and

Whereas the Fulbright Program promotes United States higher education abroad and remains a valuable diplomatic tool: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 70th anniversary of the Fulbright Program;

(2) encourages the President and the Secretary of State to work with the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State to support the work of the Fulbright Program;

(3) congratulates all past and present recipients of Fulbright awards; and

(4) calls on students, scholars, and professionals around the world to seek out opportunities to engage with each other and promote international good will.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today, along with Senator LEAHY, I submit a resolution recognizing the 70th Anniversary of the Fulbright Program.

On August 1, 1946, President Harry S. Truman signed into law legislation authored by Senator James William Fulbright of Arkansas, creating a program that used the proceeds from selling surplus war property to fund international exchanges between the United States and other countries. Senator Fulbright's program has gone on to become the largest education exchange program in history, and still works to ''promote peace and mutual understanding'' around the world. Counted among its more than 370,000 alumni are 82 Pulitzer Prize recipients, 54 Nobel Prize laureates, and 33 heads of states.

In the aftermath of World War II, Senator Fulbright understood that individual exchanges and person to person interactions are the best way to build a deep abiding understanding of other cultures and to promote peace. Today, as violence and intolerance grow across the globe, I believe the Fulbright program remains a beacon of hope for a better future. The academic and cultural opportunities provided to participants in the program ensure that ''international good will through the exchange of students in the fields of education, culture, and science'' continues to grow when it is so sorely needed.

I believe that you change the world through personal relationships, and am very proud as an Arkansan and an American of the success of the Fulbright exchange. I would like to thank the Fulbright Program, the staff at the Institute of International Education who administer the program, the Fulbright Association, and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs at the State Department for their incredible work over the last 70 years.

SENATE RESOLUTION 505—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING COMPLIANCE ENFORCEMENT OF RUSSIAN VIOLATIONS OF THE OPEN SKIES TREATY

Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 505

Whereas the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002 (in this resolution referred to as the ''Open Skies Treaty''), which established a regime for unarmed aerial observation flights over the entire territory of its participants, is one of the most wide-ranging international efforts to date to promote openness and transparency of military forces and activities;

Whereas the United States Government has declared that strengthening and maintaining European security is a top priority for the United States, that the Open Skies Treaty is a key element of the Euro-Atlantic security architecture, and that arms control is a key part of that effort because robust multilateral conventional arms control arrangements contribute to a more stable and secure European continent;

Whereas, according to Secretary of State James Baker, addressing the Open Skies Conference in 1990, the end of the Cold War gave the Open Skies Treaty new importance as a stabilizing factor in East-West relations, openness and transparency in military matters offered ''the most direct path to greater predictability and reduced risk of inadvertent war,'' and Open Skies Treaty was thus ''potentially the most ambitious measure to build confidence ever undertaken'';

Whereas, according to the President's letter of submittal for the Open Skies Treaty provided to Congress by the Secretary of State on August 12, 1992, it is the purpose of the Open Skies Treaty to promote openness and transparency of military forces and activities and to enhance mutual understanding and confidence by giving States Party a direct role in gathering information about military forces and activities of concern to them;

Whereas, according to the Report on Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments published by the Department of State on April 11, 2016 (in this resolution referred to as the ''2016 Compliance Report''), the Russian Federation ''continues not to meet its obligations [under the Open Skies Treaty] to allow effective observation of its entire territory, raising serious compliance concerns'';

Whereas, according to the 2016 Compliance Report, Russian conduct giving rise to compliance concerns has continued since the Open Skies Treaty entered into force in 2002 and worsened in 2010, 2014, and 2015; and

Whereas, according to the 2016 Compliance Report, ongoing efforts by the United States and other States Party to the Open Skies Treaty to address these concerns through dialogue with the Russian Federation ''have not resolved any of the compliance concerns.'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) restrictions upon the ability of Open Skies Treaty aircraft to overfly all portions of the territory of a State Party impede openness and transparency of military forces and activities and undermine mutual understanding and confidence, especially when coupled with an ongoing refusal to address compliance concerns raised by other States Party subject to such restrictions;

(2) it is essential to the accomplishment of the purpose of the Open Skies Treaty that Open Skies Treaty aircraft be able to observe the entire territory of a State Party in a timely and reciprocal manner as provided for under the Open Skies Treaty;

(3) the Russian Federation's restrictions upon the ability of Open Skies Treaty aircraft to overfly all portions of the territory of the Russian Federation constitute violations of the Open Skies Treaty; and

(4) for so long as the Russian Federation remains in noncompliance with the Open Skies Treaty, the United States should take such measures as are necessary to bring about the Russian Federation's return to full compliance with its treaty obligations, including, as appropriate, through the imposition of restrictions upon Russian overflights of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 506—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE IN SUPPORT OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND THE NATO SUMMIT TO BE HELD IN WARSAW, POLAND FROM JULY 8–9, 2016, AND IN SUPPORT OF COMMITTING NATO TO A SECURITY POSTURE CAPABLE OF DETERRING THREATS TO THE ALLIANCE

Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 506

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty, signed April 4, 1949, in Washington, District of Columbia, which created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (''NATO''), proclaims: ''[Members] are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilisation of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area. They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defence and for the preservation of peace and security.'';

Whereas NATO has been the backbone of the European security architecture for 67 years, evolving to meet the changing transatlantic geopolitical and security environment;

Whereas NATO continues its mission in Afghanistan following the September 11, 2001, attacks on the United States;

Whereas, at the NATO Wales Summit in September 2014, NATO reaffirmed the Alliance's role in transatlantic security and its ability to respond to emerging security threats and challenges;

Whereas Alliance members at the NATO Wales Summit defined the new security paradigm when they stated, ''Russia's aggressive actions against Ukraine have fundamentally challenged our vision of a Europe whole, free, and at peace. Growing instability in our southern neighborhood, from the Middle East to North Africa, as well as transnational and multi-dimensional threats, are also challenging our security. These can all have long-term consequences for peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic region and stability across the globe.'';

Whereas, at the 2014 NATO Wales Summit, Alliance members addressed this changed security environment by committing to enhancing readiness and collective defense; increasing defense spending and boosting military capabilities; and improving NATO support for partner countries through the Defense Capacity Building Initiative;

Whereas, although Article 14 of the Wales Declaration calls on all members of the alliance to spend a minimum of 2 percent of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on defense within a decade, currently only five members are achieving that target;

Whereas, after the 2014 Wales Summit, the Russian military invaded Ukraine, adding Crimea to the list of areas illegally controlled by Moscow, including Georgia's Abkhazia and South Ossetia regions;

Whereas Russian-backed separatists in Eastern Ukraine continue to destabilize the region with support from the Government of the Russian Federation;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation continues to undertake provocative, unprofessional, and dangerous actions towards NATO air and naval forces and continues to exercise hybrid warfare capabilities against member and nonmember states along its western borders;

Whereas Poland and the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are on the frontlines of renewed Russian aggression and hybrid warfare, including disinformation campaigns, cyber threats, and snap military exercises along the Alliance's eastern flank;

Whereas President Barack Obama proposed a quadrupling of the European Reassurance Initiative in fiscal year 2017 to $3,400,000,000 in order to enhance the United States commitment to NATO, to support Europe's defense, and to deter further Russian aggression;

Whereas the cornerstone of NATO's collective defense initiative is the Readiness Action Plan, intended to enable a continuous NATO military presence on the Alliance's periphery, especially its easternmost states, which includes enhanced troop rotations, military exercises, and the establishment of a Very High Readiness Task Force;

Whereas, in follow-up to commitments made at the NATO Wales Summit, NATO and the Government of Georgia agreed on a ''Substantial Package'' of cooperation and defense reform initiatives to strengthen Georgia's resilience and self-defense capabilities and develop closer security cooperation and interoperability with NATO members, including through the establishment of the Joint Training and Evaluation Center, which was inaugurated in 2015;

Whereas the threat of transnational terrorism has resulted in attacks in Turkey, France, Belgium, and the United States, and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) continues to pose a real and evolving threat to member states, other countries in Europe, and the broader international community;

Whereas the migration crisis from the Syrian civil war, the conflict in Afghanistan, and economic and humanitarian crises in Africa have placed a great strain on member states;

Whereas the NATO summit in Warsaw, Poland, is an opportunity to enhance and more deeply entrench those principles and build on our collective security, which continue to bind the Alliance together and guide our efforts today; and

Whereas, on May 19, 2016, Foreign Ministers of NATO member states signed an Accession Protocol to officially endorse and legally move forward Montenegro's membership in the Alliance, which, consistent with NATO's ''Open Door policy'', would indeed further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the service of the brave men and women who have served to safeguard the freedom and security of the United States and the whole of the transatlantic alliance;

(2) encourages Alliance members at the NATO Warsaw Summit to promote unity and solidarity, and to ensure a robust security posture capable of deterring any potential adversary, in the face of the complex and changing security environment confronting the Alliance on its eastern, northern, and southern fronts;

(3) urges all NATO members to invest at least two percent of GDP in defense spending and carry an equitable burden in supporting the resource requirements and defense capabilities of the Alliance;

(4) reaffirms its commitment to NATO's collective security as guaranteed by Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty;

(5) recognizes Georgia's troop contributions to missions abroad, its robust defense spending, and its ongoing efforts to strengthen its democratic and military institutions for NATO accession; and

(6) recognizes the ongoing work of NATO's Resolute Support Mission in Afghanistan, with 12,000 troops advising and assisting Afghanistan's security ministries, and army and police commands across the country.

SENATE RESOLUTION 507—DESIGNATING JULY 8, 2016, AS COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY AND RECOGNIZING THAT THE COLLECTION AND RESTORATION OF HISTORIC AND CLASSIC CARS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF PRESERVING THE TECHNOLOGICAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 507

Whereas many people in the United States maintain classic automobiles as a pastime and do so with great passion and as a means of individual expression;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the effect that the more than 100-year history of the automobile has had on the economic progress of the United States and supports wholeheartedly all activities involved in the restoration and exhibition of classic automobiles;

Whereas the collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity shared across generations and across all segments of society;

Whereas thousands of local car clubs and related businesses have been instrumental in preserving a historic part of the heritage of the United States by encouraging the restoration and exhibition of such vintage works of art;

Whereas automotive restoration provides well-paying, high-skilled jobs for people in all 50 States; and

Whereas automobiles have provided the inspiration for music, photography, cinema, fashion, and other artistic pursuits that have become part of the popular culture of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 8, 2016, as ''Collector Car Appreciation Day'';

(2) recognizes that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to engage in events and commemorations of Collector Car Appreciation Day that create opportunities for collector car owners to educate young people about the importance of preserving the cultural heritage of the United States, including through the collection and restoration of collector cars.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4791. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4792. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4793. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4794. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4795. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4796. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4797. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4798. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4799. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4800. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4801. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4802. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4803. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment

SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4804. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4805. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4806. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4807. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4808. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4809. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4810. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4811. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4812. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4813. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4814. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KING, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4815. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4816. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4815 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4817. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4818. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4817 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4819. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4820. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4819 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4821. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4822. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4821 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4823. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4824. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4823 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4825. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4826. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4825 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4827. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4828. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4829. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4830. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4831. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4832. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4833. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4834. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4688 submitted by Mr. WYDEN and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4835. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4836. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4837. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4838. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4839. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4840. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4841. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4842. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4843. Mr. SASSE (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4844. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4845. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4846. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4847. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4848. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. NELSON, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4849. Mr. BURR (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4850. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4851. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment

SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4852. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mrs. ERNST) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1777, to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the ''Former Presidents Act of 1958'', with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes.

SA 4853. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. THUNE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2736, to improve access to durable medical equipment for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4791. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 80, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 301. Funds appropriated or made available under the heading ''NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION'' under the heading ''SCIENCE'' under this title to award research grants may be made available to increase the transparency, to the maximum extent practicable, of any grant application submitted by a recipient of such grant, provided that doing so does not compromise intellectual property, competitive advantage, or the privacy of such recipients or other individuals associated with the grant.

SA 4792. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a fully documented report that includes the following:

(1) A list of the specific actions the Administrator will implement through 2021 to promote the recovery of the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon and the basis for such actions.

(2) An evaluation of the causes of salmon mortality rates in 2014 and 2015 in the Sacramento River and a description of activities to be carried out to address such mortality.

(3) An evaluation of the reliability of data from rotary-screw traps and other facilities at Red Bluff Diversion Dam used to evaluate the year-class strength of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon and an assessment of the potential benefits of increasing data collection further upstream on the Sacramento River and during high flow events.

(b) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation a fully documented plan to carry out the actions and activities described in subsection (a).

SA 4793. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. ADDITION OF RHODE ISLAND TO THE MID-ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL.

Section 302(a)(1)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(a)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''Rhode Island,'' after ''States of'';

(2) by inserting ''Rhode Island,'' after ''except North Carolina,'';

(3) by striking ''21'' and inserting ''23''; and

(4) by striking ''13'' and inserting ''14''.

SA 4794. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds in this Act shall be provided to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council to prepare a fishery management plan or amendment or to take other action that does not include the full participation, including in votes of the Council, of the principal official with marine fishery management responsibility (or a designee) for the State of Rhode Island and one additional representative designated by the Secretary of Commerce from among at least three qualified individuals recommended by Governor of the State of Rhode Island.

SA 4795. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, line 13, insert '': *Provided*, That of the grants awarded through such section 27, funds shall be awarded to university incubators eligible to participate in the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research of the National Science Foundation'' after ''27''.

SA 4796. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 80, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) conducting deep space exploration requires radioisotope power systems, such as thermoelectric and Stirling generators and converters;

(2) establishing continuity in the production of the material needed to power such radioisotope power systems is paramount to the success of future deep space missions; and

(3) Federal agencies supporting the National Aeronautics and Space Administration through the production of the material described in paragraph (2) should do so in a cost effective manner so as not to impose excessive reimbursement requirements on the Administration.

(b) ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS AND RISKS.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies, shall conduct an analysis of—

(1) the requirements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for radioisotope power system material that is needed to carry out planned, high priority robotic missions in the solar system and other surface exploration activities beyond low-Earth orbit; and

(2) the risks to missions of the Administration in meeting those requirements, or any additional requirements, due to a lack of adequate radioisotope power system material.

(c) CONTENTS OF ANALYSIS.—The analysis conducted under subsection (b) shall—

(1) detail the current projected mission requirements and associated timeframes for radioisotope power systems and radioisotope power system material;

(2) explain the assumptions used to determine the requirements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the material, including—

(A) the planned use of advanced thermal conversion technology, such as advanced thermocouples and Stirling generators and converters; and

(B) the risks and implications of, and contingencies for, any delays or unanticipated technical challenges affecting or related to the mission plans of the Administration for the anticipated use of advanced thermal conversion technology;

(3) assess the risk to the programs of the Administration of any potential delays in achieving the schedule and milestones for planned domestic production of radioisotope power system material;

(4) outline a process for meeting any additional Administration requirements for the material;

(5) estimate the incremental costs required to increase the amount of material produced each year, if such an increase is needed to support additional Administration requirements for the material;

(6) detail how the Administration and other Federal agencies will manage, operate, and fund production facilities and the design

and development of all radioisotope power systems used by the Administration and other Federal agencies as necessary;

(7) specify the steps the Administrator will take, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to preserve the infrastructure and workforce necessary for production of radioisotope power systems and ensure that Administration reimbursements to the Department of Energy associated with such preservation are equitable and justified;

(8) identify the steps the Administrator will take to preserve taxpayer investment to date in Advanced Stirling Convertor technology; and

(9) detail how the Administrator has implemented or rejected the recommendations of the National Research Council in the 2009 report titled ''Radioisotope Power Systems: An Imperative for Maintaining U.S. Leadership in Space Exploration''.

(d) TRANSMITTAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall transmit the results of the analysis conducted under subsection (b) to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

SA 4797. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall ensure that the Administration responds in a timely manner to a request from Congress or the Congressional Budget Office, including a response to questions for the record, a letter from a Member of Congress, a request for technical assistance, or views on legislation.

(b) The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to Congress an annual report on the requests for information submitted to the Administration during the previous year and the timeliness of responses to such requests. Each such report shall include—

(1) the number of such requests made by members of Congress or the Congressional Budget Office and the response time for each such request; and

(2) the number of such requests made under section 552 of title 5 (commonly referred to as the ''Freedom of Information Act'') and the response time for each such request.

SA 4798. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 68, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 218. (a) IN GENERAL.—

None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Tax Division of the Department of Justice to investigate, litigate, or pursue any other tax enforcement action against any person found to be delinquent in paying a tax on any amount income which would be includible in gross income by reasons of the discharge (in whole or in part) of any loan described in the subsection (b) if such discharge was —

(1) pursuant to subsection (a) or (d) of section 437 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 or the parallel benefit under part D of title IV of such Act (relating to the repayment of loan liability),

(2) pursuant to section 464(c)(1)(F) of such Act, or

(3) otherwise discharged on account of the death or total and permanent disability of the student.

(b) LOANS DESCRIBED.—A loan is described in this subsection if such loan is—

(1) a student loan (as defined in section 108(f)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), or

(2) a private education loan (as defined in section 140(7) of the Consumer Credit Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(7))).

SA 4799. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. No funds made available by this Act may be expended from the amounts appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, to pay final judgments, awards, compromise settlements, or interest or costs specified in the judgments or otherwise authorized by law if such payment is otherwise provided for, including expenditures that Congress has otherwise limited or restricted.

SA 4800. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. REPEAL OF SUNSET OF TITLE VII OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 403 of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–261; 122 Stat. 2474) is amended by striking subsection (b).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 404 of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–261; 50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended by striking subsection (b).

SA 4801. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. AUTHORITY FOR ROVING SURVEILLANCE UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Section 102(b)(1) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–177; 50 U.S.C. 1805 note, 50 U.S.C. 1861 note, and 50 U.S.C. 1862 note) is amended by striking ''and section 105(c)(2) read as they'' and inserting ''reads as it''.

SA 4802. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. ACCESS TO CERTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS COLLECTED UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978 PRIOR TO NOVEMBER 29, 2015.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the National Security Agency shall have access to all business records collected under section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) prior to November 29, 2015, in the same manner and for the same purposes that the Director had access to such records prior to such date.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the National Security Agency shall maintain each business record referred to in subsection (a) for the 5-year period beginning on the date that such record was acquired under section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861).

(c) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—The authority for access to business records under subsection (a) shall be in effect during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 4803. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 11, strike line 9 and all that follows through ''$119,000,000'' on page 12, line 8, and insert the following

For necessary expenses of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), $680,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $9,000,000 may be transferred to the ''Working Capital Fund'': *Provided*, That not to exceed $5,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That NIST may provide local transportation for summer undergraduate research fellowship program participants.

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

For necessary expenses for industrial technology services, $135,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $130,000,000 shall be for the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership, and of which $5,000,000 shall be for the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation.

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

For construction of new research facilities, including architectural and engineering design, and for renovation and maintenance of existing facilities, not otherwise provided for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as authorized by sections 13 through 15 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278c–278e), $50,000,000

SA 4804. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR INDIVIDUAL TERRORIST TO BE TREATED AS AGENTS OF FOREIGN POWERS UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Section 6001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended by striking subsection (b).

SA 4805. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available to the Department of Justice under this Act may be used in the seizure of funds through civil or criminal forfeiture based on a violation of paragraph (1) or (3) of section 5324(a) of title 31, United States Code, unless the seizure satisfies the requirements described in conditions set forth in the Department of Justice Policy Directive 15–3 (March 31, 2015).

SA 4806. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available to the Department of Justice under this Act may be used for litigation defending the legality of any final rule based on the proposed rule of the Federal Communications Commission entitled ''Protecting the Privacy of Customers of Broadband and Other Telecommunications Services'' (81 Fed. Reg. 23359 (April 20, 2016)) or for assisting in such litigation in any other way.

SA 4807. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to seek enforcement of any forfeiture obtained by consent decree pursuant to any final rule based on the proposed rule of the Federal Communications Commission entitled ''Protecting the Privacy of Customers of Broadband and Other Telecommunications Services'' (81 Fed. Reg. 23359 (April 20, 2016)).

SA 4808. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5_____. STUDY ON DRUG TRAFFICKING.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and submit a report to Congress on the impact that the trafficking of narcotics, specifically opioids and methamphetamine, through States that border Mexico has on substance abuse of narcotics by the residents of such States.

SA 4809. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 158, line 12, strike ''$68,000,000'' and insert ''$62,500,000''.

On page 159, line 3, strike ''$5,000,000'' and insert ''$10,500,000''.

SA 4810. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. OPERATION STREAMLINE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Border Patrol's Yuma Sector has long grappled with the crossing of undocumented aliens and has seen illegal traffic decline precipitously from the early 2000s to the present.

(2) A combination of increased manpower, technology implementation, and the delivery of appropriate consequences have resulted in gains in border security in the Yuma Sector.

(3) A key to the success in the Yuma Sector has been the implementation of Operation Streamline, a program established in 2005 that was described by former Department of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano as ''a DHS partnership with the Department of Justice, . . . a geographically focused operation that aims to increase the consequences for illegally crossing the border by criminally prosecuting illegal border-crossers.''.

(4) The Yuma County Sheriff's Office, which is known for its ''zero-tolerance'' approach, cites 100 percent prosecution of illegal border crossers as a shared goal of a partnership including Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies.

(5) Among the various consequences delivered to illegal crossers by the Department of Homeland Security, Operation Streamline is associated with a recidivism rate that is well below average and has seen a steady decrease in recidivism in recent years.

(6) The United States Attorney's Office for the District of Arizona will reportedly no longer be prosecuting those apprehended crossing the border illegally for the first time.

