United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 19, 2015 *No. 77*

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 19, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE BOST to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last week, The Washington Post ran a story titled, ''Defense Firm that Employed Drunk, High Contractors in Afghanistan May Have Wasted $135 Million in Taxpayer Dollars,'' by Colby Itkowitz. Colby writes:

''The defense contractor investigated in 2012 after cellphone videos surfaced of its employees drunk and high on drugs in Afghanistan may have misused almost $135 million of U.S. taxpayer money, an audit finds.''

The Hill further reported that:

''The company also did not comply with Federal procurement law, the audit found.''

Mr. Speaker, I have been coming down to this floor for weeks to highlight the waste, fraud, and abuse in Afghanistan, which John Sopko, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, has reported is worse now than ever.

The National Defense Authorization Act, which the House passed last week, authorized $42 billion for Afghanistan, which is one of the reasons I did not vote for the bill.

Why do we continue to spend billions of American taxpayer dollars in Afghanistan when infrastructure all over the United States is rapidly deteriorating? This past weekend, CBS' ''60 Minutes'' ran a segment on America's failing infrastructure and reported that 70,000 bridges in the United States have been deemed structurally deficient, according to the Federal Government. That is one bridge out of every nine. My constituents in eastern North Carolina continually experience frustration and concern over the Bonner Bridge, which is falling apart. This further highlights the waste and the failed policy in Afghanistan.

I know some Members of Congress will be upset that I am calling attention to the reckless spending in Afghanistan the NDAA authorized, but then why doesn't Congress stop sending billions of dollars to a failed state where young American men and women are being wounded and killed? Mr. Speaker, this includes the father of these two little girls who are on a poster beside me. Their names are Eden and Stephanie Balduf. Their daddy, Sergeant Kevin Balduf, was shot and killed in Afghanistan 2 years ago by the Afghan he was training.

Mr. Speaker, it just gets worse and worse. Those wasted billions of dollars should be allocated to fix American bridges and roads from falling apart and endangering American citizens. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the American people that, last year, the Obama administration signed a 10-year bilateral security agreement with Afghanistan strapping us with 10 more years of waste, fraud, and abuse; 10 more years of billions of dollars being wasted; 10 more years of young Americans being killed and wounded while the infrastructure in America is collapsing; 10 more years of veterans worrying about their benefits. There are so many needs here in America, so many needs that are not being met because we are wasting money overseas in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should debate and vote to stop the madness in Afghanistan on behalf of our soldiers and our men and women in uniform, their families, and the taxpayers of America.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said many times that Afghanistan is a graveyard of empires. I hope there is a headstone for America because that is where we are heading, to the graveyard in Afghanistan.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, after a rocky start this Congress, we have seen some signs of progress.

Earlier this session, the House leadership allowed the process to work when all Democrats joined many Republicans to rescue Homeland Security from the potential disastrous shutdown by cutting off funds.

Later, a decade-long struggle on the Medicare sustainable growth rate, the so-called doc fix, moved forward. An impasse that had lasted for years was

broken, and the solution was overwhelmingly approved by Members of both parties.

Well, now, we are facing yet another impasse, one that has haunted us far longer than a decade, transportation funding. The authority to spend for surface transportation programs expires May 31.

Just as I predicted last summer, the stopgap approach that we approved then would put us right back in the same spot this spring, cutting badly needed transportation projects this summer and the jobs that go with them.

America is falling apart and falling behind in part because you cannot pay for 2015 transportation needs with 1993 dollars, which was the last time we raised the gas tax. Thirty-two short-term funding extensions are evidence of a bipartisan failure for these 22 years to deal with the gas tax, and there is no meaningful alternative for transportation resources on the horizon.

Ironically, the solution is clear, thoroughly studied and broadly supported: raise the gas tax for the first time since 1993. The House Republican leadership doesn't have to do anything extraordinary, just allow the Ways and Means Committee to follow regular order. Let's listen to the experts; invite the stakeholders that build, maintain, and use our transportation system.

Listen to the heads of the AFL–CIO, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, leaders in transit, truckers, AAA, bicyclists, all of whom agree with President Eisenhower, who used the gas tax to start the highway trust fund and the interstate freeway system, and President Ronald Reagan, who increased gas tax a nickel, more than doubling it in 1992.

In fact, we can invite legislators from today. Six red Republican States have raised the gas tax already this year: Nebraska, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Utah, and South Dakota. State Senator Michael Vehle comes to mind.

The key is to have real hearings, like Congress used to conduct. Have a full week devoted to solving the transportation funding crisis. Bring in the witnesses, grill them, test their thoughts and theories, discuss real solutions, not gimmicks or ideologically driven fantasies.

Let's have serious work sessions and a markup. President Obama could help by establishing a marker that he will approve no further extensions past September 31.

It will not be less complex, expensive, or easier politically in 2016, 2017, or 2018. If this slides until 2016, which is the approach evidently favored by the Republican leadership, we will be struggling with this in the next Congress and the next administration.

This does not have to be an exercise in futility. We are seeing the leadership exhibited all across the country with 20 States that have stepped up, and as I mentioned, six red States already this year.

Now is the time for Congress to do its job. In fact, if we do our job, taking the solution that has been thoroughly vetted, studied, and widely supported by interest groups across the political spectrum, we are going to be able to solve this funding conundrum.

We will be able to rebuild and renew America, putting hundreds of thousands of people to work at family-wage jobs, while Congress helps make our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

I strongly urge that the House reject the approach that would simply dodge this problem for 2 more months, then slide to the end of the year and beyond. We should call the question now, establish the parameters.

This is something that is long overdue, that all of us can embrace, and America will be the better for it.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, the challenges we face today are different from the challenges we faced when Mental Health Awareness Month began decades ago, but now, it is more important than ever that we take time out of our busy schedules to speak about the prevalence of mental illness and understand the importance, as friends, as family members, and as a community, of discussing the common signs of mental illness.

Mr. Speaker, you may be surprised to learn, as I was, that 1 in 5 adults experience mental health problems each year; and, while each illness is unique, there are some common signs that you or a loved one could be suffering from mental illness, like difficulty concentrating or experiencing a change in sleeping habits.

As parents, we must make an effort to talk to our children about their emotions and their mental health, just as we care for our children's physical health, by encouraging them to eat well, get enough sleep, and exercise frequently.

Without a doubt, Mr. Speaker, America is one of the most blessed countries in the world. We are all offered the opportunities for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Raising healthy families, both physically and mentally, is one of the responsibilities that comes with those freedoms.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the more voices we have speaking up about mental health, the better we can eliminate stigma surrounding mental health conditions. The National Alliance on Mental Illness of North Carolina is asking individuals in my home State, North Carolina, to see the person and not the illness and pledge to be stigma-free.

It is time to end the silence and stigma often linked with mental health conditions, and I join them happily in this effort.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF B.B. KING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, B.B. King, a musical genius, has passed away.

When B.B. King was just a little boy down in Indianola, Mississippi, he stood up in the middle of a cotton field, and he said:

> One day, somebody is going to stand up and sing about me and play the guitar about me.

Then he said:

> You know, I reckon it will be myself. Yeah, I reckon it will be me.

B.B. King went on to become a worldwide icon of music; and people all over the world, regardless of race, creed, or color, appreciated and loved B.B. King. B.B. King influenced all the great ones, from Frank Sinatra to Elvis Presley; and Elvis Presley loved B.B. King.

Aretha Franklin, Sam Cook, Eric Clapton, Mick Jagger, even the Beatles and Muddy Waters, Bo Diddley, all of these musical legends were influenced by B.B. King.