(7) According to the Sheriff of Yuma County, Operation Streamline ''had a deterrent effect in Yuma County, which gained a reputation as an area to avoid crossing into because if caught, you were assured to go to court and possibly face penalties'', but now the program ''has been severely diluted.''.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) gains made in border security in the Yuma Sector and positive trends in recidivism rates are of critical importance to those living and working in the border region and to the Nation as a whole;

(2) refusing to prosecute first time illegal border crossers under Operation Streamline will jeopardize border security gains;

(3) the border security steps that have led to some measure of improvement on the border, such as the historical implementation of Operation Streamline, should be preserved; and

(4) the Executive Branch should immediately remove any issued or related prohibition, policy, guidance, or direction to cease prosecuting first time illegal border crossers under Operation Streamline.

SA 4811. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used to purchase information from the National Technical Information Service.

SA 4812. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 70, line 1, strike ''$5,395,000,000'' and all that follows through ''That the formulation'' and insert ''$5,375,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018; *Provided*, That the amount available under this paragraph for the Near-Earth Object program may not exceed $40,000,000; *Provided further*, That the formulation''.

SA 4813. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 80, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 301. The unclassified version of any study conducted using funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this title shall include the following:

(1) The name of each Agency that provided funds for the conduct of the study.

(2) The project or award number of the study.

(3) An estimate of the total cost of the study.

SA 4814. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KING, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY TO DENY TRANSFERS OF FIREARMS OR EXPLOSIVES TO TERRORISTS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with the procedures under this section, and without regard to section 842, 843, section 922(g) or (n), or section 923 of title 18, United States Code, the Attorney General may deny the transfer of a firearm, not later than 3 business days after a licensee under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, contacts the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of Public Law 103–159 (18 U.S.C. 922 note), deny the transfer of an explosive, or deny the issuance of a Federal firearms or explosives license or permit, if either of the following are met:

(A) NO FLY LIST.—The Attorney General determines that transferee or applicant—

(i) based on the totality of the circumstances, represents a threat to public safety based on a reasonable suspicion that the transferee or applicant is engaged, or has been engaged, in conduct constituting, in preparation of, in aid of, or related to terrorism, or providing material support or resources therefor; and

(ii) based on credible information, poses—

(I) a threat of committing an act of international terrorism or domestic terrorism with respect to an aircraft (including a threat of piracy, or a threat to airline, passenger, or civil aviation security);

(II) a threat of committing an act of domestic terrorism with respect to the homeland;

(III) a threat of committing an act of international terrorism against any United States Government facility abroad and associated or supporting personnel, including United States embassies, consulates and missions, military installations, United States ships, United States aircraft, or other auxiliary craft owned or leased by the United States Government; or

(IV) a threat of engaging in or conducting a violent act of terrorism and who is operationally capable of doing so.

(B) SELECTEE LIST.—The Attorney General determines that transferee or applicant meets the standard for inclusion on the Selectee List, which is the subset list of the Terrorist Screening Database, maintained by the Terrorist Screening Center of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of individuals who are selected for enhanced security screening when attempting to board a United States commercial aircraft or fly into, out of, or over United States airspace, based on the standard to be on such Selectee List on June 16, 2016.

(2) NICS.—Solely for purposes of sections 922(t) (1), (2), (5), and (6) of title 18, United States Code, and section 103(g) of Public Law 103–159 (18 U.S.C. 922 note), a denial by the Attorney General under paragraph (1) shall be treated as equivalent to a determination that receipt of a firearm would violate subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code. During the 3-business-day period beginning when a licensee under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, contacts the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of Public Law 103–159 (18 U.S.C. 922 note), and notwithstanding section 922(t)(2) of title 18, United States Code, the Attorney General may delay assigning a unique identification number to a transfer of a firearm in order to determine whether the transferee or applicant meets the requirements under paragraph (1).

(b) NOTIFICATION OF PROSPECTIVE FIREARM TRANSFERS TO KNOWN OR SUSPECTED TERRORIST.—The Attorney General and Federal, State, and local law enforcement shall be immediately notified, as appropriate, of any request to transfer a firearm or explosive to a person who is, or with in the previous 5 years was, identified in the Terrorist Screening Database maintained by the Terrorist Screening Center of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(c) PETITION FOR REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual who is a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States who seeks to challenge a denial by the Attorney General under subsection (a)(1) may file a petition for review and any claims related to that petition in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit or in the court of appeals of the United States for the judicial circuit in which the individual resides.

(2) DEADLINES FOR FILING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a petition for review under paragraph (1), and any claims related to that petition, shall be filed not later than 60 days after the petitioner receives actual notice of the denial by the Attorney General.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The court of appeals in which a petition for review is to be filed under paragraph (1) may allow the petition to be filed after the deadline specified in subparagraph (A) only if there are reasonable grounds for not filing by that deadline.

(3) AUTHORITY OF COURTS OF APPEALS.—The court of appeals in which a petition for review is filed under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall have—

(i) jurisdiction to decide all relevant questions of law and fact; and

(ii) exclusive jurisdiction to affirm, amend, modify, or set aside any part of the denial of the Attorney General that is the subject of the petition for review; and

(B) may order the Attorney General to conduct further proceedings.

(4) EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—No district court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to consider any claim related to or arising out of facts and circumstances that could have been included in a petition filed under paragraph (1), including any constitutional claim.

(B) LAWFULNESS AND CONSTITUTIONALITY.—No district court of the United States or court of appeals of the United States shall have jurisdiction to consider the lawfulness or constitutionality of this section except pursuant to a petition for review under section.

(C) NONCITIZENS.—No district court of the United States or court of appeals of the United States shall have jurisdiction to hear any claim by an individual who is not a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States related to or arising out a denial by the Attorney General under subsection (a)(1).

(d) REQUIREMENT FOR AN ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD AND PROCEDURES FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the following procedures shall apply with respect to a petition for review filed in a court of appeals under subsection (c):

(1) The United States shall file with the court an administrative record, which shall consist of—

(A) the information the Attorney General relied upon in denying the transfer or application;

(B) any information the petitioner has submitted pursuant to any administrative process;

(C) any information determined relevant by the United States; and

(D) any information that is exculpatory.

(2)(A) The petitioner may file with the court any information determined relevant by the petitioner.

(B) With leave of the court, the United States may supplement the administrative record with additional information.

(3) All information in the administrative record that is not classified and is not otherwise privileged or subject to statutory protections shall be provided to the petitioner.

(4) No discovery shall be permitted, unless the court shall determine extraordinary circumstances requires discovery in the interests of justice.

(5) Sensitive security information contained in the administrative record may only be provided pursuant to a protective order.

(6)(A) The administrative record may include classified information, which the United States shall submit to the court in camera and ex parte.

(B) The United States shall notify the petitioner if the administrative record filed under paragraph (1) contains classified information.

(C) The court may enter an order, after notice and a hearing, allowing disclosure to the petitioner, counsel for the petitioner, or both, of—

(i) an unclassified summary of some or all classified information in the administrative record;

(ii) a statement admitting relevant facts that some or all classified information in the administrative record would tend to prove;

(iii) some or all classified information, if counsel for the petitioner possess the appropriate security clearance; or

(iv) any combination thereof.

(D)(i) If the court enters an order under subparagraph (C) providing for the disclosure of classified information and the United States files with the court an affidavit of the Attorney General objecting to the disclosure, the court shall order that the classified information not be disclosed.

(ii) If classified information is not disclosed under clause (i), the court shall enter such an order as the interests of justice require, which may include an order quashing the denial by the Attorney General under subsection (a)(1).

(iii) An order under subparagraph (C) or clause (ii) of this subparagraph shall be subject to review pursuant to section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

(iv) An order under clause (ii) shall be administratively stayed for 7 days.

(v) The functions and duties of the Attorney General under this subparagraph—

(I) may be exercised by the Deputy Attorney General, the Associate Attorney General, or by an Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General for such purpose; and

(II) may not be delegated to any other official.

(E) Any information disclosed under subparagraph (C) shall be subject to an appropriate protective order.

(7) Any classified information, sensitive security information, law enforcement sensitive information, or information that is otherwise privileged or subject to statutory protections, that is part of the administrative record, or cited by the court or the parties, shall be treated by the court and the parties consistent with the provisions of this subsection, and shall be sealed and preserved in the records of the court to be made available in the event of further proceedings. In no event shall such information be released as part of the public record.

(8) The court shall award reasonable attorney fees to a petitioner who is a prevailing party in an action under this section.

(9) After the expiration of the time to seek further review, or the conclusion of further proceedings, the court shall return the administrative record, including any and all copies, to the United States. All privileged information or other information in the possession of counsel for the petitioner that was provided by the United States under a protective order shall be returned to the United States, or the counsel for the petitioner shall certify its destruction, including any and all copies.

(e) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—The court of appeals shall quash any denial by the Attorney General under subsection (a)(1), unless the United States demonstrates, on a de novo review of fact and law—

(1) that—

(A) based on the totality of the circumstances, the transferee or applicant represents a threat to public safety based on a reasonable suspicion that the transferee or applicant is engaged, or has been engaged, in conduct constituting, in preparation of, in aid of, or related to terrorism, or providing material support or resources therefor; and

(B) based on credible information, the transferee or applicant poses—

(i) a threat of committing an act of international terrorism or domestic terrorism with respect to an aircraft (including a threat of piracy, or a threat to airline, passenger, or civil aviation security);

(ii) a threat of committing an act of domestic terrorism with respect to the homeland;

(iii) a threat of committing an act of international terrorism against any United States Government facility abroad and associated or supporting personnel, including United States embassies, consulates and missions, military installations, United States ships, United States aircraft, or other auxiliary craft owned or leased by the United States Government; or

(iv) a threat of engaging in or conducting a violent act of terrorism and who is operationally capable of doing so; or

(2) that the standard has been met for including the transferee or applicant on the Selectee List, which is the subset list of the Terrorist Screening Database, maintained by the Terrorist Screening Center of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of individuals who are selected for enhanced security screening when attempting to board a United States commercial aircraft or fly into, out of, or over United States airspace, based on the standard to be on such Selectee List on June 16, 2016.

(f) EFFECT OF QUASHING.—If the court of appeals quashes a denial by the Attorney General under subsection (e), notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General shall—

(1) for a denial of the transfer of a firearm, cause a unique identifier to issue pursuant to section 922(t)(2) of title 18, United States Code, not later than 3 days after the issuance of the order under subsection (e); and

(2) for a denial of a license or permit, expeditiously issue a license or permit under chapter 40 or 44 of title 18, United States Code, as applicable.

(g) SUPREME COURT REVIEW.—A decision by a court of appeals under this section may be reviewed by the Supreme Court under section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

(h) EXCLUSIVE REMEDY.—The judicial review under a petition for review filed under subsection (c) shall be the sole and exclusive remedy for a claim by an individual who challenges a denial under subsection (a)(1).

(i) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—

(1) COURTS.—Not later than 14 days after the date on which a petition is filed challenging a denial under subsection (a)(1), a court of appeals shall determine whether to quash the denial, unless the petitioner consents to a longer period.

(2) OF QUASHING.—If the court of appeals quashes a denial by the Attorney General under subsection (e), a petitioner may submit the order quashing the denial to the Department of Homeland Security for expedited review, as appropriate.

(j) TRANSPARENCY.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and quarterly thereafter—

(1) the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report providing—

(A) the number of persons denied a firearm transfer or a license or permit under subsection (a)(1) during the reporting period;

(B) the number of petitions for review filed under subsection (d); and

(C) the number of instances in which a court of appeals quashed a denial by the Attorney General under subsection (e); and

(2) the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Homeland Security Committee the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report providing—

(A) the number individuals—

(i) with respect to whom a court of appeals quashed a denial by the Attorney General under subsection (e); and

(ii) who submitted the order quashing the denial to the Department of Homeland Security under subsection (i)(2); and

(B) a description of the actions taken and final determinations made by the Department of Homeland Security with regard to submissions described in subparagraph (A)(ii) respecting the status of individuals on the No Fly List or Selectee List, including the length of time taken to reach a final determination.

(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The term ''classified information'' has the meaning given that term in section 1(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.).

(2) DOMESTIC TERRORISM.—The term ''domestic terrorism'' has the meaning given that term in section 2331(5) of title 18, United States Code.

(3) INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.—The term ''international terrorism'' has the meaning given that term in section 2331(1) of title 18, United States Code.

(4) MILITARY INSTALLATION.—The term ''military installation'' has the meaning given that term in section 2801(c)(4) of title 10, United States Code.

(5) NATIONAL SECURITY.—The term ''national security'' has the meaning given that term in section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

(6) SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION.—The term ''sensitive security information'' has the meaning given that term by sections 114(r) and 40119 of title 49, United States Code, and the regulations and orders issued pursuant to those sections.

(l) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the Attorney General to modify the length of period before a firearm may be transferred under section 922(t) of title 18, United States Code.

SA 4815. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 1 day after enactment.

SA 4816. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4815 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''.

SA 4817. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:
The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 3 days after enactment.

SA 4818. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4817 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike ''3'' and insert ''4''.

SA 4819. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:
The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 5 days after enactment.

SA 4820. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4819 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike ''5'' and insert ''6''.

SA 4821. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:
The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 7 days after enactment.

SA 4822. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4821 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike ''7'' and insert ''8''.

SA 4823. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:
The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 9 days after enactment.

SA 4824. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4823 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike ''9'' and insert ''10''.

SA 4825. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:
The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 11 days after enactment.

SA 4826. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4825 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike ''11'' and insert ''12''.

SA 4827. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 71, line 3, insert before the period the following: ''; *Provided*, That $10,000,000 shall be for research by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in collaboration with the Unmanned Aircraft Systems Center of Excellence of the Federal Aviation Administration, at the six test sites of the Federal Aviation Administration on the use of unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) for a broad range of public safety purposes over land and maritime environments''.

SA 4828. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 71, line 3, insert before the period the following: ''; *Provided*, That $25,000,000 shall be for the Advanced Composites Partnership within the Advanced Air Vehicles program''.

SA 4829. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. 2____. (a) In this section—

(1) the term ''eligible nonprofit organization'' means a nonprofit organization that has experience providing rapid telephone and cellular alert calls on behalf of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to find missing children and elderly adults; and

(2) the term ''rapid telephone and cellular alert call system'' means an automated system with the ability to place at least 1,000 telephone and cellular calls in 60 seconds to a specific geographic area determined by law enforcement—

(A) based on the last known whereabouts of a missing individual; or

(B) based on other evidence and determined by such law enforcement agency to be necessary to the search for the missing individual.

(b) The Attorney General may use unobligated balances made available to the Department of Justice under this title to make grants to eligible nonprofit organizations to assist Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies in the rapid recovery of missing children, elderly individuals, and disabled individuals through the use of a rapid telephone and cellular alert call system. Such grants shall be used to—

(1) provide services to Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies, in response to a request from such agencies, to promote the rapid recovery of a missing child, an elderly individual, or a disabled individual by utilizing rapid telephone and cellular alert calls;

(2) maintain and expand technologies and techniques to ensure the highest level of performance of such services;

(3) provide both centralized and on-site training and distribute information to Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agency officials about missing children, elderly individuals, and disabled individuals and use of a rapid telephone and cellular alert call system;

(4) provide services to Federal, State, tribal, and local Child Abduction Response Teams;

(5) assist Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies to combat human trafficking through the use of rapid telephone and cellular alert calls;

(6) share appropriate information on cases with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the AMBER Alert, Silver Alert, and Blue Alert programs, and appropriate Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies; and

(7) assist appropriate organizations, including Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies, with education and prevention programs related to missing children, elderly individuals, and disabled individuals.

SA 4830. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) The matter under the heading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' under the heading ''BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES'' under title II of division B of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 112–55; 125 Stat. 609) is amended by striking the sixth proviso.

(b) The sixth proviso under the heading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' under the heading ''BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES'' under title II of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 111–117; 123 Stat. 3128) is amended by striking ''beginning in fiscal year 2010 and thereafter'', and inserting ''in fiscal year 2010''.

(c) The sixth proviso under the heading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' under the heading ''BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES'' under title II of division B of the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 111–8; 123 Stat. 575) is amended by striking ''beginning in fiscal year 2009 and thereafter'', and inserting ''in fiscal year 2009''.

(d) The sixth proviso under the heading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' under the heading ''BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES'' under title II of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 110–161; 121 Stat. 1903) is amended by striking ''beginning in fiscal year 2009 and thereafter'', and inserting ''in fiscal year 2009''.

(e) The sixth proviso under the heading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' under the heading ''BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES'' under title I of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 109–108; 119 Stat. 2295) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or any other'';

(2) by striking ''with respect to any fiscal year''; and

(3) by striking '', and all such data shall be immune from legal process'' and all that follows through ''a review of such an action or proceeding''.

(f) The sixth proviso under the heading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' under the heading ''BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES'' under title I of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 108–447; 118 Stat 2859) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or any other''; and

(2) by striking ''with respect to any fiscal year''.

(g) The sixth proviso under the heading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' under the heading ''BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES'' under title I of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–199; 118 Stat. 53) is amended by inserting after ''1998'' the following: '', and before October 1, 2004''.

(h) No Federal department or agency or State, local, or tribal government shall knowingly and publically disclose covered firearms information that will—

(1) compromise the identity of any undercover law enforcement officer or confidential informant;

(2) interfere with any case under investigation; or

(3) include the name, address, or any other uniquely identifying information of the lawful purchaser of any firearm.

(i) Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the disclosure for use in, or the use, reliance on, disclosure, admissibility, or permissibility of using, covered firearms information in any action or proceeding that is—

(1) commenced by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to enforce the provisions of chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code;

(2) instituted by a government agency and relating to a license or similar authorization; or

(3) a review of an action or proceeding described in paragraph (1) or (2).

(j) For purposes of this section—

(1) the term ''covered firearms information'' means any information—

(A) contained in the Firearms Trace System database maintained by the National Trace Center of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives;

(B) required to be kept by a licensee under section 923(g) of title 18, United States Code; or

(C) required to be reported under paragraph (3) or (7) of section 923(g) of title 18, United States Code;

(2) the term ''firearm'' has the meaning given that term in section 921 of title 18, United States Code; and

(3) the term ''licensee'' means a person licensed under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code.

SA 4831. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. 2____. (a) In this section—

(1) the term ''eligible entity'' means—

(A) a partnership between a State educational agency and 1 or more local educational agencies (as those terms are defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)) of the State;

(B) a local educational agency;

(C) a nonprofit organization; or

(D) a consortium of elementary schools or secondary schools (as those terms are defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)) collaborating with an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C);

(2) the term ''Internet safety education program'' means an age-appropriate, research-based program that—

(A) encourages safe, ethical, and responsible use of the Internet;

(B) promotes an informed, critical understanding of the Internet; and

(C) educates children and communities about how to prevent or respond to problems or dangers related to the Internet or new media;

(3) the term ''new media''—

(A) means emerging digital, computerized, or networked information and communication technologies that often have interactive capabilities; and

(B) includes e-mail, instant messaging, text messaging, websites, blogs, interactive gaming, social media, cell phones, and mobile devices; and

(4) the term ''nonprofit organization'' means an organization that is—

(A) described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(B) exempt from tax under section 501(a) of that Code.

(b) The Attorney General may use unobligated balances made available to the Department of Justice under this title to make grants to eligible entities to carry out an Internet safety education program and other activities relating to Internet safety, including to—

(1) identify, develop, and implement Internet safety education programs, including educational technology, multimedia and interactive applications, online resources, and lesson plans;

(2) provide professional training to elementary and secondary school teachers, administrators, and other staff on Internet safety and new media literacy;

(3) develop online-risk prevention programs for children;

(4) train and support peer-driven Internet safety education initiatives;

(5) coordinate and fund research initiatives that investigate online risks to children and Internet safety education;

(6) develop and implement public education campaigns to promote awareness of online risks to children and Internet safety education;

(7) educate parents about teaching their children how to use the Internet and new media safely, responsibly, and ethically and help parents identify and protect their children from risks relating to use of the Internet and new media; or

(8) carry out any other activity approved by the Attorney General.

SA 4832. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 107, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

TITLE VI—LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICE ACT

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Large Capacity Ammunition Feeding Device Act of 2016''.

SEC. 602. DEFINITIONS.

Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (29) the following:

''(30) The term 'large capacity ammunition feeding device'—

''(A) means a magazine, belt, drum, feed strip, helical feeding device, or similar device, including any such device joined or coupled with another in any manner, that has an overall capacity of, or that can be readily restored, changed, or converted to accept, more than 10 rounds of ammunition; and

''(B) does not include an attached tubular device designed to accept, and capable of operating only with, .22 caliber rimfire ammunition.

''(31) The term 'qualified law enforcement officer' has the meaning given the term in section 926B.''.

SEC. 603. RESTRICTIONS ON LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (u) the following:

''(v)(1) It shall be unlawful for a person to import, sell, manufacture, transfer, or possess, in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, a large capacity ammunition feeding device.

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the possession of any large capacity ammunition feeding device otherwise lawfully possessed on or before the date of enactment of the Large Capacity Ammunition Feeding Device Act of 2016.

''(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

''(A) the importation for, manufacture for, sale to, transfer to, or possession by the United States or a department or agency of the United States or a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision of a State, or a sale or transfer to or possession by a qualified law enforcement officer employed by the United States or a department or agency of the United States or a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision of a State for purposes of law enforcement (whether on or off-duty), or a sale or transfer to or possession by a campus law enforcement officer for purposes of law enforcement (whether on or off-duty);

''(B) the importation for, or sale or transfer to a licensee under title I of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 for purposes of establishing and maintaining an on-site physical protection system and security organization required by Federal law, or possession by an employee or contractor of such licensee on-site for such purposes or off-site for purposes of licensee-authorized training or transportation of nuclear materials;

''(C) the possession, by an individual who is retired in good standing from service with a law enforcement agency and is not otherwise prohibited from receiving ammunition, of a large capacity ammunition feeding device—

''(i) sold or transferred to the individual by the agency upon such retirement; or

''(ii) that the individual purchased, or otherwise obtained, for official use before such retirement; or

''(D) the importation, sale, manufacture, transfer, or possession of any large capacity ammunition feeding device by a licensed manufacturer or licensed importer for the purposes of testing or experimentation authorized by the Attorney General.