□ 1015

B.B. King sung about the deep things of life. He sung about love—love lost and love gained. B.B. King sang, and he played the blues. A unique American cultural, musical genre, B.B. King.

Ladies and gentlemen, you know, B.B. King would say:

> Trouble in mind, I'm blue
> But I won't be blue always
> 'Cause I know the sun's gonna shine in my back door someday
> I am all alone at midnight, and the lights are burning low
> But the sun's gonna shine in my back door someday.

Mr. Speaker, the great classic of so many classics that he wrote and he sang was ''The Thrill is Gone.'' As he would say, ''The thrill is gone away.'' But, Mr. Speaker, the thrill of B.B. King and his life and his music and his great contributions as a genuine American hero will live on and on for generations to come. B.B. King's music will live on, and Lucille, his guitar, will live on.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, we thank God, Jehovah God Almighty, for sending B.B. King our way.

IRAN

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, a large and respected Iranian expatriate community has settled in California, and it has been my privilege to get to know some of them in recent years. They are part of an international diaspora of 5 million people who fled Iran after it fell to Islamic fascism 36 years

ago. The stories they tell are bloodcurdling.

One woman told of her cousin who had been rounded up in an antigovernment demonstration and taken to prison. After several years, the families were informed that their loved ones were to be released in the town square. When the excited families arrived for their long-awaited reunion, their sons were hanged before their eyes.

A doctor told me of his college days in Paris. He called home to tell his brother in Tehran of an anti-Khomeini demonstration. His brother was promptly arrested, tortured, and imprisoned for simply listening.

Now, a few months ago, after many years of silence, the brother in America received a call from his brother in Iran who wanted to tell him of the simmering unrest going on throughout that country. The American brother told him to shut up, to remember what happened the last time they had spoken so candidly. His brother in Tehran said: ''I don't care anymore. They can't arrest all of us.''

All of the Iranian expatriates I spoke with tell me the same thing: the economic sanctions and international isolation of the regime were bringing Iran to the brink of revolution.

And this brings us to the President's negotiation with Iran's fascist Islamic regime. Any agreement between Iran's leaders and the United States is meaningless because Iran's leaders' word is meaningless. Iran's government is a notoriously untrustworthy rogue state that has made it unmistakably clear that it intends to acquire nuclear weapons and, once acquired, to use them. The only way to avert this nightmare, short of war, is for the regime to collapse from within.

Over the last several years, the Iranian opposition has grown dramatically for two reasons: there is a strong and growing perception among the Iranian people that the Iranian dictatorship is a pariah in the international community, and the resulting international economic sanctions have created conditions that make the regime's overthrow imperative.

At precisely this moment in history, Barack Obama did incalculable damage by initiating these negotiations. By engaging this rogue state, President Obama has given it international recognition and legitimacy at just that moment when it had lost legitimacy in the eyes of its own people. Worse, by promising relief from economic sanctions, he has removed the most compelling reason the organized Iranian resistance had to justify the regime's overthrow.

It is not the outcome of the negotiations that matters because any agreement with Iran's conniving leaders is meaningless. It is the negotiations, themselves, that have greatly strengthened the regime, just when it was most vulnerable from growing opposition among its own people.

Now, the House just passed H.R. 1191 that purports to restore congressional oversight to these talks. I believe it completely missed the point.

First, our Constitution requires that any treaty be approved by two-thirds of the Senate. Well, that wasn't going to happen, so Mr. Obama simply redefined the prospective treaty as an agreement between leaders, an agreement with no force of law and no legal standing.

I fear the Congress has just changed this equation by establishing a wholly extra-constitutional process that lends the imprimatur of Congress to these negotiations with no practical way to stop the lifting of sanctions. Instead of two-thirds of the Senate having to approve a treaty, as the Constitution requires, this agreement takes effect automatically unless two-thirds of both Houses reject it—a complete sham.

But worse, I fear this bill gives tacit approval to extremely harmful negotiations that Congress, instead, ought to vigorously condemn and unambiguously repudiate.

We can only hope that in the days ahead what Churchill called ''the parliamentary democracies'' will regain the national leadership required to prevent these negotiations from producing what amounts to the Munich accords for the Middle East. That will require treating the Iranian dictatorship as the international pariah that it is, and it will require providing every ounce of moral and material support to the Iranian opposition that they need to rid their Nation of this fascist Islamic dictatorship, to restore their proud heritage, and to retake their place among the civilized nations of the world.

POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain once said that ''action speaks louder than words but not nearly as often.''

Since last week's tragic Amtrak accident, we have heard plenty of words about the need for stronger rail safety measures and investments in our infrastructure, but it is time for Congress to back up these words with action. It is time for Congress to put its money where its mouth is.

We know how to prevent tragic accidents like the one that happened on Amtrak last week. We even mandated new technology called positive train control that would have prevented it. But what Congress has refused to do is to pay to actually get it done.

Positive train control is a game-changer for rail safety. The technology would have likely prevented 140 train accidents that have caused more than 280 deaths and $300 million in property damage since 1969. But this safety technology is also incredibly complex and expensive to implement. We have mandated technology that is expected to cost billions, and we are forcing the Nation's railroads to foot the entire bill.

Much of this last week's focus has been on Amtrak, but despite last week's accident, Amtrak is actually on target to implement positive train control by the end of the year.

For the already cash-strapped commuter railroads around the country, it is a completely different story. For them, Congress' refusal to fund positive train control has pretty much stopped implementation in its tracks. Expected to cost commuter railroads nearly $3.5 billion, it is no wonder that over 70 percent of commuter railroads won't achieve positive train control implementation before this year's deadline.

Our commuter railroads are integral to the daily commute of millions of Americans. In fact, Amtrak's annual ridership pales in comparison to our Nation's commuter railroads. While Amtrak carries 30 million riders a year, commuter railroads carry close to 500 million.

In the Chicago area alone, Metra's ridership last year was over 80 million. With numbers like that, how can Congress justify mandating a policy that they know commuter railroads simply cannot afford while providing very little funding to help them do it?

This unfunded mandate is forcing commuter rails to sacrifice other investments that are crucial to railroad safety and efficiency. Fifty percent of commuter railroads are currently deferring other capital investments to implement positive train control.

And what happens when the commuters aren't able to implement this technology before the end of this year? They get penalized—fined. Instead of giving money to the commuters to pay for PTC, the Federal Government is actually going to end up collecting money from them for not being able to afford to do so.

For good reason, Congress mandated incredibly important and incredibly expensive new technology. But it has amounted to a lot of words and very little action.

The same 2008 law that mandated PTC also authorized $50 million a year in rail safety technology grants to help Amtrak and commuter railroads pay for this implementation, but in the 7 years since the law was passed, Congress has only appropriated funding once.

Mr. Speaker, $50 million a year wasn't enough then, and it is sure not enough now. That is why I introduced a bill with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) in March to reauthorize PTC funding at $200 million a year.

It is time for Congress to finish what it started. It is time for Congress to get serious about investing in our Nation's transportation infrastructure. And it is time for Congress to help our commuter railroads implement positive train control and prevent the kind of

tragedies that we saw on Amtrak last week.

RECOGNIZING MAX DEMBY

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Max Demby. Mr. Demby is a former congressional intern from my office, a University of Colorado senior, and an outstanding young man of character who was recently recognized by his community and local police for an act of heroism when he stopped a sexual assault in progress on his school campus.

Mr. Demby, who is from Cortez, Colorado, is a dedicated student, pursuing a degree in accounting at CU. He fills his time outside of the classroom with extracurricular activities such as internships and also works as a Ralphie handler at CU, which involves helping to manage the school mascot.

Late one evening, Mr. Demby was walking on campus when he happened to come across what looked to be an attempted sexual assault. Acting with bravery and determination, Mr. Demby took action and ran off the attacker.