''(4) For purposes of paragraph (3)(A), the term 'campus law enforcement officer' means an individual who is—

''(A) employed by a private institution of higher education that is eligible for funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

''(B) responsible for the prevention or investigation of crime involving injury to persons or property, including apprehension or detention of persons for such crimes;

''(C) authorized by Federal, State, or local law to carry a firearm, execute search warrants, and make arrests; and

''(D) recognized, commissioned, or certified by a government entity as a law enforcement officer.''.

(b) IDENTIFICATION MARKINGS FOR LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.—Section 923(i) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''A large capacity ammunition feeding device manufactured after the date of enactment of the Large Capacity Ammunition Feeding Device Act of 2016 shall be identified by a serial number and the date on which the device was manufactured or made, legibly and conspicuously engraved or cast on the device, and such other identification as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe.''.

(c) SEIZURE AND FORFEITURE OF LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.—Section 924(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting ''or large capacity ammunition feeding device'' after ''firearm or ammunition'' each place the term appears;

(B) by inserting ''or large capacity ammunition feeding device'' after ''firearms or ammunition'' each place the term appears; and

(C) by striking ''or (k)'' and inserting ''(k), or (v)'';

(2) in paragraph (2)(C), by inserting ''or large capacity ammunition feeding devices'' after ''firearms or quantities of ammunition''; and

(3) in paragraph (3)(E), by inserting ''922(v),'' after ''922(n),''.

SEC. 604. PENALTIES.

Section 924(a)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or (q)'' and inserting ''(q), or (v)''.

SEC. 605. USE OF BYRNE GRANTS FOR BUY-BACK PROGRAMS FOR LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.

Section 501(a)(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3751(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(H) Compensation for surrendered large capacity ammunition feeding devices, as that term is defined in section 921 of title 18, United States Code, under buy-back programs for large capacity ammunition feeding devices.''.

SEC. 606. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title, an amendment made by this title, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title, the amendments made by this title, and the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

SA 4833. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5___. CRIMINAL STREET GANG RICO PROSECUTION ACT.

Section 1961 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''(a)'' before ''As used'';

(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting ''any criminal street gang,'' after ''other legal entity,'';

(3) in paragraph (9), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(4) in paragraph (10), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

''(11) 'criminal street gang'—

''(A) means any organization, association, or group of 3 or more individuals associated in fact, whether formal or informal, that engages in criminal gang activity; and

''(B) does not include 3 or more individuals, associated in fact, whether formal or informal, who are not engaged in criminal gang activity; and

''(12) 'criminal gang activity' means the commission, attempted commission, conspiracy to commit, or solicitation, coercion, or intimidation of another person to commit a racketeering activity.''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) For purposes of this chapter, the existence of a criminal street gang may be established by 1 or more identifying characteristics, including—

''(1) evidence of a common name or common identifying signs, symbols, tattoos, graffiti, attire, aliases, nicknames, or social media posts; and

''(2) other distinguishing characteristics, including, common activities, rules, codes, customs, or behaviors.''.

SA 4834. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4688 submitted by Mr. WYDEN and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, insert the following: ''This section shall not apply to a corporation, association, educational institution or institution of learning, or society that is exempt from the discrimination provisions of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) pursuant to section 702(a) or 703(e)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e–1(a), 2000e–2(e)(2)).''.

SA 4835. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS.

Any agency or office of any branch of the Federal Government receiving funds under

this Act shall, with respect to any religious corporation, religious association, religious educational institution, or religious society that is a recipient of or offeror for a Federal Government contract, subcontract, grant, purchase order, or cooperative agreement, provide protections and exemptions consistent with sections 702(a) and 703(e)(2) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–1(a) and 42 U.S.C. 2000e–2(e)(2)) and section 103(d) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12113(d)).

SA 4836. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to settle, with payments out of amounts appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, any lawsuit brought by a health plan or health insurance issuer related to section 1342 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18062) or any other provision of such Act (Public Law 111–148).

SA 4837. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to make payments out of amounts appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, with respect to any lawsuit related to section 1341, 1342, or 1343 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18061, 18062, 18063). The Department of Justice shall pay any amounts owed as a result of any such lawsuit with funds appropriated under the heading of this title ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' under the heading of this title ''GENERAL ADMINISTRATION'' for human resources purposes.

SA 4838. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by a Department of Justice lawyer to lie to, willfully deceive, or intentionally misrepresent facts before any Federal judge.

SA 4839. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Congress finds the following:

(1) On May 19, 2016, United States district court judge Andrew Hanen issued an order finding that Department of Justice lawyers made a number of intentionally false statements to defend the Accountability Immigration Executive Action of the President.

(2) Judge Hanen stated the lawyers lied to the court 3 distinct times:

(A) LIE #1.—On December 19, 2014, Department of Justice lawyers asked to push a hearing back to January, assuring the court that no applications to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program (in this section referred to as ''DACA'') program would be approved. (''This was not a curve ball thrown by the Government; this was a spitball which neither the Plaintiff States nor the Court would learn of until March 3, 2015.''. Texas v. United States, Civil No. B–14–254, 2016 WL 3211803, at *5 (S.D. Tex. May 19, 2016).)

(B) LIE #2.—In January 2015, Department of Justice lawyers told the court no applications for DACA would be accepted until February 18, 2015, and no action would be taken on them until March 4—meanwhile 100,000 applications had already been approved.

(C) LIE #3.—On February 23, 2015, a week after an injunction was issued, Department of Justice lawyers filed a brief stating that DACA applications were set to begin on March 3, despite the fact that the Department of Homeland Security started processing them in late November 2014. (''Yet counsel, who knew of the DHS activity, were not only silent, but their motion was certainly calculated to give the impression that nothing was happening or had happened pursuant to the 2014 DHS Directive—when, in fact, by that time over 100,000 applications had already been granted.'' Id. at *7.)

(3) Judge Hanen drew the following conclusions:

(A) ''[T]he Justice Department lawyers knew the true facts and misrepresented those facts to the citizens of the 26 Plaintiff States, their lawyers and this Court on multiple occasions. . . . Such conduct is certainly not worthy of any department whose name includes the word 'Justice.' ''. Id. at *3.

(B) ''The United States Department of Justice . . . has now admitted making statements that clearly did not match the facts. It has admitted that the lawyers who made these statements had knowledge of the truth when they made these misstatements.''. Id. at *1.

(C) ''These misrepresentations will be discussed in more detail below; but suffice it to say the Government's attorneys effectively misled the Plaintiff States into foregoing a request for a temporary restraining order or an earlier injunction hearing. Further, these misrepresentations may have caused more damage in the intervening time period and may cause additional damage in the future. Counsel's misrepresentations also misdirected the Court as to the timeline involved in the implementation of the 2014 DHS Directive, which included the amendments to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals ('DACA')program.''. Id. at *2.

(D) ''The Government's attorneys knew since late-November of 2014 that the DHS was issuing three-year deferrals under the 2014 DHS Directive. Whether it was one person or one hundred thousand persons, the magnitude does not change a lawyer's ethical obligations. The duties of a Government lawyer, and in fact of any lawyer, are threefold: (1) tell the truth; (2) do not mislead the Court; and (3) do not allow the Court to be misled. The Government's lawyers failed on all three fronts. The actions of the DHS should have been brought to the attention of the opposing counsel and the Court as early as December 19, 2014. The failure of counsel to do that constituted more than mere inadvertent omissions—it was intentionally deceptive. There is no de minimis rule that applies to a lawyer's ethical obligation to tell the truth.''. Id. at *7 (citation omitted).

(E) ''The failure of counsel to inform the counsel for the Plaintiff States and the Court of the DHS activity—activity the Justice Department admittedly knew about—was clearly unethical and clearly misled both counsel for the Plaintiff States and the Court.''. Id. at *9.

(F) ''This Court finds that the misrepresentations detailed above: (1) were false; (2) were made in bad faith; and (3) misled both the Court and the Plaintiff States.''. Id. at *10.

(G) ''In fact, it is hard to imagine a more serious, more calculated plan of unethical conduct.''. Id. at *11.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that the conduct of the Department of Justice lawyers is unbecoming of representatives of the highest-ranking law enforcement officer in the United States.

SA 4840. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5___. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used by an officer or employee of a department or agency funded under this Act to enter into an agreement related to resolving a dispute or claim with an individual that would restrict in any way the individual from speaking to members of Congress or their staff on any topic not otherwise prohibited from disclosure by Federal law or required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs.

SA 4841. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 80, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that conducting deep space exploration requires radioisotope power systems, such as thermoelectric and Stirling generators and converters.

(b) ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS AND RISKS.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies, shall conduct an analysis of—

(1) the requirements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for radioisotope power system material that is needed to carry out planned, high priority robotic missions in the solar system and other surface exploration activities beyond low-Earth orbit; and

(2) the risks to missions of the Administration in meeting those requirements, or any additional requirements, due to a lack of adequate radioisotope power system material.

SA 4842. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 68, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 218. (a) With respect to funds appropriated under this title under the heading ''STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE'' the Attorney General shall award grants, not exceed an aggregate amount of $4,000,000, to county, municipal, or tribal governments in States along the Southwest border of the United States, for costs, or reimbursement of costs, associated with the transportation and processing of unidentified alien remains that have been transferred to an official medical examiner's office or an area university with the capacity to analyze human remains using forensic best practices where such expenses may contribute to the collection and analysis of information pertaining to missing and unidentified persons.

(b) The restriction under section 1001(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(c)) shall not apply to amounts made available under subsection (a): *Provided*, that the Attorney General shall otherwise award amounts made available under subsection (a) in a manner and form consistent with amounts made available under paragraph (1) under the heading ''STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE''.

SA 4843. Mr. SASSE (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to implement any change relating to the status of the People's Republic of China under section 771(18) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(18)).

SA 4844. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 16, line 3, strike ''$65,000,000,'' and insert ''$80,000,000,''.

SA 4845. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to enforce any contraceptive mandate under title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg et seq.) or the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148).

SA 4846. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 16, line 3, strike ''$65,000,000,'' and insert ''$80,000,000, of which $15,000,000 is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)(i)),''.

SA 4847. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 80, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 301. It is the sense of Congress that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should not continue to implement the consolidation of procurement and human resource services, as recommended by the Technical Capabilities Assessment Team, until the Comptroller General of the United States completes—

(1) an analysis of the business case resulting in the relocation of procurement services under the consolidation; and

(2) an assessment whether the relocation of procurement services would enable the Field Centers of the Administration to leverage for research full-time employees who would revert to the Centers under the consolidation.

SA 4848. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. NELSON, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2___. ADDITIONAL RESOURCES AND FIREARMS TRAFFICKING.

(a) ADEQUATE RESOURCES FOR FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—In addition to the amounts provided under the heading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' under the heading ''FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION'' under this title, $175,000,000 for personnel, training, and equipment needed to counter both foreign and domestic terrorism, including lone wolf actors: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)(i)).

(b) ADEQUATE RESOURCES FOR VALOR.—In addition to the amounts provided under the heading ''STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE'' under the heading ''OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS'' under this title, $15,000,000 for an Officer Robert Wilson III memorial initiative on Preventing Violence Against Law Enforcement Officer Resilience and Survivability (VALOR): *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)(i)).

(c) ADEQUATE RESOURCES FOR CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION.—In addition to the amounts provided under the heading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES'' under the heading ''LEGAL ACTIVITIES'' under this title, $30,000,000 for the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)(i)).

(d) ADEQUATE RESOURCES FOR COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE.—In addition to the amounts provided under the heading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE'' under the heading ''LEGAL ACTIVITIES'' under this title, $11,000,000 for the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice for personnel and training to respond to hate crimes: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)(i)).

(e) STRENGTHENING FIREARMS TRAFFICKING INVESTIGATIONS AND PROSECUTIONS.—Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

''(h) Whoever knowingly transfers or receives a firearm, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that such firearm will be used to commit a Federal crime of terrorism (as defined in section 2332b(g)(5)), a crime of violence (as defined in subsection (c)(3)), or a drug trafficking crime (as defined in subsection (c)(2)) shall be imprisoned not more than 15 years, fined in accordance with this title, or both.''.

SA 4849. Mr. BURR (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. STUDY ON GAPS IN NEXRAD COVERAGE AND REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN TO ADDRESS SUCH GAPS.

(a) STUDY ON GAPS IN NEXRAD COVERAGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall complete a study on gaps in the coverage of the Next Generation Weather Radar of the National Weather Service (referred to in this section as ''NEXRAD'').

(2) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) identify areas in the United States with limited or no NEXRAD coverage below 6,000 feet above ground level of the surrounding terrain;

(B) for the areas identified under subparagraph (A)—

(i) identify the key weather effects for which prediction would improve with improved radar detection;

(ii) identify additional sources of observations for high impact weather that were available and operational for such areas on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (commonly known as ''TDWR''), air surveillance radars of the Federal Aviation Administration, and cooperative network observers; and

(iii) assess the feasibility and advisability of efforts to integrate and upgrade Federal radar capabilities that are not owned or controlled by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including radar capabilities of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Department of Defense;

(C) assess the feasibility and advisability of incorporating State-operated and other non-Federal radars into the operations of the National Weather Service;

(D) identify options to improve radar coverage in the areas identified under subparagraph (A); and

(E) estimate the cost of, and develop a timeline for, carrying out each of the options identified under subparagraph (D).

(3) REPORT.—Upon the completion of the study required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that includes the findings of the Secretary with respect to the study.

(b) PLAN TO IMPROVE RADAR COVERAGE.—Not later than 30 days after the completion of the study under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a plan to the congressional committees referred to in subsection (a)(3) for improving radar coverage in the areas identified under subsection (a)(2)(A) by integrating and upgrading, to the extent practicable, additional observation solutions to improve hazardous weather detection and forecasting.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR THIRD-PARTY REVIEWS REGARDING PLAN TO IMPROVE RADAR COVERAGE.—The Secretary of Commerce shall seek third-party reviews on scientific methodology relating to, and the feasibility and advisability of, implementing the plan submitted under subsection (b), including the extent to which warning and forecast services of the National Weather Service would be improved by additional NEXRAD coverage.

SA 4850. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place , insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Justice under this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to defend the constitutionality of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

SA 4851. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4685 proposed by Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) to the bill H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to enforce the contraceptive, abortifacient, and sterilization coverage mandates under title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg et seq.).

SA 4852. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mrs. ERNST) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1777, to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the ''Former Presidents Act of 1958'', with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Presidential Allowance Modernization Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.

(a) FORMER PRESIDENTS.—The first section of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes'', approved August 25, 1958 (commonly known as the ''Former Presidents Act of 1958'') (3 U.S.C. 102 note), is amended by striking the matter preceding subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each former President shall be entitled for the remainder of his or her life to receive from the United States—

''(1) an annuity at the rate of $200,000 per year, subject to subsection (c); and

''(2) a monetary allowance at the rate of $200,000 per year, subject to subsections (c) and (d).

''(b) DURATION; FREQUENCY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The annuity and allowance under subsection (a) shall each—

''(A) commence on the day after the date on which an individual becomes a former President;

''(B) terminate on the date on which the former President dies; and

''(C) be payable by the Secretary of the Treasury on a monthly basis.

''(2) APPOINTIVE OR ELECTIVE POSITIONS.—The annuity and allowance under subsection (a) shall not be payable for any period during which a former President holds an appointive or elective position in or under the Federal Government to which is attached a rate of pay other than a nominal rate.

''(c) COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES.—Effective December 1 of each year, each annuity and allowance under subsection (a) that commenced before that date shall be increased by the same percentage by which benefit amounts under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased, effective as of that date, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

''(d) LIMITATION ON MONETARY ALLOWANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the monetary allowance payable under subsection (a)(2) to a former President for any 12-month period—

''(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), may not exceed the amount by which—

''(i) the monetary allowance that (but for this subsection) would otherwise be so payable for such 12-month period, exceeds (if at all)

''(ii) the applicable reduction amount for such 12-month period; and

''(B) shall not be less than the amount determined under paragraph (4).

''(2) DEFINITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'applicable reduction amount' means, with respect to any former President and in connection with any 12-month period, the amount by which—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the adjusted gross income (as defined in section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of the former President for the most recent taxable year for which a tax return is available; and

''(II) any interest excluded from the gross income of the former President under section 103 of such Code for such taxable year, exceeds (if at all)

''(ii) $400,000, subject to subparagraph (C).

''(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, subclauses (I) and (II) of subparagraph (A)(i) shall be applied by taking into account both the amounts properly allocable to the former President and the amounts properly allocable to the spouse of the former President.

''(C) COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES.—The dollar amount specified in subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be adjusted at the same time that, and by the same percentage by which, the monetary allowance of the former President is increased under subsection (c) (disregarding this subsection).

''(3) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.—

''(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

''(i) the terms 'return' and 'return information' have the meanings given those terms in section 6103(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

''(ii) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of the Treasury's delegate.

''(B) REQUIREMENT.—A former President may not receive a monetary allowance under subsection (a)(2) unless the former President discloses to the Secretary, upon the request of the Secretary, any return or return information of the former President or spouse of the former President that the Secretary determines is necessary for purposes of calculating the applicable reduction amount under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

''(C) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Except as provided in section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may not, with respect to a return or return information disclosed to the Secretary under subparagraph (B)—

''(i) disclose the return or return information to any entity or person; or

''(ii) use the return or return information for any purpose other than to calculate the applicable reduction amount under paragraph (2).

''(4) INCREASED COSTS DUE TO SECURITY NEEDS.—With respect to the monetary allowance that would be payable to a former President under subsection (a)(2) for any 12-month period but for the limitation under paragraph (1), the Administrator of General Services, in coordination with the Director of the United States Secret Service, shall determine the amount of the allowance that is needed to pay the increased cost of doing business that is attributable to the security needs of the former President.''.

(b) SURVIVING SPOUSES OF FORMER PRESIDENTS.—

(1) INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF MONETARY ALLOWANCE.—Subsection (e) of the first section of the Former Presidents Act of 1958 is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''$20,000 per annum,'' and inserting ''$100,000 per year (subject to paragraph (4)),''; and

(B) in the second sentence—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking ''or the government of the District of Columbia''; and

(II) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) shall, after its commencement date, be increased at the same time that, and by the same percentage by which, annuities of former Presidents are increased under subsection (c).''.

(2) COVERAGE OF WIDOWER OF A FORMER PRESIDENT.—Subsection (e) of the first section of the Former Presidents Act of 1958, as amended by paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) by striking ''widow'' each place it appears and inserting ''widow or widower''; and

(B) by striking ''she'' and inserting ''she or he''.

(c) SUBSECTION HEADINGS.—The first section of the Former Presidents Act of 1958 is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by inserting after the subsection enumerator the following: ''WIDOWS AND WIDOWERS.—'';

(2) in subsection (f), by inserting after the subsection enumerator the following: ''DEFINITION.—''; and

(3) in subsection (g), by inserting after the subsection enumerator the following: ''AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—''.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed to affect—

(1) any provision of law relating to the security or protection of a former President or a member of the family of a former President; or

(2) funding, under the Former Presidents Act of 1958 or any other law, to carry out any provision of law described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 4. TRANSITION RULES.

(a) FORMER PRESIDENTS.—In the case of any individual who is a former President on the date of enactment of this Act, the amendment made by section 2(a) shall be applied as if the commencement date referred in subsection (b)(1)(A) of the first section of the Former Presidents Act of 1958, as amended by section 2(a), coincided with such date of enactment.

(b) WIDOWS.—In the case of any individual who is the widow of a former President on the date of enactment of this Act, the amendments made by section 2(b)(1) shall be applied as if the commencement date referred to in subsection (e)(1) of the first section of the Former Presidents Act of 1958, as amended by section 2(b)(1), coincided with such date of enactment.

SEC. 5. APPLICABILITY.

For a former President receiving a monetary allowance under the Former Presidents Act of 1958 on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, the limitation under subsection (d)(1) of the first section of that Act, as amended by section 2(a), shall apply to the monetary allowance of the former President, except to the extent that the application of the limitation would prevent the former President from being able to pay the cost of a lease or other contract that is in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act and under which the former President makes payments using the monetary allowance, as determined by the Administrator of General Services.

SA 4853. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. THUNE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2736, to improve access to durable medical equipment for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Patient Access to Durable Medical Equipment Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TRANSITION TO NEW PAYMENT RATES FOR DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall extend the transition period described in clause (i) of section 414.210(g)(9) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations, from June 30, 2016, to June 30, 2017 (with the full implementation described in clause (ii) of such section applying to items and services furnished with dates of service on or after July 1, 2017).

SEC. 3. FLOOR ON BID CEILING FOR COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION FOR DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

Section 1847(b)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3(b)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting '', subject to subparagraph (E),'' after ''subsection (a)(2)''; and

(B) by inserting '', subject to subparagraph (E),'' after ''Based on such bids''; and

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

''(E) FLOOR ON BID CEILING FOR DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The ceiling for a bid submitted for applicable covered items may not be less than the fee schedule amount that would otherwise be determined under section 1834(a), section 1834(h), or section 1842(s) for such items furnished on July 1, 2016 (determined as if section 2 of the Patient Access to Durable Medical Equipment Act of 2016 had not been enacted).

''(ii) APPLICABLE COVERED ITEMS DEFINED.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'applicable covered items' means competitively priced items and services described in subsection (a)(2) that are furnished with respect to rounds of competition that begin on or after January 1, 2017.''.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENTS IN DETERMINING ADJUSTMENTS USING INFORMATION FROM COMPETITIVE BIDDING PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1834(a)(1)(G) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(a)(1)(G)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''In the case of items and services furnished on or after January 1, 2019, in making any adjustments under clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (F), under subsection (h)(1)(H)(ii), or under section 1842(s)(3)(B), the Secretary shall—

''(i) solicit and take into account stakeholder input; and

''(ii) take into account the highest amount bid by a winning supplier in a competitive acquisition area and a comparison of each of the following with respect to non-competitive acquisition areas and competitive acquisition areas:

''(I) The average travel distance and cost associated with furnishing items and services in the area.

''(II) Any barriers to access for items and services in the area.

''(III) The average delivery time in furnishing items and services in the area.

''(IV) The average volume of items and services furnished by suppliers in the area.

''(V) The number of suppliers in the area.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 1834(h)(1)(H)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(h)(1)(H)(ii)) is amended by striking ''the Secretary'' and inserting ''subject to subsection (a)(1)(G), the Secretary''.

(2) Section 1842(s)(3)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(s)(3)(B)) is amended by striking ''the Secretary'' and inserting ''subject to section 1834(a)(1)(G), the Secretary''.

SEC. 5. REPORTS ON THE RESULTS OF THE MONITORING OF ACCESS OF MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES TO DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT AND OF HEALTH OUTCOMES.

Not later than October 1, 2016, January 1, 2017, April 1, 2017, and July 1, 2017, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall publish on the Internet website of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services the results of the monitoring of access of Medicare beneficiaries to durable medical equipment and of health outcomes, as described on page 66228 in the final rule published by the Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services on November 6, 2014, and entitled ''Medicare Program; End-Stage Renal Disease Prospective Payment System, Quality Incentive Program, and Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics, and Supplies'' (79 Fed. Reg. 66120-66265).

SEC. 6. REVISION OF EFFECTIVE DATE OF PROVISION LIMITING FEDERAL MEDICAID REIMBURSEMENT TO STATES FOR DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT (DME) TO MEDICARE PAYMENT RATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1903(i)(27) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(i)(27)) is

amended by striking ''January 1, 2019'' and inserting ''October 1, 2018''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 503 of division O of Public Law 114–113.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2016, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2016, at 9:30 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled ''FirstNet Oversight: An Update on the Status of the Public Safety Broadband Network.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2016, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Small Business Retirement Pooling: Examining Open Multiple Employer Plans.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2016, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Ideology of ISIS.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2016, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR–418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH–219 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy, and Consumer Rights be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2016, at 2 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The CREATES Act: Ending Regulatory Abuse, Protecting Consumers, and Ensuring Drug Price Competition.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 507, 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. 507) designating July 8, 2016, as Collector Car Appreciation Day and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 507) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

PRESIDENTIAL ALLOWANCE MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1777 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. 1777) to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the ''Former Presidents Act of 1958,'' with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Ernst substitute amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 4852) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Presidential Allowance Modernization Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.

(a) FORMER PRESIDENTS.—The first section of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes'', approved August 25, 1958 (commonly known as the ''Former Presidents Act of 1958'') (3 U.S.C. 102 note), is amended by striking the matter preceding subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each former President shall be entitled for the remainder of his or her life to receive from the United States—

''(1) an annuity at the rate of $200,000 per year, subject to subsection (c); and

''(2) a monetary allowance at the rate of $200,000 per year, subject to subsections (c) and (d).

''(b) DURATION; FREQUENCY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The annuity and allowance under subsection (a) shall each—

''(A) commence on the day after the date on which an individual becomes a former President;

''(B) terminate on the date on which the former President dies; and

''(C) be payable by the Secretary of the Treasury on a monthly basis.

''(2) APPOINTIVE OR ELECTIVE POSITIONS.—The annuity and allowance under subsection (a) shall not be payable for any period during which a former President holds an appointive or elective position in or under the Federal Government to which is attached a rate of pay other than a nominal rate.

''(c) COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES.—Effective December 1 of each year, each annuity and allowance under subsection (a) that commenced before that date shall be increased by the same percentage by which benefit amounts under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased, effective as of that date, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

''(d) LIMITATION ON MONETARY ALLOWANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the monetary allowance payable under subsection (a)(2) to a former President for any 12-month period—

''(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), may not exceed the amount by which—

''(i) the monetary allowance that (but for this subsection) would otherwise be so payable for such 12-month period, exceeds (if at all)

''(ii) the applicable reduction amount for such 12-month period; and

''(B) shall not be less than the amount determined under paragraph (4).

''(2) DEFINITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'applicable reduction amount' means, with respect to any former President and in connection with any 12-month period, the amount by which—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the adjusted gross income (as defined in section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of the former President for the most recent taxable year for which a tax return is available; and

''(II) any interest excluded from the gross income of the former President under section 103 of such Code for such taxable year, exceeds (if at all)

''(ii) $400,000, subject to subparagraph (C).

''(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, subclauses (I) and (II) of subparagraph (A)(i) shall be applied by taking into account both the amounts properly allocable to the former President and the amounts properly allocable to the spouse of the former President.

''(C) COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES.—The dollar amount specified in subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be adjusted at the same time that, and by the same percentage by which, the monetary allowance of the former President is increased under subsection (c) (disregarding this subsection).

''(3) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.—

''(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

''(i) the terms 'return' and 'return information' have the meanings given those terms in section 6103(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

''(ii) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of the Treasury's delegate.

''(B) REQUIREMENT.—A former President may not receive a monetary allowance under subsection (a)(2) unless the former President discloses to the Secretary, upon the request of the Secretary, any return or return information of the former President or spouse of the former President that the Secretary determines is necessary for purposes of calculating the applicable reduction amount under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

''(C) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Except as provided in section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may not, with respect to a return or return information disclosed to the Secretary under subparagraph (B)—

''(i) disclose the return or return information to any entity or person; or

''(ii) use the return or return information for any purpose other than to calculate the applicable reduction amount under paragraph (2).

''(4) INCREASED COSTS DUE TO SECURITY NEEDS.—With respect to the monetary allowance that would be payable to a former President under subsection (a)(2) for any 12-month period but for the limitation under paragraph (1), the Administrator of General Services, in coordination with the Director of the United States Secret Service, shall determine the amount of the allowance that is needed to pay the increased cost of doing business that is attributable to the security needs of the former President.''.

(b) SURVIVING SPOUSES OF FORMER PRESIDENTS.—

(1) INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF MONETARY ALLOWANCE.—Subsection (e) of the first section of the Former Presidents Act of 1958 is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''$20,000 per annum,'' and inserting ''$100,000 per year (subject to paragraph (4)),''; and

(B) in the second sentence—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking ''or the government of the District of Columbia''; and

(II) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) shall, after its commencement date, be increased at the same time that, and by the same percentage by which, annuities of former Presidents are increased under subsection (c).''.

(2) COVERAGE OF WIDOWER OF A FORMER PRESIDENT.—Subsection (e) of the first section of the Former Presidents Act of 1958, as amended by paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) by striking ''widow'' each place it appears and inserting ''widow or widower''; and

(B) by striking ''she'' and inserting ''she or he''.

(c) SUBSECTION HEADINGS.—The first section of the Former Presidents Act of 1958 is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by inserting after the subsection enumerator the following: ''WIDOWS AND WIDOWERS.—'';

(2) in subsection (f), by inserting after the subsection enumerator the following: ''DEFINITION.—''; and

(3) in subsection (g), by inserting after the subsection enumerator the following: ''AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—''.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed to affect—

(1) any provision of law relating to the security or protection of a former President or a member of the family of a former President; or

(2) funding, under the Former Presidents Act of 1958 or any other law, to carry out any provision of law described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 4. TRANSITION RULES.

(a) FORMER PRESIDENTS.—In the case of any individual who is a former President on the date of enactment of this Act, the amendment made by section 2(a) shall be applied as if the commencement date referred in subsection (b)(1)(A) of the first section of the Former Presidents Act of 1958, as amended by section 2(a), coincided with such date of enactment.

(b) WIDOWS.—In the case of any individual who is the widow of a former President on the date of enactment of this Act, the amendments made by section 2(b)(1) shall be applied as if the commencement date referred to in subsection (e)(1) of the first section of the Former Presidents Act of 1958, as amended by section 2(b)(1), coincided with such date of enactment.

SEC. 5. APPLICABILITY.

For a former President receiving a monetary allowance under the Former Presidents Act of 1958 on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, the limitation under subsection (d)(1) of the first section of that Act, as amended by section 2(a), shall apply to the monetary allowance of the former President, except to the extent that the application of the limitation would prevent the former President from being able to pay the cost of a lease or other contract that is in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act and under which the former President makes payments using the monetary allowance, as determined by the Administrator of General Services.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1777), as amended, was passed.

PATIENT ACCESS TO DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT ACT OF 2016

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2736.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2736) to improve access to durable medical equipment for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Thune amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, be considered to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 4853) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Patient Access to Durable Medical Equipment Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TRANSITION TO NEW PAYMENT RATES FOR DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall extend the transition period described in clause (i) of section 414.210(g)(9) of

title 42, Code of Federal Regulations, from June 30, 2016, to June 30, 2017 (with the full implementation described in clause (ii) of such section applying to items and services furnished with dates of service on or after July 1, 2017).

SEC. 3. FLOOR ON BID CEILING FOR COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION FOR DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

Section 1847(b)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3(b)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting '', subject to subparagraph (E),'' after ''subsection (a)(2)''; and

(B) by inserting '', subject to subparagraph (E),'' after ''Based on such bids''; and

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

''(E) FLOOR ON BID CEILING FOR DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The ceiling for a bid submitted for applicable covered items may not be less than the fee schedule amount that would otherwise be determined under section 1834(a), section 1834(h), or section 1842(s) for such items furnished on July 1, 2016 (determined as if section 2 of the Patient Access to Durable Medical Equipment Act of 2016 had not been enacted).

''(ii) APPLICABLE COVERED ITEMS DEFINED.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'applicable covered items' means competitively priced items and services described in subsection (a)(2) that are furnished with respect to rounds of competition that begin on or after January 1, 2017.''.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENTS IN DETERMINING ADJUSTMENTS USING INFORMATION FROM COMPETITIVE BIDDING PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1834(a)(1)(G) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(a)(1)(G)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''In the case of items and services furnished on or after January 1, 2019, in making any adjustments under clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (F), under subsection (h)(1)(H)(ii), or under section 1842(s)(3)(B), the Secretary shall—

''(i) solicit and take into account stakeholder input; and

''(ii) take into account the highest amount bid by a winning supplier in a competitive acquisition area and a comparison of each of the following with respect to non-competitive acquisition areas and competitive acquisition areas:

''(I) The average travel distance and cost associated with furnishing items and services in the area.

''(II) Any barriers to access for items and services in the area.

''(III) The average delivery time in furnishing items and services in the area.

''(IV) The average volume of items and services furnished by suppliers in the area.

''(V) The number of suppliers in the area.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 1834(h)(1)(H)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(h)(1)(H)(ii)) is amended by striking ''the Secretary'' and inserting ''subject to subsection (a)(1)(G), the Secretary''.

(2) Section 1842(s)(3)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(s)(3)(B)) is amended by striking ''the Secretary'' and inserting ''subject to section 1834(a)(1)(G), the Secretary''.

SEC. 5. REPORTS ON THE RESULTS OF THE MONITORING OF ACCESS OF MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES TO DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT AND OF HEALTH OUTCOMES.

Not later than October 1, 2016, January 1, 2017, April 1, 2017, and July 1, 2017, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall publish on the Internet website of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services the results of the monitoring of access of Medicare beneficiaries to durable medical equipment and of health outcomes, as described on page 66228 in the final rule published by the Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services on November 6, 2014, and entitled ''Medicare Program; End-Stage Renal Disease Prospective Payment System, Quality Incentive Program, and Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics, and Supplies'' (79 Fed. Reg. 66120-66265).

SEC. 6. REVISION OF EFFECTIVE DATE OF PROVISION LIMITING FEDERAL MEDICAID REIMBURSEMENT TO STATES FOR DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT (DME) TO MEDICARE PAYMENT RATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1903(i)(27) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(i)(27)) is amended by striking ''January 1, 2019'' and inserting ''October 1, 2018''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 503 of division O of Public Law 114–113.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2736), as amended, was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR PRINTING—S. 2943

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the engrossed version of S. 2943 be printed as passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The bill, S. 2943, as passed by the Senate, is printed in the RECORD of Wednesday, June 15, 2016.)

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 2016

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 22; 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 H.R. 2578, with the time until the cloture vote equally divided between the managers or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:46 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 22, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF CARL E. FITCHETT, JR.

HON. RENEE L. ELLMERS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to seek to honor the life of Carl E. Fitchett, Jr., who passed away May 29, 2016 in Smithfield, North Carolina at the age of 93.

Mr. Fitchett had a fierce passion for serving his community, as made apparent through his past roles as director of the N.C. Oil Jobbers Association, president of the Dunn Chamber of Commerce, and Commander of the American Legion. He also served as president of the Dunn Rotary Club which awarded him the Man of the Year award in 1958, and was a deacon, elder, and trustee at First Presbyterian Church of Dunn. In addition to his volunteer leadership roles in the Dunn community, Carl served in World War II and owned and operated Fitchett Oil Co., retiring in 1991.

Mr. Fitchett is survived by his wife, Vivian; two children, Carl and Jeanette; and four grandchildren, Duncan, Margaret, Austin and Katherine.

Carl Fitchett, like so many of our community leaders, sacrificed time to better the lives of those around him. He spent his entire life helping those in Harnett County, and we are forever indebted to him for his dedication in serving the local community, especially his hometown of Dunn. He truly embodied the role of the local hero.

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF FARM CREDIT

SPEECH OF

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 2016

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the centennial of the Farm Credit System.

One hundred years ago the Farm Credit System began its mission to provide American agriculture with a steady hand and dependability, which they needed to provide for our nation.

Throughout its history the Farm Credit System has helped our farmers through the Great Depression, the agriculture crisis of the 1980's, and even the market collapse of 2008.

This deep rooted understanding of our nation's complex agribusiness industry—and the people that work tirelessly to send products to market—is what makes the Farm Credit System so critical to our producers and their future success.

And this dedication, to my district in Upstate New York and to American agriculture across this great nation, is why I am proud to stand on the House Floor today and honor the Farm Credit System on its centennial.

TRIBUTE TO RUNELL FOSTER

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, one hundred ten years ago a virtuous woman of God, Runell "Nell" Brooks Foster was born in Gwinnett, Georgia on March 27, 1906 to George B. and Emma Palmer Brooks; and

Whereas, she grew up on the family farm in Gwinnett County, Georgia and married Mr. Clyde Foster on February 12, 1928; their union has blessed our district and nation ever since; and

Whereas, this phenomenal Proverbs 31 woman, who is the oldest living graduate of Grayson High School, has shared her time and talents as a wife, mother, educator and motivator, becoming a Georgia citizen of great worth, a fearless leader and a servant to all by always advancing the lives of others; and

Whereas, Mrs. Foster has been blessed with a long, happy life, devoted to God, Community and Family; and

Whereas, Mrs. Foster along with her family and friends are celebrating a remarkable milestone, her 110th Birthday, we pause to acknowledge a woman who is a cornerstone in Gwinnett County, Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Foster on her birthday and to wish her well and recognize her for an exemplary life which is an inspiration to all; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim March 27, 2016 as Mrs. Runell "Nell" Brooks Foster Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 27th day of March, 2016.

HONORING JUDGE DAN WINN

HON. TOM GRAVES

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Judge Dan Winn, a good friend and dedicated public servant who passed away on May 10th. Judge Winn served the people of Georgia as Polk County Solicitor, and Solicitor General and Superior Court Judge in the Tallapoosa Judicial Circuit, as well as Senior Judge for the State of Georgia.

Judge Winn was a resident of Cedartown, Georgia. He selflessly risked his life for our country as a Marine fighter pilot during World War II and was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross. After the war, he went on to study law, and had a long and distinguished legal career.

His lifetime achievements include serving as Georgia's Assistant Attorney General, a member of the Georgia Constitution Revision Commission and President of the World Jurist Foundation.

Judge Winn was the embodiment of a servant leader and was well respected by everyone who knew him.

Like his family and many friends, I will miss Judge Winn dearly but I know he lived life to the fullest and made a real difference in our community, state and country.

He will not be forgotten.

HONORING CAPTAIN JAMES ARCH FOULKS JR.

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the life of U.S. Air Force Captain James Arch Foulks Jr. and his service as a B–29 pilot in the 372nd Bomber Squadron. On Friday, June 17, 2016, surrounded by his family, Captain Foulks was presented with nothing less than full military honors and a customary fly-over in Arlington Cemetery.

A native of Union City, Tennessee, Captain Foulks made the ultimate sacrifice for our freedom on October 23, 1951 during the Korean War, when his plane was shot down near the Yellow Sea. Though some of his crew survived, including a handful of Prisoners of War, he and others on his crew were listed as Missing in Action.

I sincerely express my gratitude to Captain James Foulks for his service and his membership in the ranks of those who have sacrificed their lives in the name of freedom.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER AND MIRIAM HENDERSON

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, Walter and Miriam Henderson are celebrating fifty (50) years in marriage today in Rockdale County, Georgia; and

Whereas, their union on March 26, 1966 blessed our community with a family that has enhanced our district; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man of God and this phenomenal and virtuous Proverbs 31 woman are beacons of light to those in need, their church and the many friends from across the state of Georgia; and

Whereas, Mr. and Mrs. Henderson are distinguished citizens of our state; they are spiritual warriors, persons of compassion, fearless

leaders and servants to all; they are visionaries who have shared with their family and our community their passion to improve the lives of others; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mr. Walter and Mrs. Miriam Henderson as they celebrate their 50th Anniversary, fifty (50) years in marital bliss; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim March 26, 2016 as Mr. Walter and Mrs. Miriam Henderson Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 26th day of March, 2016.

HONORING MARY DUBOIS IN CELEBRATION OF HER 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. FRANK C. GUINTA

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my congratulations to Mary Dubois in celebration of her reaching the milestone 90th birthday.

As she reflects on the great memories and milestones that have highlighted the past ninety years, I know she will think fondly on all that she's accomplished and the positive impact she's had on New Hampshire.

It is with great admiration that I congratulate Ms. Dubois on achieving this wonderful milestone, and wish her the best on all future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO PASTOR MICHAEL SHINN

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, Pastor Michael A. Shinn is celebrating twenty-five (25) years in Pastoral leadership this year at New World Harvest Church and has provided stellar leadership to the church on an international level; and

Whereas, Pastor Michael A. Shinn under the guidance of God has pioneered and sustained New World Harvest Church as an instrument in our community that uplifts the spiritual, physical and mental welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man of God has given hope to the hopeless, fed the hungry and is a beacon of light to those in need; and

Whereas, Pastor Shinn is a spiritual warrior, a man of compassion, a fearless leader and a servant to all, but most of all a visionary who has shared with his Church, our District and the world his passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Pastor Michael A. Shinn as he celebrates twenty-five years on his Pastoral Anniversary; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim March 18, 2016 as Pastor Michael A. Shinn Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 18th day of March, 2016.

SUPPORT FOR S. 2133, H.R. 4902, AND H.R. 4639

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the bipartisan legislation reported from the Oversight and Government Reform Committee for consideration today by the full House.

I urge my colleagues to support the Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act (S. 2133). I joined Chairman MEADOWS of the Government Operations Subcommittee to introduce the House companion, H.R. 4180. Our bipartisan, bicameral legislation will prompt agencies to become more pro-active in deploying best practices to continuously monitor their financial data to better detect and deter fraudulent activities.

The fight against fraud and improper payments is a long-standing challenge transcending Presidential administrations and affecting all federal agencies. Our Committee has investigated this issue in depth, and when it comes to rooting out fraud, we would be wise to heed Benjamin Franklin's famous axiom that, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

As my colleagues will recall, GAO earlier this year reported that improper payments made by the federal government totaled nearly $137 billion in fiscal year 2015. Over a 10-year period, that's more than $1.2 trillion dollars, or the equivalent of the spending cuts required under sequestration. Federal agencies ought to be doing more to stop these improper payments on the front end, and this should be considered low-hanging fruit in our ongoing effort to curb government waste.

In addition, I was pleased to collaborate with Chairman HURD of the Oversight and Government Reform IT Subcommittee to introduce the Air and Marine Officers Pay Reform Act (H.R. 4902) to improve the efficiency of the pay system for law enforcement officers of the Customs and Border Protections' Air and Marine Operations.

These officers are currently compensated for their overtime through a variety of systems including Administratively Uncontrollable Overtime, which according to the U.S. Office of Special Counsel has a troubling history of misuse. Our legislation harmonizes the pay systems to avoid situations in which employees of CBP are working side-by-side yet subject to different overtime calculations. This bipartisan legislation addresses that issue and clarifies agent payroll procedures. It is imperative that Congress create a new pay system for Border Patrol agents because there are still hundreds of officers and Internal Affairs employees operating under an older, abused system.

In addition to addressing inequities and saving the agency $1.6 million in the first year, this legislation continues our effort to improve efficiency and interoperability across the federal government. Our bill reflects a collaborative effort with the majority and minority, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 4902.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the legislation introduced by Reps. BLUM and MEADOWS (H.R. 4639) to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel. Mr. MEADOWS and I held a Government Operations Subcommittee hearing on this subject in December. At that time, we looked at the peculiar situation of the Office of Special Counsel, along with the Merit Systems Protection Board and the Office of Government Ethics. These three agencies are some of the smallest agencies in the federal government, but their work has a tremendous impact on the integrity of the federal civil service. Unfortunately, the authorizations for these agencies expired in 2007, yet they've been sustained by annual appropriations, so Congressional action is long overdue.

The Office of Special Counsel's primary mission is to protect federal employees from prohibited personnel practices, enforce the Hatch Act, and enforce employment rights under the Uniform Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act for federal employees who have served in the uniformed services. It also serves as the front line of defense for whistleblowers who disclose government wrong doing.