Referencing the confrontation with the attacker, Mr. Demby humbly stated: ''I was able to be in the right place at the right time and do the right thing.'' By intervening, Max put himself in harm's way to help the victim, and his act of selflessness drastically reduced the irreparable damage that the criminal was intent on causing.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Demby's selfless act should not go unnoticed. He serves as an admirable example of what young men of character should be. By putting others before himself and by intervening to stop a crime without hesitation, he made his community and campus a safer place.

On behalf of the Third Congressional District and the State of Colorado, I would like to thank Mr. Demby for his selfless act of bravery.

HUNGER AMONG SENIORS GROWING IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at the end of March, I had the privilege of spending some time with the Highland Valley Elder Services' Meals on Wheels program in Northampton, Massachusetts, as part of their ''March for Meals Month'' to raise awareness about senior hunger.

I began my visit in the kitchen at the Walter Salvo Elder House, where an average of 550 healthy meals are prepared from scratch every weekday for delivery to homebound seniors and disabled residents of Hampshire County.

I had the opportunity to chat with Highland Valley director Allan Ouimet and nutrition program director Nancy Mathers. Then I helped volunteer driver Arthur Mongeon pack up the day's meals in insulated coolers to keep the food hot. This day's meal was homemade chicken covered in gravy, mashed potatoes, green beans, cranberry sauce, applesauce, and milk. The food looked and smelled delicious and reminded me of what my grandmother used to make.

I joined Arthur on his normal N1 route, making stops at 15 homes in Northampton. At each stop, I had the opportunity to deliver the meal and chat with the residents. It was an eye-opening experience, and I thoroughly enjoyed hearing people's stories.

Each meal delivered contains one-third of the daily nutritional recommendations. For many individuals, the meal they receive from Meals on Wheels is the only well-balanced meal they eat all day.

□ 1030

The individuals who receive these meals are low-income and often have significant health challenges that make it simply too difficult to prepare a full meal, never mind going out to the grocery store to shop.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting things I learned from my visit is that Meals on Wheels is so much more than just a meals program. People who are homebound—many, who live alone—look forward to the brief, daily visits from the volunteers. These visits lift their spirits and allow them to socialize, and volunteers can check in and see how they are doing. Because of programs like Meals on Wheels, seniors can stay in their own homes where they are most comfortable and live independently longer.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about food insecurity in this country, nearly everybody talks about children, and we are right to want to do everything we can to end childhood hunger. But lost in that narrative is the reality that, among the food insecure, the rising population is seniors. One in twelve seniors in our country is faced with the reality of hunger. That is 5.3 million seniors who don't have enough to eat. Many are living on fixed incomes that often force them to choose between prescriptions and food—or paying their medical bills or heating their homes.

Seniors and the disabled represent about 20 percent of those who receive Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, benefits. The average SNAP benefit for households with seniors is a meager $134 per month. Unfortunately, we also know that eligible elderly households are much less likely to participate in SNAP than other eligible households. Many seniors may not realize that they qualify for assistance, or they may simply be reluctant to ask for help.

Seniors have unique nutritional needs. Hunger is especially dangerous for seniors and can exacerbate underlying medical conditions. Food-insecure seniors are at increased risk for conditions like depression, heart attack, diabetes, and high blood pressure.

Mr. Speaker, May is Older Americans Month, and national organizations like Feeding America, the nationwide network of food banks, are focused on raising awareness about senior hunger through their #solveseniorhunger social media campaign.