The bill would reauthorize the OSC through fiscal year 2020. It would make several changes to OSC's statutory authority that would, among other things, enhance its access to federal agency information, increase agency accountability in whistleblower disclosure cases, and modify procedural requirements for certain prohibited personnel practice cases. For example, it would provide OSC with statutory authority to access agency information for the purposes of its investigations in a manner similar to Inspectors General. Another provision would require agencies to provide a description of the actions they have taken when OSC substantiates misconduct on the part of an employee.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the bipartisan spirit in which our Committee has worked to advance these bills, and I hope we can sustain this momentum to continue improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the federal government.

TRIBUTE TO YULINDA COOK

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, twenty-eight years ago a virtuous woman of God accepted her calling to serve in the Social Security Administration; and

Whereas, Mrs. Yulinda Cook begun her career as a Teleservice Representative in Birmingham, Alabama with the Social Security Administration, where she educated and mentored throughout her many years of service as a Technical Expert, providing stellar leadership and outstanding service to our community and ending her tenure as an Operations Supervisor in the Gwinnett Field Office in November, 2015; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents, giving the citizens of our District a friend to help those in need as a fearless leader and servant to all, who ensured that the system worked for everyone; and

Whereas, Mrs. Yulinda Cook is a wife, mother and grandmother; she is also a cornerstone in our community who has enhanced

the lives of thousands for the betterment of our District and Nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Yulinda Cook on her retirement and to wish her well in her new endeavors; now therefore, I, HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim February 27, 2016 as Mrs. Yulinda Cook Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 27th day of February, 2016.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF FIRE AND RESCUE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue on its 50th anniversary and to commend the men and women who have selflessly served in the Department during its history.

What is now the third largest career fire department in the Commonwealth of Virginia began in 1966 with the hiring of Phil Ponder from Dumfries as the first paid firefighter and Shelby Jones of Williamsburg as the first fire marshal in the county. Later that year, Mr. Jones was appointed Director of Fire and Rescue Services, the equivalent of today's Department Chief. Prior to 1966, the local community relied solely upon the Occoquan-Woodbridge-Lorton Volunteer Fire Department that was formed in approximately 1938 out of necessity because there were no fire and rescue services offered between the cities of Alexandria and Fredericksburg.

Since its inception, the Prince William Department of Fire and Rescue has led the way. In 1967, Prince William County became the first jurisdiction on the East Coast to implement the 911 System. That same year, Prince William became the first county in the Commonwealth and the National Capital Region to implement a physical ability exam for career firefighters. In 1994, Mary Beth Michos was hired as Chief; and became the first female fire and rescue chief of a metro-sized department. The Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue continues to maintain one of the most progressive combination fire departments in the country and its legacy of ''firsts'' continues. It is one of only three jurisdictions in the Commonwealth of Virginia with delegated training authority granted by the Virginia Department of Fire Programs.

Always on the front lines, the Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue came to the aid of those directly impacted by the tragic events of September 11th in New York City and at the Pentagon. When tragedy struck again in 2005, Prince William fire protection personnel swung into action to provide assistance to the victims of Hurricane Katrina.

The Department of Fire and Rescue is comprised of three sections: community safety, operations, and support systems. At the time of the Department's founding, approximately 50,000 people lived in Prince William County. Today, the Department of Fire and Rescue effectively serves a population of 432,000 with a staff of 555 uniformed and 60 civilian personnel providing around the clock services from 21 fire stations in a county spanning 348 square miles. In 2015, the Department responded to approximately 48,000 calls, and it recently broke ground for Station 26, which is expected to open in mid-2017.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize the Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue as it celebrates 50 years of service to the residents of the county. I thank the brave men and women of the Department as well as its leadership for their tireless commitment to public safety and the protection of lives and property in Prince William County.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIVE DAUGHTERS OF THE GOLDEN WEST

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the Native Daughters of the Golden West non-profit organization by proclaiming June 21, 2016 as Native Daughters of the Golden West Day.

The Native Daughters of the Golden West was founded on September 11, 1886 in Jackson, California by Lilly O'Reichling. The non-profit Mutual Benefit Corporation of Women was established on the principles of love of the home, devotion to the flag of our country, veneration of the pioneers of California, and an abiding faith in the existence of God.

The Native Daughters of the Golden West will be celebrating its 130th year of admirable work for our great State of California. They have grown to over 4,500 dedicated members and 80 Parlors throughout the Golden State. The society remains true visionaries and continues to be one of many stable and thriving women's non-profit organizations.

The Native Daughters of the Golden West offers its members a variety of valuable charitable organizations including, but not limited to, children's foundations, veterans' welfare, education and scholarships, and mission restoration.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending the Native Daughters of the Golden West upon this important milestone and for their exuberance and dedication to our State of California.

TRIBUTE TO POLICE CHIEF WILLIS D. BOOTH

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a man who served his community of Clearwater, Florida for many years, former Clearwater Police Chief Willis D. Booth. Former Chief Booth is being inducted into the Florida Law Enforcement Officers Hall of Fame.

Chief Booth was born November 12, 1924 in Safety Harbor, Florida and is the great grandson of the man credited to be the first settler of Pinellas County peninsula, Mr. Count Odet Phillipe. Chief Booth graduated from Clearwater High School in 1942 and started his career in law enforcement September 6th, 1947.

It did not take long for Chief Booth to rise through the ranks. He was promoted to Sergeant on August 16th, 1949 and subsequently enrolled and graduated from the Southern Police Institute in 1953. Four years later, on July 28th, 1953, he advanced to the status of Captain. During this time, Booth was the man everyone could rely on filling in for any position when necessary, including as Senior Captain and Acting Chief when the acting officers were unavailable. Finally, when his predecessor, Chief Irving Dribben retired, Chief Booth was chosen to succeed him and became Chief on November 4th, 1957.

While Chief Booth was the Chief of Police for 11 years, he was a member of numerous groups and committees. He was a member of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and was a part of the Public Relations Committee in 1963. Additionally, he served on the Membership Committee and on the Regional Committee on Education and Training for Florida, Georgia, and Alabama. He was also on the Board of Directors of the Florida Police Chiefs Association, Tampa Bay Area Chiefs of Police Association, and served as president for both.

In 1968, Chief Booth retired from his role in the Clearwater Police Department to accept the position of Assistant Director of the Florida Department of Law Enforcement and to continue making a difference in communities around the state. I want to thank Former Chief Willis Booth for his years of service to our community as a member of Florida Law Enforcement. I ask that this body join me in recognizing his service and congratulating him on a distinguished career. He is an important part of the history of Pinellas County and is most deserving of his induction into the Florida Law Enforcement Officers Hall of Fame.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. JULIA AARON HUMBLES

HON. HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present the following U.S. Citizen of Distinction:

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of Mrs. Julia Aaron Humbles, who gave of herself in order for others to stand; and

Whereas, her dedicated service is present in New Orleans, Louisiana and Metropolitan Atlanta, for all to see her as an unwavering advocate of justice for the youth, the elderly, the poor and the downtrodden; and

Whereas, this remarkable, positive woman with a beautiful smile gave of herself, her time and her talent; never asking for fame or fortune but only to uplift those in need; and

Whereas, she led by example from behind the scenes, and was on the frontline for our nation; she was an original Freedom Rider in the 1960s, an active member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), a member of the Congress

of Racial Equality (CORE), a Goodwill Ambassador for her community, a charter member of her beloved church, New Beginning Full Gospel Baptist Church of Decatur, Georgia; and

Whereas, this virtuous Proverbs 31 woman was a mother, a grandmother, a great-grandmother, a wife, a daughter, a friend, a warrior, a matriarch, and a woman of great integrity; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow a Congressional recognition on Mrs. Julia Aaron Humbles for her leadership, friendship and service to all of the citizens in Georgia and throughout the Nation; now therefore, I, HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby attest to the 114th Congress that Mrs. Julia Aaron Humbles of DeKalb County, Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this ''Congressional Honor'' Mrs. Julia Aaron Humbles, U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 6th day of February, 2016.

COMMENDING PRINCE WILLIAM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CHAIRMAN DALENA KANOUSE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Dalena Kanouse on the completion of her term as Chairman of the Prince William Chamber of Commerce. Each July, a new Chairman assumes the responsibility of working with Chamber staff and board members to promote the interests of the local business community.

After the passing of her late husband, SGM (Ret) Sam Kanouse in 2009, Mrs. Kanouse assumed the reins of his business, Management and Training Consultants, Incorporated (MTCI) as President and Chief Executive Officer. As a U.S. Department of Defense contractor, Mrs. Kanouse sets the strategic vision and strives for excellence as the leader of more than 100 employees.

Mrs. Kanouse brought the same resolve to her role as Chairman. Recognizing the evolution of the Northern Virginia economy, she stressed the importance of remaining current on workforce development trends and broadening a business' footprint within the field of government contracting. She also led the Prince William Chamber's workgroup on the establishment of a 3-year strategic plan.

The Prince William Chamber of Commerce represents the interests of nearly 70,000 employees in the metropolitan community of 432,000 residents. Dedicated to maintaining an environment where businesses and people thrive, the Prince William Chamber focuses its efforts in the area of business growth, economic development, advocacy, education, and community outreach. Signature events include the Prince William Valor Awards, Business Awards, Education and Innovation Scholarship Program, and Salute to the Armed Services Luncheon.

As a military spouse, mother of two, and grandmother to three, Mrs. Kanouse has proven to be a strong advocate for military families and early childhood education both personally and professionally. She actively serves on multiple committees and councils within the Chamber, including the Chambers Veterans Council and Education and Innovation Committee. Under Mrs. Kanouse's leadership, the Chamber awarded $7,500 in scholarships to local high school students this year. Mrs. Kanouse is a strong believer in practicing what she preaches. As a display of her commitment to hiring veterans, MTCI maintains a Bronze Level Certification in the Virginia Values Veterans (V3) program. During her tenure, Mrs. Kanouse increased Chamber membership, retention, and utilized her personal network to expand the reach of the Prince William Chamber of Commerce in the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Dalena Kanouse on her effective leadership and successes as Chairman. Mrs. Kanouse has proven herself to be a visionary leader whose efforts will leave a lasting impression on the Prince William Chamber of Commerce and the community it serves.

COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING FAY G. CARBULLIDO AFTER 40 YEARS OF SERVICE ON GUAM

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate Fay Diana Garrido Carbullido on her retirement after 40 years of service as a Registered Nurse on Guam. Fay has diligently served our community in almost every arena of nursing, including numerous leadership positions with the Guam Department of Education, Guam Department of Public Health and Social Services, Guam Memorial Hospital, and Naval Hospital Guam.

Fay was born on January 9, 1953 to Facundo Diego Borja Garrido and Florencia Crisostomo Lizama Garrido of Agana Heights. She was drawn to the nursing profession by her father, who served in the U.S. Navy, and mother, who was a Navy trained nurse. As a teenager, Fay volunteered as a Candy Striper at the Guam Memorial Hospital. Upon her graduation from the Academy of Our Lady of Guam in 1971, Fay was awarded the Government of Guam's Professional Technical Scholarship to study nursing. She received her Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing from Seattle University in 1975.

She began her career providing direct nursing care in community and teaching hospitals. She was employed at the University of California—Davis Medical Center, where she worked to support her soon to be husband, Franklin Philip Carbullido, while he attended law school. Fay and Phil were married on August 2, 1976. She is the daughter-in-law of Francisco Chaco Carbullido and Maria Salas Castro Carbullido of Chalan Pago. They have four children: Brandon, Kristina, Adam, and Steven, and their family has been extended by Kristina's marriage to Charles Rapadas and their only grandson, Kellan Philip.

When Philip graduated from law school in 1978, they returned home to Guam. She continued as a hospital nurse caring for patients in the Emergency Room and Critical Care Unit, Labor & Delivery, and Medical-Surgical wards at Guam Memorial Hospital. After the birth of her first child, Fay decided she needed to work regular hours.

A majority of her career was as a school health counselor and school nurse for the Guam Department of Education, a position she held for nearly 18 years from 1979–1984, 1989–1995, and 1997–2003. She cared for thousands of students during her assignments at Finegayan Elementary, Carbullido Elementary, C.L. Taitano Elementary and Tamuning Elementary Schools. As a school nurse, Fay demonstrated a kind and gentle care for each student, at times having up to 30 students in her health room. Many who have grown still fondly refer to her as Nurse Fay.

Between her assignments as a school nurse, Fay served in several leadership and administrative positions with GDOE and the Guam Department of Public Health and Social Services. She was the School Health Program Coordinator of the entire education department from 1984–1989, where she oversaw the comprehensive School Health Program for all of Guam's public schools. Under her leadership, she championed having a school nurse in every public school and worked collaboratively with government agencies and private medical providers on issues affecting school-aged children.

In 1995, she was recruited by a Northern California home care agency to establish Guam's first home care nursing service, which provided much needed services and care to elderly and homebound patients throughout Guam. From 1995–1997, Fay was appointed to several positions within DPHSS, including the Community Health Nurse Supervisor then Administrator of the Bureau of Family Health and Nursing Services. She was Maternal and Child Health Program Director, and Alternate Response Activity Coordinator during times of typhoons and the Korean Airlines Flight 801 crash. She provided expert advice to department directors and senior leadership within the Government of Guam, including the Governor of Guam, and worked with local leaders to expand public health programs and nursing services in Guam and the Pacific region.

Fay retired from the Government of Guam in 2003 after 27 years of local government service when she was recruited by Naval Hospital Guam to be the Patient Safety Manager. She established and coordinated Naval Hospital's first Patient Safety Program that resulted in two successful accreditation surveys by The Joint Commission. In 2009 she transitioned to be the Breast Health Coordinator where she worked with medical staff, patients and their families to provide support and education to more than 300 women with breast health concerns. She is currently the Population Health Nurse who worked closely with medical providers and patients to bring Naval Hospital Guam to be among the Top 3 in Navy Medicine for several months.

Throughout her life, Fay has been an active member of our community. She is a member of numerous professional associations, and spearheaded initiatives to raise awareness of health issues and disease prevention on Guam and the Pacific region. She worked with the Government of Guam and community partners to establish the Hemophilia Foundation of Guam, where she served as a founding member, vice chairwoman and board member. She has served as the chair of the Guam Board of Nurse Examiners, Guam Interagency Consortium for Individuals with Special Needs, and

Pediatric Evaluation and Development Services, and she was Guam's Delegate to the National Association of School Nurses. She is also a former vice chair of the American Red Cross Guam Chapter, charter member of Soroptimist International of the Marianas, and member of the Guam Memorial Hospital Volunteers Association, among other organizations. Fay is also deeply involved in Guam's Catholic Church, as a member of the Christian Mothers, Legion of Mary Auxiliary, and Catholic Daughters of America.

Fay has had an exceptional career and has made our island a better place. I join our community in commending her for her tireless work to advance health issues on the island. On behalf of the people of Guam and a grateful nation, I extend my deepest appreciation to Fay Carbullido for her 40 years of dedicated service to our island and our country. I congratulate her on her retirement and I wish her the best as she begins the next chapter of her life. Thank you (Si Yu'os Ma'ase), Fay.

TRUBUTE TO MR. HAROLD BUCKLEY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present the following U.S. Citizen of Distinction:

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the leadership and service of Mr. Harold S. Buckley, Sr.; and

Whereas, Mr. Buckley served our nation with honor and valor in the United States Army. He demonstrated unquestionable leadership and courage as a soldier devoted in protecting our nation; and

Whereas, Mr. Buckley served and led our district in DeKalb County as a steadfast pillar of our community by being ever so watchful of issues that would hinder constituents. His 30-year tenure on the MARTA Board of Directors stands as the longest in the Authority's History. He served residential and commercial clients through his thriving real estate office; and

Whereas, Mr. Buckley advised many elected and appointed officials on issues concerning the public, he also promoted supporting local small businesses; and served as a history-making member of the DeKalb Board of Realtors; and

Whereas, he never asked for fame or fortune, nor found a job too small or too big; he gave of himself, his time, his talent and his life to uplift those in need by demonstrating unwavering commitment to protecting and serving the citizens of DeKalb County; and

Whereas, he was a husband, a father, a grandfather and friend; he was a man of great integrity who remained true to the uplifting and service of my district; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia recognizes Mr. Harold S. Buckley, Sr., as a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby attest to the 114th Congress that Mr. Harold S. Buckley, Sr., is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honor" by declaring Mr. Harold S. Buckley, Sr. U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 27th day of February, 2016.

HONORING THE 26TH ANNUAL MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. YOUTH ORATORICAL CONTEST

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 31st Annual King Day Celebration and the cornerstone of the event, the 26th Annual Martin Luther King, Jr. Youth Oratorical Contest, hosted by the Prince William Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated.

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. will forever be engrained in our history as the formative figure in the quest for justice through civil dialogue. His legacy is one of tolerance despite the violence perpetrated against him and other leaders of the Civil Rights Movement. Responding through peaceful and principled communication to condemn the injustice of social and racial inequality, Dr. King worked tirelessly to establish a more united society. In his Letter from a Birmingham Jail, Dr. King highlighted the need for civility in order to establish equality. For his courage, vision, and perseverance, we celebrate Dr. King, not just for the man he was, but for his vision of the American Dream and what America can be.

Each year, residents of Prince William County gather to reflect upon the past year and receive a message of hope from the youth of today and leaders of tomorrow. Contestants in the MLK Youth Oratorical Contest pay homage to the legacy of Dr. King through their effective communication. The ability to communicate with passion and clarity will serve them well as they assume future leadership opportunities and establish the personal relationships necessary for community engagement.

I congratulate the following contestants in the 26th Annual Martin Luther King, Jr. Youth Oratorical Contest:

Middle School Contestants

Jennifer Faruque—Stonewall Middle School

Zoree Jones—Ronald Reagan Middle School

Sunjum Mehta—Porter Traditional School

High School Contestants

Ja'Neese Jefferson—Manassas Park High School

Norman Jones—Stonewall Jackson High School

Nicholas Smith—Forest Park High School

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in commending the Prince William Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. for showcasing the power of purposeful and meaningful communication reminiscent of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and in congratulating the talented contestants in the 2016 MLK Youth Oratorical Contest.

SPRINKLER FITTERS, LOCAL 550, 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Sprinkler Fitters, Local 550, on the occasion of their 100th Anniversary and to congratulate Business Manager Peter Gibbons as he leads the Sprinkler Fitters, Local 550, into their second century of excellence.

Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1916, United Association General President, John R. Alpine, had the foresight to move the Sprinkler Fitters, Local 550, toward independence from one of the several auxiliary locals, to their now sister local Road Sprinkler Fitters, Local 669. During the United Association General Convention of 1946, the Sprinkler Fitters, Local 550, were awarded their autonomous status. After significant debate, the delegates voted to give the auxiliaries their independent status and made that status retroactive to the signing of each charter. In the case of Local 550, their status was retroactively dated on June 17, 1916.

Until 1993, Local 550 had offices at various locations in Boston and monthly union meetings were hosted in several different locations. On November 1, 1993, Sprinkler Fitters, Local 550, moved into their newly reconstructed home at 46 Rockland Street in West Roxbury, Massachusetts; a building which was large enough to house a union meeting hall. Ironically, the building was destroyed twice by fire damage during previous inceptions as the Leiderkranz German Club, and the Roberts Post, before Local 550 purchased the land and commenced renovations that included the installation of a working fire protection system. The purchase and renovations were overseen by the late Brother George McCarthy, who served as Business Manager for 30 years from 1974 until 2004 when current Business Manager, Financial Secretary, Peter Gibbons took office.

The Rockland Street location also served as the original home to the Local 550, Apprenticeship Training Facility until 2014 when, under the direction of Business Manager and Joint Apprenticeship Coordinator Peter Gibbons and the entire Joint Apprenticeship Committee, the apprentices were relocated to a new, state-of-the-art training center in Weymouth, Massachusetts. At present, apprentices are now trained in all aspects of the installation and inspection of fire protection systems, while capably providing the future workforce of Local 550. Among the many skills they learn, apprentices of Local 550 are provided with hands-on training using actual working fire pumps that flow water to facilitate training in the installation and inspection of all aspects of fire pumps. Included in the new training facility is a mock two-story house constructed within the training center where apprentices learn to plan and implement sprinkler installations. This hands-on approach fully prepares apprentices for real life situations that often arise on the job.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many changes in the industry since the Local's inception 100 years ago, but the one thing that has remained constant is the bond of the Union Brotherhood and Local 550's commitment to the communities they serve. Not only are there nearly 650 Local 550 hardworking brothers and sisters quick to lend a hand to fellow members, they are also known for their tremendous acts of selfless charitable giving to the many communities throughout the state. Local 550 members have donated their time and resources to many important community efforts. These projects include the Gavin Foundation, Chez-Vous Roller Rink, and Habitat for Humanity. In addition, Local 550 members sponsor a golf fundraiser; most recently

benefitting the Phoenix Society, which supports burn survivors.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the Sprinkler Fitters, Local 550, 100th Anniversary Gala weekend held June 24 through June 26, 2016 in Boston, I rise to extend my congratulations and appreciation for Local 550's 100 years of service to the City of Boston and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I look forward to continuing my work with the outstanding men and women of Sprinkler Fitters, Local 550, and wish them nothing but success for the next 100 years.

Congratulations on this momentous occasion.

TRIBUTE TO 2ND LT. GERALD ''BUD'' BERRY

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Veteran 2nd Lieutenant Gerald ''Bud'' Berry for his actions during World War II and during D-Day, June 6, 1944.

2nd Lt. Berry was drafted in 1942 and signed up for the Aviation Cadet Program. It took him a year to complete the training and upon graduation, he earned his 2nd Lieutenant ranking. A couple months later, he was sent overseas to begin training for the Army Air Corps. There 2nd Lt. Berry was assigned a specialized flight plan to assist in the United States effort on D-Day.