In July, we will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Older Americans Act, which provides a range of critical services, including Meals on Wheels, that enable about 11 million older adults to stay independent as long as possible. To honor that significant anniversary, I hope that Congress will pass a strong reauthorization of OAA programs, which have been flat-funded over the past decade and without a long-term authorization since 2011. Demand for OAA programs and services continues to rapidly increase as our population ages, and to think that more and more seniors will experience hunger is heartbreaking. It is unacceptable in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the wonderful people and the work that they do at Highland Valley Elder Services throughout western Massachusetts. Every day they are making the lives of seniors a little better and a little brighter. We in Congress should do our part to ensure that our Nation's seniors don't go hungry. We should pass a strong reauthorization of the Older Americans Act and adequately fund programs like Meals on Wheels, and we should reject harmful cuts to SNAP that will disproportionately harm the most vulnerable among us: children, seniors, and the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, we should urge the White House to hold a White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Hunger to come up with a comprehensive plan to end hunger once and for all in this country. We can and we should end hunger now.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAMS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an issue that is coming upon us very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, many people across the Nation have talked about Social Security and Medicare and the trust funds going bankrupt for the retirement fund and Medicare sometime in 2033, 2034, but, Mr. Speaker, there is a more impending crisis coming down upon us. The Social Security disability trust fund is scheduled to go insolvent in 2016. That means, if we do nothing, what is going to happen in 2016 is millions of Americans across this Nation who receive those lifesaving disability benefits monthly will see a reduction in their benefits to the tune of 20 to 21 percent. That is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

Two years ago, as I serve on the Ways and Means Committee, I had an opportunity to question our Treasury Secretary, Jack Lew. I asked him the question 2 years ago: You know this crisis is on the horizon. I have read your testimony to this committee of Ways and Means, and I read the entire President's budget.

I said: Nowhere in there is a solution or a reference to this impending crisis. What is the solution the White House is offering?

Simply, what they propose is they are going to take the portion of our payroll taxes that goes to Social Security retirement that is paid by future retirees and use the $270 billion necessary to bail out the disability trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress, I had a private business. If you talk to any small-business owner across America, what they will tell you that is, it is robbing Peter to pay Paul because the Social Security retirement trust fund is on that same path to insolvency in 2033. So why would you take from one and use it to bail out another when both programs are in dire straits? So, Mr. Speaker, I said to Jack Lew this year, when I had an opportunity to question him, that is unacceptable. We need to do better not only in order to protect the Social Security retirees, who are near and dear to me, but also to those in the disability community that rely on these benefits.

The disability trust fund hasn't been reformed for decades. I care about those individuals deeply. And when I see disabled folks coming in to my office, as I have reached out to stakeholder groups and had conversations, what they tell me is they have a disability trust fund program that essentially penalizes them for trying to go back to work. That doesn't make sense.

We should be standing with the disability community if they have a capacity, a willingness, and a desire to go back to work. Our policies here in Washington, D.C., should say we are going to stand with you, we are going to encourage you, and we are going to applaud you, not penalize you, for doing that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that this crisis needs to be dealt with. It is time to lead. What we are looking for is input from across the country on ideas on how we can reform the disability trust fund, protect our Social Security retirees to the extent that we possibly can, and make sure that we have a disability trust fund that is designed and performing in the 21st century, a trust fund that says to the disabled community, we are with you, we are going to stand next to you, and we are going to give you the resources you need in order to live a great and fruitful life. At the same time we are going to look at our Social Security retirees and say to them, ''We are going to protect you.''

If we can't fix this crisis coming upon us in 2016, Mr. Speaker, then how in God's name can we fix the crises of Medicare and Social Security that are coming upon us in 2033 and thereabouts? There are millions of Americans that deserve a better answer than kicking the can down the road. Mr. Speaker, it is time to lead, and I rise today to ask all my colleagues to join me in that leadership role.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 37 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Gregory Goethals, S.J., Loyola High School, Los Angeles, California, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come today to this holy Chamber of democracy conscious of our great gifts and conscious of the great people for whom we use these gifts in service.

Come to us. Remain with us. Enlighten our hearts. Give us courage and strength to know Your will, to make it our own, and to live it in our own lives.