He was assigned to towing gliders to the front and flying the 91st squadron of the 439th troop carrier group. He was responsible for flying the paratroopers over their designated landing zones, and for capturing any gliders that were in good enough shape to reuse. On D-Day, 2nd Lt. Berry was prepared and successfully completed his portion of the mission helping the Allied forces begin their surge to victory in the War.

I want to thank and acknowledge 2nd Lt. Gerald Berry for his honor, duty, and sacrifice for our country. He was a part of a mission that changed the course of history, and his efforts will be revered and remembered. I extend my deepest gratitude to 2nd Lt. Berry for his service. I ask that this body join me in recognizing him for his service.

HONORING THE 2016 FAIRFAX COUNTY STUDENT PEACE AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the recipients of the 2016 Fairfax County Student Peace Awards.

The program was begun in 2006 with the hope of moving people to think more about peace as both a means and an end, and to recognize young people who work as peacemakers. The program began with one high school and expanded gradually from there. In 2013, for the first time, it was offered to every public high school in Fairfax County, as well as to three private schools.

Participating high schools choose one Junior or Senior or one student group active in promoting peace and/or removing the causes of conflict. Examples of outreach include:

Committing to peace by engaging in activities that strive to end conflict, either locally or globally;

Seeking to discuss or otherwise resolve potentially controversial issues within the school or community;

Promoting the understanding of divisive issues and situations to bridge language, ethnic, racial, religious, gender, sexual orientation, or class differences; and

Working to resolve conflicts among students or members of the community who feel isolated or alienated.

I am pleased to submit the names of this year's Student Peace Award winners:

Anti-Bullying Committee, Cedar Lane School

Jieru Shi, Senior, Chantilly High School

Smriti Subedi, Senior, Herndon High School

Laith Abuhaija, Senior, Islamic Saudi Academy

Renata Urbina De la Flor, Senior, Lake Braddock Secondary School

Catherine White, Senior, Langley High School

Cindy Le/Quan Lu, Seniors, Robert E. Lee High School

Kenzie Hines, Senior, James Madison High School

Doreen Ndizeye, Senior, George C. Marshall High School

Michelle Ma, Senior, McLean High School

Trevor Christensen, Senior, Mount Vernon High School

Student Contributors to The Mountain View Mirror Mountain View High School

Stepping Stones Club, Oakton High School

Sara Hobbs, Senior, Quander Road School

Burke Centre Library Teen Advisory Board Robinson Secondary School

Kyle Engelhardt, Senior, South County High School

Aditi Takle, Senior, South Lakes High School

Sam Laveson, Senior, JEB Stuart High School

Kristin Myers, Junior, Thomas Jefferson High School for Science and Technology

Bennett Shoop, Senior, West Springfield High School

Logan Mannikko, Senior, Westfield High School

Daniel Kim, Junior, W.T. Woodson High School

Mr. Speaker, the efforts of these young people to build a more peaceful world in their own communities and the building blocks of a more peaceful world. I commend them on their awards and ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating them and wishing them great success in all their future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO JOYCE JORDAN

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present the following U.S. Citizen of Distinction:

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this extraordinary woman, who has given of herself in order for others to stand; and

Whereas, Mrs. Joyce Ann Johnson Jordan's work is present in the lives of the many people she has touched during her time here on earth; a joyful woman who believed in living a life with no regrets. She loved to travel, dance and was a connoisseur of music; and

Whereas, this remarkable woman gave of her time, talent and life; she never asked for fame or fortune while uplifting those in need. She just wanted to do what was right; and

Whereas, Mrs. Jordan led by working behind the scenes for the causes that mattered to her the most; she loved God, her family and her friends; Mrs. Jordan was a warrior, a matriarch, a woman of great integrity who remained true to the uplifting of her family as a wife, sister and aunt; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow a Congressional recognition on Mrs. Joyce Ann Johnson Jordan for her leadership, friendship and service to all of the citizens in Georgia and throughout the Nation; a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction; now therefore, I, HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby attest to the 114th Congress that Mrs. Joyce Ann Johnson Jordan of Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this ''Congressional Honor'' Mrs. Joyce Ann Johnson Jordan U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 2nd day of April, 2016.

HONORING THE MEMBERS OF RESCUE RESTON

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate the members of Rescue Reston on being named the 2015 Citizen of the Year by the Reston Citizens Association. The Citizen of the Year Award traditionally honors an individual or group of individuals who have contributed to the quality of life in Reston, helped others in need, or acted with the goals of Reston in mind without thought of personal benefit or recognition.

Rescue Reston is a grassroots organization comprised of thousands of Restonians who united to support preserving the Reston National Golf Course as open green space. Reston and the surrounding area have witnessed an explosion of growth and development in recent years. The preservation of public parks and open space is crucial in ensuring the high quality of life that is enjoyed by Fairfax County residents and honoring Reston's founding principles.

It is fitting that this award is given by one grassroots organization to another. It speaks yet again to the legacy that the founder of Reston, Robert E. Simon, leaves behind. I believe that such a high level of engagement is one of the best indicators of a healthy and vibrant community.

As a former civic association president, I am uniquely aware of the impact that these organizations can have, not only in their local community but also in the surrounding area. Their efforts give the members of that organization a sense of ownership and serve as a constant

reminder that a thoughtful, organized group of citizens can indeed bring about change.

Mr. Speaker, the efforts of Rescue Reston on behalf of the greater Reston community are selfless undertakings which are truly worthy of our highest praise. I commend them on their award and ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating them and wishing them great success in all their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING AND CONGRATULATING DR. TOM SHIEH ON HIS 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE OF GUAM

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate Dr. Thomas Shieh as he celebrates 20 years of service to the people of Guam. Dr. Shieh is the president and owner of Dr. Shieh's Clinic in Tamuning, Guam. Dr. Shieh's Clinic has served as one of Guam's leading clinics in women's services since 1999.

Dr. Shieh came to Guam by way of the U.S. Navy as a Medical Officer. He served in the Naval Hospital Guam for four years, and as the Chief of Gynecology for the last two years. After completion of his active duty service and falling in love with the island community, Dr. Shieh decided to make Guam his permanent home and opened a practice of his own. Since serving as an OB/GYN on Guam, Dr. Shieh has delivered over 8,000 babies. He is often recognized for being one of Guam's most accessible doctors. He keeps a close relationship with his patients and families and is always a phone call away. Not only does he care for his patients, he seeks to educate each woman about their health and medical needs. As a physician-owned practice, Dr. Shieh's Clinic is patient driven and practices the philosophy, ''Patients First.'' He is a reliable consultant for thousands of patients and medical professionals on Guam and the Asia-Pacific Region. He has been able to maintain and grow his personal business for the past 16 years to build on his service from the Naval Hospital Guam and provide important services to the island.

As a board certified physician and fellow of the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Dr. Shieh is one of the most experienced and desired ob-gyns on the island. He serves as the president of the Guam Medical Association, comprised of more than 300 physicians, nurses and medical professionals. As a part of the Guam Medical Association, Dr. Shieh lobbies for legislation and policy to better the health care for the people of Guam. He works to bring the latest technology in health care and ensures that medications are available to provide best services to patients. Dr. Shieh was responsible for establishing the first ever bone marrow donor registration drive for Guam and increasing Pacific Islanders in the national database by 80 percent. He has also organized medical missions to help with relief efforts after natural disasters in the region.

Throughout his service on Guam, Dr. Shieh has always demonstrated a strong commitment to community involvement, volunteerism and philanthropy. Most notably, Dr. Shieh has established a scholar athlete scholarship fund to assist students pursue higher education. He also sponsors an annual volleyball tournament and organizes health fairs and outreach events in the community.

Again, I congratulate Dr. Shieh, his wife Raven, daughters Tiffany and Beverly, and Dr. Shieh's Clinic on 20 years of service to the people of Guam. I join the people of Guam in commending them for their service and dedication, and thanking them for their many contributions to our island community.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 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 $19,252,984,535,317.64. We've added $8,626,107,486,404.56 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $8.6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 2016 ASIAN-AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE EXCELLENCE AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Asian-American Chamber of Commerce and the recipients of the 2016 Excellence Awards.

The Asian-American Chamber of Commerce (AACC) is dedicated to improving economic development opportunities for Asian Pacific American-owned businesses in the Washington, D.C., region. The 11th District of Virginia is blessed by its diversity. About 1 in 4 residents are foreign born and approximately 40 percent are minorities. Half of our foreign-born population emigrated from Asia, and more than 80,000 of our neighbors speak an Asian language at home.

Northern Virginia has a robust international business community and is home to the largest concentration of minority-owned technology firms in the nation. The AACC and its members contribute greatly to our economic strength and stability; Asian-American businesses generate more than 52 percent of total revenues generated by all minority owned businesses in this region.

In Fairfax County alone, 25,000 businesses are Asian-owned. These businesses generate approximately $9 billion in revenue and create 54,000 jobs.

Each year, the AACC recognizes businesses and non-profits in the Asian American community for their outstanding contributions to the Metropolitan Washington community and economy. I am pleased to submit the names of the following individuals and organizations:

Citizen of the Year
Ruth Crout, Fred Plum
Young Professional of the Year
Frank Chin
New Member of the Year
Dave and Joanne Adams
Laura Drain
Member of the Year
Shakha Agrawal
Business of the Year
Kyllo and Pattana Cox
Non-Profit of the Year
Youth for Tomorrow
Epoch Times
Asian Business Leader of the Year
Grace Kim
Jimmy Rhee
Chairman's Award
Audrey Lustre
Oanh Henry

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the recipients of the 2016 Asian-American Chamber of Commerce Excellence Awards and in commending the Chamber for its work to support Asian and Pacific Islander owned businesses throughout our region.

TRIBUTE TO BETTY BAISDEN

HON. HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, reaching the age of 80 years is a remarkable milestone; and

Whereas, Mrs. Betty Jane Baisden was born on March 19, 1936 and today she is celebrating that milestone; and

Whereas, Mrs. Baisden has been blessed with a long, happy life, devoted to God and credits it all to the Will of God; she has been a devoted Christian since her childhood days to present as President of the Mothers Board at Mt. Vernon Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia; and

Whereas, Mrs. Baisden is celebrating her 80th Birthday with her family members, church members and friends here in Georgia, she celebrates a life of blessings; as a Mother, Grandmother, friend, community servant and leader; and

Whereas, the Lord has been her Shepherd throughout her life and she prays daily and is leading by example a blessed life; an advocate, faithful matriarch and a community leader; and

Whereas, we are honored that she is celebrating the milestone of her 80th birthday in the 4th District of Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Betty Jane Baisden for an exemplary life which is an inspiration to all; now therefore, I, HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim March 19, 2016 as Mrs. Betty Jane Baisden Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 19th day of March, 2016.

TRIBUTE TO DALE K. JOHNSON, RANDALL KAHLE, AND RONNIE BENNETT

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize three members of our community, Mr. Dale K. Johnson, Mr. Randall Kahle, and Mr. Ronnie Bennett for being selected by the St. Petersburg Civitan Club as citizens of Pinellas whose work for the community exemplifies the club's pillars of service, fellowship, and knowledge.

Civitan International is an association of volunteer service clubs that started in 1917 and now has more than 40,000 members across the country and internationally. The mission of this collection of groups is to build good citizenship by creating a volunteer network of service clubs that address individual and community needs. They specialize in serving people with developmental disabilities.

The St. Petersburg chapter was established on April 12, 1921, and for the past 95 years it has been a part of many efforts to support children and adults who require extra assistance due to a disability.

Since 1986, the St. Petersburg chapter has honored and recognized outstanding members of the Police and Fire departments of the area. This year, the three honorees are: Police Field Training Officer Dale K. Johnson, Fire Officer Randall Kahle, and Firefighter Ronnie Bennett. These three have exemplified the high standards of the Civitan Club, serving people across Pinellas who are especially in need of assistance. I am very happy to have them as my neighbors here in Pinellas County.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge these three exceptional individuals for their hard work. They are most deserving of this recognition from the Civitan Club and I hope they continue to support those in need within Pinellas County. I ask that this body join me in thanking these three exceptional individuals for their exceptional service.

HONORING THE SHEPHERD'S CENTER OF OAKTON-VIENNA

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the volunteers of the Shepherd's Center of Oakton-Vienna and to thank them for their many contributions to the Northern Virginia community. Organized in 1997, the Shepherd's Center of Oakton-Vienna (SCOV) is a non-profit that provides services to help older adults continue living independently, and it offers programs that supply opportunities for enrichment, learning, and socialization.

Every year, approximately 200 volunteers support older residents who want to age in place in their homes and stay engaged in social activities. Services are available free of charge to anyone age 50 or older who resides in the local community.

Last year was a particularly successful year for SCOV, whose volunteer drivers provided more than 1,400 round-trip rides for medical reasons and other errands. Volunteers also made regular contact with individuals who may have limited interaction and may feel isolated in their homes. "Handy Helpers" made minor home repairs to help older adults keep their homes safe and livable. The Health Team provided individual health counseling, referral to community resources, and blood pressure readings.

All told, SCOV served more than 3,000 individuals in 2015. Volunteers also run programs such as Lunch n' Life, Adventures in Learning, trips and outings, special events, and caregivers' support groups. In 2014, SCOV was recognized for these efforts as an Outstanding Volunteer Caregiving Program by the National Volunteer Caregiving Network.

The services and programs offered by this extraordinary organization help to ensure that our seniors stay connected to the community through the promotion of active lifestyles, ongoing social integration, and availability of resources for older residents to use and share their experience, training, and skills.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the Shepherd Center of Oakton-Vienna for its work to enable older adults in our community to age in place and enjoy their golden years with dignity and independence. I thank the many volunteers who generously dedicate their time and efforts to the welfare of our neighbors. The value of their contributions cannot be overstated and are deserving of our highest praise.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. ANDREA P. THAU, AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT-ELECT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Andrea P. Thau, a physician whose practice is located in the district I represent. Dr. Thau has been elected the 94th President of the American Optometric Association, AOA, and will begin her term during the AOA 119th annual meeting on July 2, 2016, in Boston.

Dr. Thau is a graduate of the SUNY College of Optometry and is the owner of a private practice in Manhattan. She was first elected to the American Optometric Association Board of Trustees in 2007, and elected President-Elect at the 118th Annual AOA Congress & 45th Annual AOSA Conference: Optometry's Meeting in June 2015. In addition to her leadership in this national organization, Dr. Thau has made great contributions in service to her state and local community. Dr. Thau was the first woman president of the New York State Optometric Association, the New York Academy of Optometry, and the Optometric Society of the City of New York.

Along with her many leadership roles, Dr. Thau is also an advocate and educator in the field. A champion for children's vision, Dr. Thau has advocated on their behalf both statewide and nationally. She is also a founding member and former vice president of the New York Children's Vision Coalition. As a spokesperson for the American Optometric Association, she has been featured on television, radio and in print to educate the public about eye and vision care.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. Andrea Thau as she begins her term as President of the American Optometric Association. I am proud to join her friends and colleagues in congratulating her on this outstanding professional achievement.

TRIBUTE TO EVA NEWSOME

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, one hundred years ago a virtuous woman of God, Eva Bell Hicks Newsome was born in Reynolds, Taylor County, Georgia on April 16, 1916 to Mr. Ezekiel and Mrs. Mahalia Hicks; and

Whereas, she grew up in Reynolds, Georgia and was married to Mr. LB Newsome, Sr. for 76 years; their union has blessed our district and nation with four children and a host of grand, great, great-great and great-great-great grandchildren; and

Whereas, this phenomenal Proverbs 31 woman has shared her time and talents as a wife, mother and friend, becoming a Georgia citizen of great worth, a fearless leader and a servant to all by always advancing the lives of others; and

Whereas, Mrs. Newsome has been blessed with a long, happy life, devoted to God and credits it all to the Will of God; and

Whereas, Mrs. Newsome is celebrating a remarkable milestone; her 100th Birthday. Her family and friends are pausing to acknowledge a woman who has been revered by many as a pillar of her community; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and extend well wishes to Mrs. Newsome on her birthday and recognize her for an exemplary life that has been an inspiration to all; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim April 16, 2016 as Mrs. Eva Bell Hicks Newsome Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 16th day of April, 2016.

RECOGNIZING PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF FIRE AND RESCUE RECRUIT CLASS 2015–02

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the 2015–02 Prince William County Public Safety Training Center graduates. As they prepare to join the ranks of the Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue, which is celebrating its 50th year, I encourage the 21 graduates to reflect on the history of the department and the contributions and dedication of the brave men and women who have served to protect our community for the last half century.

Each member of recruit class 2015–02 has successfully completed a rigorous application process followed by 1,248 hours of exhaustive academic and physical training over the course of 26 weeks. Upon successful completion of this program, each recruit is eligible to graduate and become a Fire and Rescue Technician I with the Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue.

A Technician I is trained in emergency medical services, fire prevention, and countless other public safety measures. The certifications required for reaching the status of a Technician I cannot be accomplished without dedication and hard work. The graduates have completed the requisite coursework for certification in CPR, Infection Control, CISM, EMTB, Firefighter I, Firefighter II, EVOC 2, EVOC 3, Flashover Simulation, RIT, Mayday, Hazmat Awareness/Operations, Swift Water Rescue Awareness, LPG with Simulation, Rural Water Supply, BLS Protocols, Rope Rescue Awareness, Vehicle Rescue Awareness and Child Passenger Safety Seat Installation.

It is my honor to submit the following names of the 2015–02 recruit class graduates of the Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue:

Matthew Baker, Zachary Burnette, John Campbell, Matthew Cone, Nathan Eppley, Tyler Frable, Jason Guimond, Patrick McKinnon, Nicholas Ntiros, Brian Pelletier, Zachary Ramey, Dontrell Royal, Andrew Ruddle, Daniel Sawyer, Joshua Servais, Brian Smith, James Spengler, Andrew Turner, Chase Walton, Daniel Worrell, Austin Wing

As the newest members of the Department of Fire and Rescue, the 2015–02 recruit class graduates join the department as integral parts of the emergency response and community safety team. Just as the current and past Prince William County public safety officers have done, I am confident that this graduating class will serve the residents of Prince William County with honor and distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the newest members of the Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue. I thank them in advance for their dedication to protecting the lives and property of the county's residents. In the tradition of their new firefighting family I say: ''Stay safe.''

HONORING BAKER COUNTY COMMISSIONER TIM KERNS FOR HIS YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE TO OREGON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my good friend Commissioner Tim Kerns for his many years of dedicated public service in Baker County. Tim is set to retire at the end of his term after serving 15 years as Baker County Commissioner, and I would like to pay tribute to his leadership for the people of Baker County.

Born in Baker City, Tim was raised with an appreciation for agriculture on his family farm which led him to attend Oregon State University to pursue a degree in Agricultural Engineering at a notable pace, completing 206 credit hours in just four years. But probably the best part of his time at Oregon State was meeting Jan—his wife of 52 years. Upon completing their degrees, Tim and Jan returned to ranching in Baker County.

As his operation grew, so did Tim's desire to serve his community. His ability to provide innovative solutions to the problems that Baker County faced proved invaluable in a number of leadership roles, including serving on the school district budget board, as president of both the Baker County Livestock Growers and Farm Bureau, and as Regional Vice President of the Oregon Cattleman's Association.

Tim's familiarity with the agricultural industry and community leadership experience next led him to become a major figure in the national farm lending system. Between 1975 and 1994 he was a board member of a number of farm lenders, including the Baker Production Credit Association, Spokane Farm Credit Services, and Inter State Production Credit Association. Following success in those roles, he was appointed to a three year term as Director of the national Federal Farm Credit Funding Corporation. After completing his dual term with the Ag America Farm Credit Bank and the Farm Credit Funding Corporation, Tim was appointed to fill a vacant seat with the county commission, a seat which he has held for the past 15 years.

With federal lands making up more than 51% of Baker County, plenty of hurdles exist in the path to economic growth. Despite these hurdles, I know I can count on Tim's work ethic and knowledge of Baker County to help work through these issues and make sure that the needs of the local communities will not be ignored by the federal government. Whether it was stopping the EPA from regulating a local cement plant out of existence and killing hundreds of jobs, or some of the ongoing problems such as the red tape cutting off Baker County miners from being a part of a rich local mining history, or attempts to limit local access to national forests, I knew I could count on Tim to provide valuable input as we craft solutions.

As Tim begins his transition into retirement, I know he and Jan will look forward to more time with their two sons and three grandchildren, as well as plenty of time on the ranch and volunteering in various Baker County activities.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, please join me in recognizing and thanking my good friend, Commissioner Tim Kerns for his many years of leadership and service to Baker County.

RECOGNIZING THE LOUISIANA VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS' (VFW) 2016 STATE CONVENTION IN ALEXANDRIA, LA

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Louisiana Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) for a successful 2016 State Convention in Alexandria, LA.

Our veterans are a national treasure. These men and women have sacrificed tremendously, many continuing to live with service-connected disabilities, in service to our country. Without their courageous decision to answer the call of duty, our nation would not be the shining beacon of hope and freedom we are today. As we continue working to improve healthcare delivery and expand healthcare services for our veterans, the VFW will continue to be an important partner in organizing and advocating for our veterans across the country.

I also want to express my pride and congratulations that Louisiana was selected to host the 2017 VFW National Convention in New Orleans, LA. I am confident those attending next year's convention will experience the rich culture and hospitality during their stay that makes us proud to call Louisiana home.

I remain committed to working with the Louisiana VFW to ensure they are represented on the local and national levels. Their tireless efforts and advocacy in support of veterans in Louisiana and across the country are tremendously appreciated.

HONORING THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA VETERANS ASSOCIATION

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the one-year anniversary of the Northern Virginia Veterans Association.

The Northern Virginia Veterans Association (NOVA Vets) officially launched on May 16, 2015, Armed Forces Day. With a diverse membership comprised of veterans, active military, service connected family members, community residents, and businesses, NOVA Vets' mission is to provide veterans with a comprehensive network of local resources by providing a continuum of services. Specifically, NOVA Vets provides care and support in the areas of reintegration, healthcare, employment, education, family/caregiver support, legal services, housing assistance, and community engagement.

Signature programs include offering reintegration programs at Fort Belvoir and Marine Corps Base Quantico, military care and resource training for civilian medical/healthcare providers, suicide awareness, and Veterans Helping Veterans.

Reintegration Program: Each reintegration program provides 24 months of comprehensive support to service members and their families relocating to or staying in Northern Virginia to ease the transition from activity duty. Over the course of the two-year cycle, data collection is used to determine what areas of support are needed to ensure comprehensive support and quality of life.

Military Care and Healthcare Resource Training Program: The in-person training provides insight and details needed to effectively treat and communicate with the veteran and military population. In addition, civilian health care providers are educated on health resources available at the local, state, and federal levels for veterans and service-connected members of the community.

Suicide Awareness Program: Throughout the year, NOVA Vets offer suicide prevention initiatives to include the screening of military

documentaries and Mental Health First-Aid classes to ensure people are educated on the signs and symptoms of potential suicide and know how to assist a veteran, friend, family member, neighbor, or co-worker in a time of crisis.

Veterans Helping Veterans Program: The program is a formalized network providing skill-based veteran volunteers with non-profits who assist veterans both directly and indirectly.

It is my honor to submit the names of the charter members of the Northern Virginia Veterans Association:

Angela McConnell, Doug Earhart, Tom Benjamin, Scott Cox, Carol McKnight, Matt Paschal, Greg Schumacher, Kathy Schumacher, Rick Bockes, Polly Sherard, Rich Nagel, Rick Haney, Toby Terrill, Cameron Dougherty, Robin Kelleher, Gwendolyn Bush, Larry Zilliox, Henry Patterson, Mike May, Emma Artis, Lee D'Orlando, Diana Paguaga, Cindy Fox, Anthony Garris, Gerald Mazur, Rob Cork, Mike Allen, Mina Little, Dave Mather, Daniela Horsman, Jerome Atger, Brooke Ray, Aminata Jah, Marianne Catina, Al Alborn, Stephen Prasser, Erika Laos, Don Howell, John Murray, Ariel Goldchain, Christine Garris, Hope For The Warriors, HealthSouth Hospital, Semper K9, Access National Bank, VITAS Hospital, Core Chiropractic, Fauquier Chamber of Commerce, Neighbor's Keeper, Brain Injury Services, Fauquier Economic Development Center, Catoctin Estate Planning, Freedom Museum, Juncture Consulting, Habitat for Humanity-Prince William County, Atlantic Low Vision, Quarterly Advisory Committee Motorcycle Collaborative, Project Mend A House, The Better Brain Center, Volunteers of America, Men of War Motorcycle Club, Action in Community Through Service of Prince William, Inc., American Red Cross, Comfort Keepers, and Hylton Performing Arts Center.

Veterans can often feel abandoned and confused after being discharged. Navigating the maze of services and programs that are available can be daunting, and reintegrating into civilian life can be overwhelming. These factors, especially when combined with the effects of traumatic brain injury or post-traumatic stress disorder, can lead to depression, substance abuse, anger management issues, and even suicide. This is why programs like NOVA Vets are so important and deserving of our support.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in commending the individuals, organizations, and businesses that comprise the Northern Virginia Veterans Association and in thanking them for their dedication and commitment to our veteran community.

TRIBUTE TO DEKALB COUNTY NAACP

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, since 1955, the DeKalb County branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has been a worthy instrument for good; and

Whereas, the DeKalb County branch of the NAACP is celebrating sixty one years at Green Forest Community Baptist Church in Decatur, Georgia; and

Whereas, this organization is a champion for civil rights throughout our county and state, ensuring the rights and liberties of our citizens in Georgia are guaranteed through the U.S. Constitution; and

Whereas, its members give of themselves tirelessly and unconditionally to serve our community through endeavors such as voter registration, health walks, mentorships and scholarships; and

Whereas, the lives of many in our district are touched by the leadership and service given by the officers and members of the DeKalb County NAACP, our nation and the world is a better place due to their commitment to excellence in all of their endeavors; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize their outstanding service to our District; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim April 9, 2016 as DeKalb County NAACP Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 9th day of April, 2016.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF UNITED STATES ARMY SPECIALIST BRANDON A. BANNER OF MILTON, FLORIDA

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 2016, nine soldiers were taken from us during the tragic training accident at Fort Hood, Texas. A grateful and grieving Nation mourn the tremendous loss of these fine men and women, and it is with profound sadness that I rise to honor them and pay a special tribute to United States Army Specialist Brandon A. Banner of Milton, Florida.

SPC Banner graduated from Milton High School in 2013 where he played defensive end on the school's football team. He also attended Pensacola State College before joining the Army in March 2014 as a motor transport operator. In July 2014, SPC Banner was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 16th Field Artillery Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood.

Fort Hood had been experiencing unprecedented levels of rainfall and flash flooding when on Thursday morning, June 2, while SPC Banner and members of his unit were conducting convoy operations, their Light Medium Tactical Vehicle overturned at Owl Creek and all nine were killed. SPC Banner was 22 years old.

Amongst his Army Family, SPC Banner was known to be a loyal and faithful friend who was determined and was destined for great success. His military career may have been short-lived, but as evidenced by his several awards including the National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Korea Defense Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon and the Marksmanship Qualification Badge—Sharpshooter with Carbine, it was a career during which SPC Banner displayed an unwavering commitment to duty and excellence.

Mr. Speaker, our servicemembers know full well the risk involved when they join the greatest military in the world. Yet they do it anyway and for a cause greater than their own. We owe these soldiers and their families our everlasting gratitude and our greatest respect. Vicki and I join citizens all across Northwest Florida and our great Nation in praying for the family and friends of Specialist Brandon A. Banner and his eight comrades. May the service and selfless sacrifice of these warriors never be forgotten and may God continue to bless all members of the Armed Forces and the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO HAMILTON ASSOCIATES, P.C.

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mr. Paul Hamilton and Mr. Eric Hamilton of Council Bluffs, Iowa, father and son owners of Hamilton Associates, P.C. which is celebrating 60 years in business in 2016. Hamilton Associates, P.C. is a certified public accounting and consulting firm.

Hamilton Associates, P.C. is a family-owned business providing services to businesses, non-profits and individuals specializing in tax management, financial, and accounting services. Paul Hamilton said he is very proud of the quality service his firm provides to its clients. Eric Hamilton added that the best part of his job is being able to give back to the community. Paul, Eric, and staff take an active role in civic, community, and volunteer activities in the Council Bluffs area. Hamilton Associates is growing and recently acquired a firm in Omaha, Nebraska, which will double the business in the next five years. Paul said his goal is to keep the business presence strong in the area, continue to practice honest business values, and continue investing in the community.

I commend and congratulate Paul Hamilton and Eric Hamilton for their many years of dedicated and devoted service to Council Bluffs and the surrounding area. Paul and Eric make a difference by helping and serving others. It is with great honor that I recognize them today. I know that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in honoring their accomplishments and I wish them and their family and staff continued success in the future.

"TURN THE PAGE" LITERACY INITIATIVE

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 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 4–6 weeks reteaching 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.

And that's just the way it is.

TRIBUTE TO KELLY KOCH

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Kelly Koch, of Waukee, Iowa, on being crowned Miss Iowa 2016.

Miss Koch recently started competing in pageants as late as 2014, and was the runner-up Miss Iowa 2015. There are five categories for which contestants are judged. She was a preliminary talent winner with her ballet en point, telling the local newspaper, Dallas County News, that she spent at least two hours daily each week with her choreographer to perfect every detail. She was attuned to national and international news in preparation for the interview portion of the pageant. During her year of service as Miss Iowa, Miss Koch chose the Pinky Swear Foundation, which provides financial and emotional support to families whose children are afflicted with cancer. Earlier, Kelly Koch had served as an intern for the organization and has a great affection for its mission.

In her service as Miss Iowa and to fulfill her obligations to the Miss Iowa organization, Kelly Koch will temporarily suspend her studies at Iowa State University where she is a member of the I.S.U. Dance Team. In September, she will represent Iowa in Miss USA set for Atlantic City, New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Kelly Koch for this recognition. I am proud to represent her in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Miss Koch and wishing her nothing but success over the coming year and beyond.

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF FARM CREDIT

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 2016

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the centennial of the Farm Credit System.

The Farm Credit System was established by Congress through the Federal Farm Loan Act of 1916 which was signed into law by President Woodrow Wilson. Next month will mark the centennial of this vital network.

I was pleased to cosponsor House Resolution 591, introduced by House Agriculture Committee Chairman MIKE CONAWAY and Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON—commending the cooperative owners and employees of the Farm Credit System for their important contributions over the last century.

Congress designed the Farm Credit System as a network of cooperatives that would be able to respond to the needs of farmers and rural communities.

My district covers an important agricultural area in Central New York. The 24th District of New York is home to some of the most productive fruit, vegetable, dairy and diversified farms in the state. According to the census of agriculture, Cayuga County ranks second in the state and Wayne County ranks fifth in terms of the value of agricultural production. Farms in my district are served by Farm Credit East, which has over $4 billion in loan commitments to its nearly 9,000 customers in New York.

As part of its centennial celebration, Farm Credit sponsored the Fresh Perspectives program to identify 100 leaders that are making a difference in rural America. Leaders were nominated in 10 different categories. From the top 100 list, a top honoree in each category was selected. I'm proud to say that Christine Fesko, of Skaneateles, NY was selected as the top honoree in the category of Agriculture Education and Community Impact.

In addition to running a 600 cow dairy farm with her family, Chris operates the Discovery Center where children, who wouldn't otherwise be able to see a working farm, can learn about agriculture. She has also produced a series of award-winning educational videos to teach children about agriculture and modern farming practices. She was elected to the Farm Credit East board of directors where she served from 2003 to 2016.

As the Farm Credit System celebrates its centennial, I want to recognize farmers like Chris who have made this cooperative system strong as it begins its next 100 years.

TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF CLIVE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Clive, Iowa for its recognition as a 2015 Tree City USA sponsored by the Arbor Day Foundation in cooperation with the National Association of State Foresters and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service's Urban and Community Forestry program (the Forest Service).

The City of Clive has met the core standards for tree care during the past year. Over 135 million Americans live in Tree USA communities. In its 40th year of celebration, the Tree City USA program is critical to the U.S. Forest Service. This federal partner delivers technical and financial resources to states, cities and communities across the nation with each community adhering to a State Action Plan, guiding investments in each state while accomplishing local projects and programs.

The U.S. Forest Service and Arbor Day Foundation cooperate with communities to establish healthy forests, improve air and water quality and contribute to important national energy conservation goals. These local investments create long term major environmental improvements nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the City of Clive and urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the community on this award and in wishing them nothing but continued success.

GENERAL LEAVE—FARM CREDIT CENTENNIAL REMARKS—NEW YORK 22ND DISTRICT

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the cooperative owners and employees of the Farm Credit System for meeting the credit and financial-services needs of rural communities and agriculture for 100 years.

I was pleased to cosponsor House Resolution 591 commemorating the Farm Credit System centennial. Congress designed the Farm Credit System as a permanent means to support the well-being and prosperity of the Nation's rural communities and agricultural producers of all types and sizes. Congress designed the Farm Credit System as a network of cooperatives, independently owned and controlled by its borrowers, responsive to their individual needs for credit and financial services.

Farm Credit East serves many farmers in my district through their offices in Cortland and Sangerfield. Further, the Farm Credit system actively supports our next generation of farmers with agriculture education and support for organizations like 4–H and Future Farmers of America.

One of Farm Credit East's recent stewardship initiatives focuses on improving ag education. One of the top FFA chapters and ag education programs in the state of New York

is located in my district at Vernon-Verona-Sherrill High School—VVS.

In honor of the Farm Credit System centennial, Farm Credit East has committed substantial resources toward teacher scholarships to attend institutes sponsored by the Curriculum for Agricultural Science Education (CASE), a program of the National Association of Agricultural Educators.

The CASE program trains ag educators how to deliver hands on, STEM-based learning to agricultural students in subjects like plant and animal science. As a strong supporter of STEM education, I understand how valuable these investments in our children's education are, and I am grateful for their generous participation in this critical area of study.

Farm Credit East recently announced 15 teacher scholarships to attend CASE institutes, including Paul Perry and Sara Tuthill from VVS. Two other recipients are also from the 22nd district—Crystal Aukema from Oxford and Johanna Fox-Bossard from Hamilton.

VVS will be hosting an institute this summer to instruct educators on teaching the CASE introductory course: Introduction to Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources. Eleven of the Farm Credit East scholarship recipients will be attending this program.

I applaud Farm Credit's support of ag educators as they train the next generation of farmers. No doubt many of those students will become members of Farm Credit during its second century of service. Congratulations to the Farm Credit System's cooperative owners and employees on the System's centennial.

TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF CLARINDA

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Clarinda, Iowa for its recognition as a 2015 Tree City USA sponsored by the Arbor Day Foundation in cooperation with the National Association of State Foresters and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service's Urban and Community Forestry program (the Forest Service).

The City of Clarinda has met the core standards for tree care during the past year. Over 135 million Americans live in Tree USA communities. In its 40th year of celebration, the Tree City USA program is critical to the U.S. Forest Service. This federal partner delivers technical and financial resources to states, cities and communities across the nation with each community adhering to a State Action Plan, guiding investments in each state while accomplishing local projects and programs.

The U.S. Forest Service and Arbor Day Foundation cooperate with communities to establish healthy forests, improve air and water quality and contribute to important national energy conservation goals. These local investments create long term major environmental improvements nationwide.

I commend the City of Clarinda and urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the community on this award and in wishing them nothing but continued success.

IN HONOR OF THE RETIREMENT OF K.L. ''KOVEN'' BROWN

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize the retirement of K.L. "Koven" Brown.

Mr. Brown will be selling his two businesses, K.L. Brown Funeral Home and Cremation Center, which he has owned since 1978, and K.L. Brown Memory Chapel, at the end of this month.

Mr. Brown wanted to be a mortician since he was a young boy. He graduated from Jefferson Davis High School in Montgomery in 1969, and was the first graduating class from Kentucky School of Mortuary Science in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1971.

Mr. Brown is in his second term in the Alabama House of Representatives and is looking forward to travelinig more with his wife, Mandee, now that he is retiring.

Mr. Brown has two children: Allison (deceased) and Emily who is married to James Avery. He is blessed with four grandchildren: Charlie, Austin, Savannah and Tyler. His mother, Dr. Faye Brown, lives in Clanton.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing K.L. Brown and congratulating him on his much-deserved retirement.

TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF COUNCIL BLUFFS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Council Bluffs, Iowa for its recognition as a 2015 Tree City USA sponsored by the Arbor Day Foundation in cooperation with the National Association of State Foresters and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service's Urban and Community Forestry program (the Forest Service).

The City of Council Bluffs has met the core standards for tree care during the past year. Over 135 million Americans live in Tree USA communities. In its 40th year of celebration, the Tree City USA program is critical to the U.S. Forest Service. This federal partner delivers technical and financial resources to states, cities and communities across the nation with each community adhering to a State Action Plan, guiding investments in each state while accomplishing local projects and programs.

The U.S. Forest Service and Arbor Day Foundation cooperate with communities to establish healthy forests, improve air and water quality and contribute to important national energy conservation goals. These local investments create long term major environmental improvements nationwide.

I commend the City of Council Bluffs and urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the community on this award and in wishing them nothing but continued success.

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF FARM CREDIT

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 2016

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Farm Credit system in America

The Firm Credit System in America was established 100 years ago through the Federal Farm Loan Act of 1916, signed into law on July 17, 1916, by President Woodrow Wilson.

It was founded to provide lending opportunities for American farmers, ranchers and dairymen; those who till the soil to put food on American dinner tables every night.

Congess intended the Farm Credit System be designed as a permanent means to support the well-being and prosperity of the nation's rural communities and agricultural producers of all types and sizes.

Further, it was designed as a network of cooperatives, independently owned and controlled by its borrowers, responsive to their individual needs for credit and financial services and continually adapting to meet the changing needs of rural communities and agriculture.

Through the success of the Farm Credit organizations throughout this country, such as Fresno-Madera Farm Credit and Yosemite Farm Credit we celebrate 100 years of that successful ability to make loans to young and old farmers alike, those just starting out or those who have been farming for generations.

And to those who in every region of America do their best to produce the healthiest, most nutritious and bountiful crops anywhere grown in the world.

The Farm Credit System today plays a vital role in the success of United States agriculture and the economic vibrancy of rural communities throughout all 50 States and Puerto Rico, providing more than $237 billion in loans to more than 500,000 customers.

This is so American consumers can enjoy those food products at lowest cost value possible.

Clearly we know the success of American agriculture is in large part due to the success Farm Credit across the country.

We commend the Farm Credit System for their efforts and celebrate 100 years of making America the most productive agriculture country in the world.

TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF ADEL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Adel, Iowa for its recognition as a 2015 Tree City USA sponsored by the Arbor Day Foundation in cooperation with the National Association of State Foresters and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service's Urban and Community Forestry program (the Forest Service).

The City of Adel has met the core standards for tree care during the past year. Over 135 million Americans live in Tree USA communities. In its 40th year of celebration, the Tree

City USA program is critical to the U.S. Forest Service. This federal partner delivers technical and financial resources to states, cities and communities across the nation with each community adhering to a State Action Plan, guiding investments in each state while accomplishing local projects and programs.

The U.S. Forest Service and Arbor Day Foundation cooperate with communities to establish healthy forests, improve air and water quality and contribute to important national energy conservation goals. These local investments create long term major environmental improvements nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the City of Adel and urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the community on this award and wishing them nothing but continued success.

2ND LIEUTENANT AUDIE MURPHY—TUESDAYS IN TEXAS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Medal of Honor is the highest military honor that can be bestowed on an American. Harry Truman once commented that he would prefer to have the blue band of the Medal of Honor around his neck than be President. To receive the medal is not to win a contest, for the forum in which this medal is given is the contest to preserve liberty. It is a contest that no individual competitor could win; rather it is struggled for by the diligence, bravery, and sacrifice of millions of Americans. Nor is it a contest that is ever finished. It is an eternal struggle. Every generation of Americans has given of her sons and daughters to contribute to it. That is why Medal of Honor recipients are never said to have ''won'' the honor, but they have received it from a grateful nation, out of recognition of their distinguished contribution to our shared and continued fight for freedom.

Next week, Farmersville, TX, a small town in Hunt County, will celebrate the life of one of its sons, who came home the most decorated soldier of WWII. Audie Murphy's story of service starts early. When he was only 17 years old he had his sister assist him in falsifying his birth certificate so that he could meet the minimum age requirement for enlisting in the military. Like millions of Americans in the mid 40's, Murphy was eager to answer the call of his country.

Before long Murphy earned the rank of 2nd Lieutenant in the U.S. Army and was given command of Company B. In France during the early winter of 1945, Murphy's company was attacked by 6 German tanks and waves of infantry. Murphy ordered his men back into the cover of the woods, while he remained forward to give firing directions to artillery by telephone. Murphy then climbed into a burning tank and, despite the risk that the tank could explode at any moment, he began to use its .50 caliber machine gun to ward off the enemy. Murphy was alone and exposed to enemy fire on three sides. Against all odds, he succeeded in single-handedly holding the enemy back for an hour.

The citation that comes with Murphy's Medal of Honor, awarded for his actions that day, tells us that despite a gunshot wound to the leg he fought until his ammunition was exhausted. He then made his way back to his company, refusing medical attention, and organized a counter attack that would prove successful and force the Germans to withdraw.

The contest for freedom is not a sprint. It is a relay that spans generations, and the champions of each generation should be honored for their service and sacrifice. We owe a debt of gratitude to all of those who fight for our freedom, and we honor individuals like 2nd Lt. Audie Murphy for their distinguished contribution.

And that is just the way it is.

TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF ATLANTIC

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Atlantic, Iowa for its recognition as a 2015 Tree City USA sponsored by the Arbor Day Foundation in cooperation with the National Association of State Foresters and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service's Urban and Community Forestry program (the Forest Service).

The City of Atlantic has met the core standards for tree care during the past year. Over 135 million Americans live in Tree USA communities. In its 40th year of celebration, the Tree City USA program is critical to the U.S. Forest Service. This federal partner delivers technical and financial resources to states, cities and communities across the nation with each community adhering to a State Action Plan, guiding investments in each state while accomplishing local projects and programs.

The U.S. Forest Service and Arbor Day Foundation cooperate with communities to establish healthy forests, improve air and water quality and contribute to important national energy conservation goals. These local investments create long term major environmental improvements nationwide.