Enable us to uphold the rights of others, and never let us be misled by ignorance or corrupted by fear and favor. Unite us in the bond of Your unconditional love, and keep us faithful to all that is true.

May we always temper justice with Your love so that our decisions are pleasing to You and earn for us the reward promised to all of Your good and faithful servants.

And we ask this in the name of your Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND GREGORY GOETHALS

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Father Gregory Goethals, a member of the Society of Jesus and the president of Loyola High School in Los Angeles, to the United States House of Representatives. We thank him for delivering today's opening prayer.

Father Goethals is one of Los Angeles' finest public servants. He has dedicated his life to educating our country's next generation of leaders. Loyola High School, an all-boys school in the Pico Union area of Los Angeles, ranks as one of the finest institutions of secondary education in America.

At Loyola, under Father Goethals, young men are motivated to become ''educated'' in the full sense of the word. Not only do students at Loyola go on to complete college at the finest universities in America, but they graduate Loyola having donated more than 1.5 million hours of community service to inner city schools and neighborhoods over the past 25 years.

This year, Loyola High School will celebrate its 150th anniversary, making it the oldest continually operated educational institution in southern California. Under the visionary stewardship of Father Goethals, Loyola is poised to graduate yet another era of American heroes and leaders.

For that, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me to applaud Father Gregory Goethals for his dedication to his faith and to our leaders of tomorrow. We will remember his words of prayer this morning.

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Foreign Affairs:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 18, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: With my appointment to the House Financial Services Committee, I hereby resign from the House Agriculture Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee. It has been an honor to serve on both.

If there are any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

TOM EMMER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 19, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign from the Committee on Homeland Security.

Sincerely,

PATRICK MEEHAN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 272

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mr. Emmer of Minnesota.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Donovan.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. Donovan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

DISTINGUISHED EAGLE SCOUT AWARD

(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, this evening I will have the honor and the privilege of presenting the national Eagle Scout Association's Distinguished Eagle Scout Award to Mr. John Graham, president and CEO of the American Society of Association Executives.

The Distinguished Eagle Scout Award was established in 1969 to acknowledge Eagle Scouts who have received extraordinary national-level recognition or eminence within their field and have a strong record of voluntary service to the community.

Mr. Speaker, of the over 100 million Scouting alumni over the last century, less than 4 percent attain the rank of Eagle, and of these Eagles, only 1 in 1,000 will be awarded the Distinguished Eagle Scout honor. Renowned Distinguished Eagle Scouts include the president of the Boy Scouts of America, Secretary Bob Gates, Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer, President Gerald Ford, astronaut Neil Armstrong, and director Steven Spielberg.

As a fellow Distinguished Eagle Scout, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. John Graham on receiving this prestigious award.

SUPPORTING A LONG-TERM SOLUTION TO OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE CRISIS

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, for months we have been calling for a long-term surface transportation bill to replace the one that expires at the end of this month.

In recent weeks, I have joined many of my colleagues as we counted down the days left for Congress to act. Without a funding solution, the jobs of over 600,000 American workers are at risk. The gas tax, by the way, hasn't been raised in 20 years and is no longer sufficient to pay for repairs to dangerous roads, highways, bridges, and rail lines needed to protect Americans.

We are being asked to vote this week on a bandaid approach that only runs to July instead of a real solution to this infrastructure crisis. This is often what happens here, but it is not the best way to govern. States and local transit agencies need this certainty that long-term funding will be available as they make important decisions about construction projects to meet our needs well into the future.

Let's pass a long-term transportation bill now.

CONGRATULATING TOYOTA MOTOR MANUFACTURING IN PRINCETON, INDIANA

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a manufacturer in Indiana on a tremendous milestone for not just the company, but our communities in southern Indiana. Just this month, Toyota Manufacturing in Princeton, Indiana, impressively surpassed 5,000 employees, and the plant plans to add an additional 300 positions by the end of next year.