I commend the City of Atlantic and urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the community on this award and wishing them nothing but continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I missed Roll Call vote numbers 306 through 333 because I was speaking at my grandson's graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No.	H.R./H. Res.	Vote
306	H.R. 5293 Shuster Amendment No. 2	No
307	H.R. 5293 Ellison Amendment No. 9	Yes
308	H.R. 5293 Rogers Amendment No. 12	No
309	H.R. 5293 Quigley Amendment No. 13	Yes
310	H.R. 5293 O'Rourke Amendment No. 16	Yes
311	H.R. 5293 Huffman Amendment No. 17	Yes
312	H.R. 5293 Poe Amendment No. 19	No
313	H.R. 5293 Sanford Amendment No. 21	No
314	H.R. 5293 Buck Amendment No. 22	No
315	H.R. 5293 Byrne Amendment No. 24	No
316	H.R. 5293 King Amendment No. 25	No
317	H.R. 5293 Gosar Amendment No. 26	No
318	H.R. 5293 King Amendment No. 27	No
319	H.R. 5293 Lamborn Amendment No. 29	No
320	H.R. 5293 Massie Amendment No. 30	No
321	H.R. 5293 Massie Amendment No. 31	Yes
322	H.R. 5293 McClintock Amendment No. 32	No
323	H.R. 5293 Mulvaney Amendment No. 33	Yes
324	H.R. 5293 DeSantis Amendment No. 34	No
325	H.R. 5293 Rohrabacher Amendment No. 36	No
326	H.R. 5293 Walberg Amendment No. 37	No
327	H.R. 5293 Conyers Amendment No. 40	Yes
328	H.R. 5293 Gabbard Amendment No. 42	No
329	H.R. 5293 McGovern Amendment No. 44	Yes
330	H.R. 5293 Lee Amendment No. 45	Yes
331	H.R. 5293 Polis Amendment No. 46	Yes
332	H.R. 5293	No
333	H.R. 5471	Yes

TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF BONDURANT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Bondurant, Iowa for its recognition as a 2015 Tree City USA sponsored by the Arbor Day Foundation in cooperation with the National Association of State Foresters and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service's Urban and Community Forestry program (the Forest Service).

The City of Bondurant has met the core standards for tree care during the past year. Over 135 million Americans live in Tree USA communities. In its 40th year of celebration, the Tree City USA program is critical to the U.S. Forest Service. This federal partner delivers technical and financial resources to states, cities and communities across the nation with each community adhering to a State Action Plan, guiding investments in each state while accomplishing local projects and programs.

The U.S. Forest Service and Arbor Day Foundation cooperate with communities to establish healthy forests, improve air and water quality and contribute to important national energy conservation goals. These local investments create long term major environmental improvements nationwide.

I commend the City of Bondurant and urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the community on this award and in wishing them nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO MADISON HANCE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Madison Hance of Creston High School. Madison was recently honored for outstanding academic achievement at the Fourteenth Annual Governor's Scholar Recognition on May 1, 2016.

This statewide program is sponsored by the Iowa Governor's Office, the Iowa High School Athletic Association and the Iowa Farm Bureau. Each Iowa High School was invited to select a senior with the highest academic ranking. Not only are they academically gifted,

but the selected students are often the youth who are successful in extra-curricular activities and community endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Madison Hance in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to reach her goals. I invite my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Madison on receiving this esteemed designation, and wishing her the best of luck in all her future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO BRITTANY SMITH

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Brittany Smith, an Abraham Lincoln High School of Des Moines, Iowa graduate and current student at Grand View University. Brittany Smith recently received the Most Valuable Player title from the National Collegiate Bowling Coaches Association for 2015–2016.

Brittany was raised in a family of bowlers. Her mother is the general manager of Air Lanes Bowling Center in Des Moines. The time she spent growing up in those bowling centers influenced her love of the sport and developed her work ethic to always improve her game. As she told the Des Moines Register, ''I won't leave the bowling center until I get a problem fixed. I have a mindset that I can be better every single day.'' She practices hours each day but is also a full time student, majoring in criminal justice, dreaming of one day serving as a police officer. With that tenacity, Brittany Smith is a shining example of what a true champion is.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Brittany Smith for this recognition. I am proud to represent her in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Brittany Smith and wishing her nothing but continued success.

SHELBY DECISION . . . THREE YEARS LATER

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today on Restoration Tuesday, I rise to draw attention to the coming three-year anniversary of the Supreme Court Shelby v. Holder decision and the damage that it inflicted on our democratic process.

In 2013, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision that simply called for an update of the formula used to determine which states required federal preclearance prior to enacting legislation affecting the voting process. Shortly after, a number of states, including Alabama, quickly passed restrictive laws designed to suppress the vote after the Supreme Court struck down Section 4—the coverage formula provision making it harder of federal protection for vulnerable communities. Since the decision, new restrictive laws have been put in place in 22 states—18 of them Republican led—since 2010. The Shelby decision made it easier to limit access to the ballot box. And so here we are . . . three years later.

We must accept the charge that the Supreme Court handed to provide a new modern day formula to determine when states are covered under the Voting Rights Act. In June of 2015 I rose to the challenge and introduced the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015. Most of the Democratic members have signed on as co-sponsors. Just last week, I signed a discharge petition on this legislation to force an immediate vote on the House floor. Still, there has been much talk on both sides with little collective action. We were given this challenge in 2013, but somehow, here we are . . . three years later.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was reauthorized nearly a decade ago and it is shameful that still today, people across the nation do not enjoy full and free access to exercise their right to vote. It is reprehensible that still in 2016, Americans across the nation continue to face modern day barriers to the ballot box. The time is always ripe to do what is right. As we continue to progress throughout this election year, it is especially critical that all Americans have fair and equal access to the ballot box. Our very democracy is built on the ability of every citizen being able to have their voices heard and vote counted. No Vote, No Voice. America cannot and must not be silenced.

After decades of progress that culminated with the Voting Rights Act of 1965, we are now going backward. Old battles have become new again. The guise of a free photo ID masks the various fees necessary to pay for documents needed to obtain the ID. This ''poll tax'' makes it harder to vote for those who are barely able to make ends meet. Many elderly are unable to acquire documents proving birth due to the high number of midwife births. These are real barriers affecting real people. Is it our job as Members of Congress to deny them the right to vote? Is this obstruction of the vote what we took from the Supreme Court instructing us to revisit and recreate a formula? Why are we still here . . . three years later?

My colleagues, we are approaching the first Presidential election since the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 without full protection of the law against discrimination at the ballot box. We must stand on the virtue of a true democracy, constantly striving to remove blemishes from our process. A year has passed since the introduction of the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015, and it is being held up in committee processes, instead of being pushed through to restore the voting process for all Americans. It is time to band together and fulfil that which we have been tasked to accomplish. Delay too long is justice denied. The time is now. We must Restore The Vote.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4373–S4430

Measures Introduced: Four bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3078–3081, and S. Res. 504–507. **Page S4410**

Measures Reported:

S. 2816, to reauthorize the diesel emissions reduction program. (S. Rept. No. 114–284) **Page S**

Measures Passed:

Collector Car Appreciation Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 507, designating July 8, 2016, as Collector Car Appreciation Day and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States. **Page S4428**

Presidential Allowance Modernization Act: Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1777, to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the ''Former Presidents Act of 1958'', with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S4428**

McConnell (for Ernst) Amendment No. 4852, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S4428–29**

Patient Access to Durable Medical Equipment Act: Committee on Finance was discharged from further consideration of S. 2736, to improve access to durable medical equipment for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S4429–30**

McConnell (for Thune) Amendment No. 4853, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S4429**

Measures Considered:

Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S4383–S4404**

Pending:

Shelby/Mikulski Amendment No. 4685, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S4383**

McConnell (for McCain) Amendment No. 4787 (to Amendment No. 4685), to amend section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, to clarify that the Government may obtain a specified set of electronic communication transactional records under that section, and to make permanent the authority for individual terrorists to be treated as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978. **Pages S4383, S4386–91, S4393–96**

McConnell motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations for a period of 14 days. **Page S4383**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, June 22, 2016, with the time until the vote on motion to invoke cloture on McConnell (for McCain) Amendment No. 4787 (to Amendment No. 4685) (listed above) equally divided between the two managers, or their designees. **Page S4430**

National Defense Authorization Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the engrossed version of S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, be printed as passed. **Page S4430**

Messages from the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, with respect to North Korea; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–52) **Page S4409**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, with respect to the Western Balkans; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–53) **Pages S4409–10**

Martinotti and Rossiter, Jr. Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader in consultation with the Democratic Leader, Senate begin consideration individually either of the nominations of Brian R. Martinotti, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, and Robert F. Rossiter, Jr., of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska; that there be 30 minutes for debate only on each nomination, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time on the respective nomination, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nomination. **Page S4404**

Privileged Nominations Referred to Committee: **Page S4410**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4410–12**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4412–14**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4407–09**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4414–28**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S4428**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:46 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 22, 2016. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4430.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Lieutenant General Thomas D. Waldhauser, USMC, to be general and Commander, United States Africa Command, and Lieutenant General Joseph L. Lengyel, ANG, to be general and Chief of the National Guard Bureau, who was introduced by Senator Cornyn, both of the Department of Defense, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

SEMIANNUAL MONETARY POLICY REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the semiannual monetary policy report to the Congress, after receiving testimony from Janet L. Yellen, Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

FIRSTNET

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet concluded an oversight hearing to examine FirstNet, focusing on an update on the status of the Public Safety Broadband Network, after receiving testimony from Andrew Katsaros, Principal Assistant Inspector General for Audit and Evaluation, Office of Inspector General, Department of Commerce; Major General Arthur J. Logan, Hawaii Adjutant General, Honolulu; Michael Poth, First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet), Reston, Virginia; and Jeffrey S. McLeod, National Governors Association's Center for Best Practices, Washington, D.C.

BLM PLANNING 2.0 INITIATIVE OVERSIGHT

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Bureau of Land Management's Planning 2.0 initiative, after receiving testimony from Neil Kornze, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Jim Magagna, Wyoming Stock Growers Association, Cheyenne; James D. Ogsbury, Western Governors' Association, and Kathleen Sgamma, Western Energy Alliance, both of Denver, Colorado; and Mark Squillace, University of Colorado Law School, Boulder.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Anne Hall, of Maine, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Lithuania, Lawrence Robert Silverman, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the State of Kuwait, Marie L. Yovanovitch, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Ukraine, Geoffrey R. Pyatt, of California, to be Ambassador to Greece, Douglas Alan Silliman, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iraq, Peter Michael McKinley, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Federative Republic of Brazil, and Carol Z. Perez, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chile, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

IDEOLOGY OF ISIS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the ideology of ISIS, after receiving testimony from Subhi Nahas, Spectra, San Francisco, California; Hassan Hassan, *ISIS: Inside the Army of Terror*, Washington, D.C., on behalf of the Tahrir Institute for Middle East Policy; Tarek Elgawhary, World Organization for Resource Development and Education, Montgomery Village, Maryland; and Nadia Murad Basee Taho, Essex, New York.

SMALL BUSINESS RETIREMENT POOLING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Primary Health and Retirement Security concluded a hearing to examine small business retirement pooling, focusing on examining open multiple employer plans, after receiving testimony from Nicola Favorito, Commonwealth of Massachusetts Retirement Services, Boston; Jeffrey Stacey, McGee, Hearne and Paiz, LLP, Cheyenne, Wyoming; Kent Mason, Davis and Harman LLP, and Michele Varnhagen, AARP, both of Washington, D.C.; and James Kais, Transamerica, Miami, Florida.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Jennifer Klemetsrud Puhl, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, who was introduced by Senators Heitkamp and Hoeven, Donald C. Coggins, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, who was introduced by Senator Scott, David C. Nye, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho, who was introduced by Senators Crapo and Risch, and Kathleen Marie Sweet, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

CREATES ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights concluded a hearing to examine the CREATES Act, focusing on ending regulatory abuse, protecting consumers, and ensuring drug price competition, including S. 3056, to provide for certain causes of action relating to delays of generic drugs and biosimilar biological products, after receiving testimony from Alden F. Abbott, The Heritage Foundation Edwin Meese III Center for Legal and Judicial Studies, Peter Safir, Covington and Burling LLP, and George Slover, Consumers Union, all of Washington, D.C.; Robin Feldman, University of California Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco; Beth Zelnick Kaufman, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Bridgewater, New Jersey; and Nitin Damle, American College of Physicians, Wakefield, Rhode Island.

NOMINATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Christopher E. O'Connor, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Congressional and Legislative Affairs, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

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: 17 public bills, H.R. 5537, 5539–5554; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 795 were introduced. **Pages H4052–53**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4054–55**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 5456, 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, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–628);

H.R. 5388, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–629);

H.R. 5389, to encourage engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–630);

H.R. 5452, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit individuals eligible for Indian

Health Service assistance to qualify for health savings accounts, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–631);

H.R. 5538, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–632);

H.R. 2538, to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–633);

H.R. 5447, to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–634, Part 1);

H. Res. 737, condemning and censuring John A. Koskinen, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–635, Part 1);

H.R. 4921, to amend chapter 31 of title 44, United States Code, to require the maintenance of certain records for 3 years, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–636);

S. 1550, to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish entities tasked with improving program and project management in certain Federal agencies, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 114–637);

H. Res. 793, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1270) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements (H. Rept. 114–638); andH. Res. 794, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–639). **Page H4052**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Graves (LA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3977**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:01 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H3977**

Suspensions—Failed: The House failed to agree to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act of 2016: H.R. 5525, to prohibit universal service support of commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service through the Lifeline program, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 207 yeas to 143 nays, Roll No. 334. **Pages H3978–83, H4025**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Authorizing the use of passenger facility charges at an airport previously associated with the airport at which the charges are collected: H.R. 4369, to authorize the use of passenger facility charges at an airport previously associated with the airport at which the charges are collected; **Pages H3983–85**

Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016: H.R. 5388, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 351 yeas to 4 nays, Roll No. 335; **Pages H3985–88, H4026**

Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016: H.R. 5389, to encourage engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 347 yeas to 8 nays, Roll No. 336; **Pages H3988–89, H4026–27**

Thoroughly Investigating Retaliation Against Whistleblowers Act: H.R. 4639, amended, to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide modifications to authorities relating to the Office of Special Counsel; **Pages H3990–91, H4026–27**

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10721 E Jefferson Ave in Detroit, Michigan, as the "Mary Eleanora McCoy Post Office Building": H.R. 5028, amended, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10721 E Jefferson Ave in Detroit, Michigan, as the ''Mary Eleanora McCoy Post Office Building'' **Pages H3991–92**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: ''To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10721 E Jefferson Ave in Detroit, Michigan, as the 'Mary E. McCoy Post Office Building'.''. **Page H3992**

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 522 North Central Avenue in Phoenix, Arizona, as the "Ed Pastor Post Office": H.R. 4010, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 522 North Central Avenue in Phoenix, Arizona, as the ''Ed Pastor Post Office''; **Pages H3992–93**

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 Rochester Street, Bergen, New York, as the Barry G. Miller Post Office: H.R. 4372, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 Rochester Street, Bergen, New York, as the Barry G. Miller Post Office; **Pages H3993–94**

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1301 Alabama Avenue in Selma, Alabama as the "Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building": H.R. 4777, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at

1301 Alabama Avenue in Selma, Alabama as the ''Amelia Boynton Robinson Post Office Building'';
Pages H3994–96

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 229 West Main Cross Street, in Findlay, Ohio, as the "Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building": H.R. 4925, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 229 West Main Cross Street, in Findlay, Ohio, as the ''Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building''; Pages H3996–97

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 N Broadway in Aurora, Illinois, as the "Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building": H.R. 4960, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 N Broadway in Aurora, Illinois, as the ''Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building''; Pages H3997–98

Amending title 5, United States Code, to expand law enforcement availability pay to employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Operations: H.R. 4902, to amend title 5, United States Code, to expand law enforcement availability pay to employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Operations;
Pages H3998–99

Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act: S. 2133, to improve Federal agency financial and administrative controls and procedures to assess and mitigate fraud risks, and to improve Federal agencies' development and use of data analytics for the purpose of identifying, preventing, and responding to fraud, including improper payments;
Pages H3999–S4000

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7802 37th Avenue in Jackson Heights, New York, as the "Jeanne and Jules Manford Post Office Building": H.R. 2607, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7802 37th Avenue in Jackson Heights, New York, as the ''Jeanne and Jules Manford Post Office Building''; Pages H4000–02

Inspector General Empowerment Act: H.R. 2395, amended, to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General; Pages H4002–06

Fiscal Year 2016 Department of Veterans Affairs Seismic Safety, Construction, and Leases Authorization Act: H.R. 4590, amended, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain major medical facility projects for which appropriations are being made for fiscal year 2016;
Pages H4006–08

Designating the Department of Veterans Affairs health care center in Center Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the "Abie Abraham VA Clinic": H.R. 5317, amended, to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs health care center in Center Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the ''Abie Abraham VA Clinic''; Pages H4008–10

Veteran Engagement Teams Act: H.R. 3936, amended, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary carries out Veteran Engagement Team events where veterans can complete claims for disability compensation and pension under the laws administered by the Secretary; Pages H4010–12

Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act: H.R. 5170, amended, to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private sectors to improve our Nation's social programs;
Pages H4012–21

Small Business Health Care Relief Act: H.R. 5447, amended, to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements;
Pages H4021–24

Amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit individuals eligible for Indian Health Service assistance to qualify for health savings accounts: H.R. 5452, amended, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit individuals eligible for Indian Health Service assistance to qualify for health savings accounts; and Pages H4027–28

Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016: H.R. 5456, amended, 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, and to ensure that children in foster care are placed in the least restrictive, most family-like, and appropriate settings.
Pages H4028–42

Female Veteran Suicide Prevention Act: The House agreed to take from the Speaker's table and pass S. 2487, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to identify mental health care and suicide prevention programs and metrics that are effective in treating women veterans as part of the evaluation of such programs by the Secretary. Page H4006

Presidential Messages: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared with respect to the Western Balkans is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2016—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 114–143).
Page H4024

Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared with respect to North Korea is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2016—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 114–144). **Pages H4024–25**

Discharge Petition: Representative Lowey presented to the clerk a motion to discharge the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget from the consideration of H.R. 5044, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2016 to respond to Zika virus (Discharge Petition No. 5).

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H4042.

Senate Referral: S. 2736 was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means. **Page H4052**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4025, H4026, H4026–27. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Committee Meetings

RESTORING ACCESS TO MEDICATION ACT OF 2015; FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 1270, the ''Restoring Access to Medication Act of 2015''; and H.R. 5485, the ''Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2017''. The committee granted, by record vote of 8–1, a closed rule for H.R. 1270. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–60 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–1, a structured rule for H.R. 5485. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read through page 265, line 9. The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or clause 5(a) of rule XXI, except beginning with '': Provided further'' on page 122, line 19, through ''2012'' on page 122, line 22. The rule provides that where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, a point of order may only be raised against the exposed provision and not the entire paragraph. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of the rule, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of the rule. Each amendment printed in the report 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. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of the rule. The rule provides that it shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule provides that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. In section 6, the rule provides that section 1201 of H.R. 5485 shall be considered to be a spending reduction account for purposes of section 3(d) of House Resolution 5. Finally, in section 7 the rule provides that during consideration of H.R. 5485, section 3304 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 shall not apply. Testimony was heard from Representatives Jenkins of Kansas, Crenshaw, Serrano, Davidson, Norton, Emmer of Minnesota, Mulvaney, and Sanford.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety, to hold hearings to examine pathways towards compliance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for ground-level ozone, including S. 2882, to facilitate efficient State implementation of ground-level ozone standards, and S. 2072, to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program under which the Administrator shall defer the designation of an area as a nonattainment area for purposes of the 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standard if the area achieves and maintains certain standards under a voluntary early action compact plan, 2:30 p.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold closed hearings to examine security assistance, focusing on cutting through a tangled web of authorities, 10:30 a.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine renewing communities and providing opportunities through innovative solutions to poverty, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 2785, to protect Native children and promote public safety in Indian country, S. 2920, to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancements in public safety services to Indian communities, and S. 3014, to improve the management of Indian forest land; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine accessing Department of Agriculture rural development programs in native communities, 2:15 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Drug Enforcement Administration, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the progress and challenges in modernizing information technology at the Department of Veterans Affairs, 2:30 p.m., SR–418.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Past, Present, and Future of SNAP: Evaluating Effectiveness and Outcomes in Nutrition Education'', 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, markup on Homeland Security Appropriations Bill for FY 2017; and Report on the Revised Interim Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY 2017, 10:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Military Cyber Operations'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Congressional Budgeting: Making Budget Enforcement More Effective'', 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 5529, the ''Accessing Higher Education Opportunities Act''; H.R. 5530, the ''HBCU Capital Financing Improvement Act''; H.R. 5528, the ''Simplifying the Application for Student Aid Act''; H.R. 3179, the ''Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act''; and H.R. 3178, the ''Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing entitled ''The Renewable Fuel Standard—Implementation Issues'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Full Committee, markup on H.R. 5510, the ''FTC Process and Transparency Reform Act of 2016''; H.R. 5111, the ''Consumer Review Fairness Act''; H.R. 5092, the ''Reinforcing American Made Products Act''; H.R. 5104, the ''Better Online Ticket Sales (BOTS) Act''; and H.R. 1301, the ''Amateur Radio Parity Act of 2015'', 5 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing entitled ''Venezuela's Crisis: Implications for the Region'', 1 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''The President's Visit to Vietnam: A Missed Opportunity to Advance Human Rights'', 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum Revitalization'', 10:30 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Examining the Allegations of Misconduct Against IRS Commissioner John Koskinen, Part II'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, hearing entitled ''Examining H.R. 2304, the SPEAK FREE Act'', 1 p.m., 2226 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Investigating the Appropriate Role of NEPA in the Permitting Process'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Federal Lands, hearing entitled ''Challenges and Potential Solutions for BLM's Wild Horse and Burro Program'', 2:30 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 4768, the ''Separation of Powers Restoration Act of 2016'', 1:30 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Ensuring Sound Science at EPA'', 1 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access, hearing entitled ''Audits and Attitudes: Is the IRS Helping or Hurting Small Businesses?'', 10:30 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing entitled ''FAA Oversight of Commercial Space Transportation'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing on the 2016 Annual Report of the Social Security Board of Trustees, 2 p.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 2578, Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on McConnell (for McCain) Amendment No. 4787 (to Amendment No. 4685) at approximately 10:30 a.m.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

10 a.m., Wednesday, June 22

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of the Veto Message on H.J. Res. 88—Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term ''Fiduciary''. Begin consideration of H.R. 5485—Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2017 (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of the following measure under suspension of the rules: H.R. 5210—Patient Access to Durable Medical Equipment Act of 2016.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

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.