Mr. Speaker, these are good-paying jobs that support our families and our local economy. In addition to the workforce growth, the plant recently celebrated the production of its 4 millionth vehicle, which is a testament to the best workforce in America.

These dedicated hard-working men and women are making topnotch products in Indiana that are being shipped across the country and around the world.

INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the infrastructure investment can be an economic game changer. In western New York, the Federal highway bill funded the reconstruction of Fuhrman Boulevard, which reconnected our community with its waterfront, resulting in new private sector investment.

From Filmore Avenue and Ohio Street in Buffalo to Main Street in Williamsville, the Robert Moses Parkway in Niagara Falls, and Kenmore Avenue in Tonawanda, tens of millions of Federal dollars are contributing to transformative projects in our community. The construction of these projects has economic benefits as well. 660,000 jobs depend on Federal road and transit investment. Yet today, the House will extend, for just 2 months, the Federal transportation program that is weak and inadequate. We can do much better.

America needs a long-term bill that provides funding. We need to create jobs and bring our infrastructure to a state of good repair.

Last week, I introduced the Nation Building Here at Home Act to do just that. Congress should be humbled that it has allowed our infrastructure to fall into such disrepair, and we should use these 2 months to pass a long-term bill that America needs.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to observe Mental Health Awareness Month.

Approximately one in five Americans have a mental illness. That is roughly 43 million Americans. These invisible wounds are just as serious as physical ones, and it is vital we understand the health care needs of individuals living with mental illnesses.

Race, sex, age, gender—mental illnesses do not discriminate.

Many of the Americans who suffer from PTS and TBI are our veterans, our true heroes. As vice chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am familiar with their struggle. This is why I introduced the COVER Act, which recently passed in the Veterans' Affairs Health Subcommittee and which gives veterans choices to seek

alternative therapies and treatments for PTS and TBI.

As we observe Mental Health Awareness Month, let us all remember: these invisible wounds deserve our attention as much as the physical ones.

SAM HOUSTON HIGH SCHOOL SOCCER TEAM

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Sam Houston Texans on their soccer team and their hard-fought journey to the 6A University Interscholastic League semifinals. These 25 young men not only demonstrated their athletic talent but exemplified the teamwork and perseverance needed to complete a successful season.

I also want to congratulate Samuel Huerta, Rene Benitez, and Eddy Rodriguez of the Sam Houston High soccer team for being named to the first team 6A all-State team.

The young men of Sam Houston High School's soccer team continue a tradition of success through hard work, determination, and pride. I am proud to represent Arlington Independent School District and Sam Houston High.

To all the coaches, parents, teachers, and students of Sam Houston High School, congratulations on this incredible athletic accomplishment. You have made north Texas proud.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT

(Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in great support of S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

Today marks a significant milestone in the fight against human trafficking, and I am honored to see my amendment adopted into this legislation.

Having served as a nurse, I recognize that members of the medical community are the only outside aid to have direct contact with trafficking victims. Mr. Speaker, my amendment will educate and train health care professionals on proper techniques in order to better administer care. But, more importantly, it empowers members of the medical community so they can intervene on behalf of those being trafficked.

It has been an honor to work with my colleagues on this pivotal piece of legislation, and I am thrilled to see this legislation and my amendment move to the President's desk to be signed into law.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, there are only 2 legislative days left until the highway trust fund expires on May 31, and we do not have time to waste. Across the country, 6,000 critical construction jobs are in jeopardy, and 660,000 good-paying construction jobs are hanging in the balance.

In Michigan, we know how desperately this funding is needed. Seventeen percent of our roads are rated in good shape—only 17 percent; 38 percent of our roads are in poor, some dangerous—not fair, but poor, condition. It is unacceptable.

We must work together to find a long-term solution to repair our roads, bridges, and transit. Today our Republican colleagues have introduced a plan that just kicks it down the road again. This must be the last time. Funding the highway trust fund is about this Nation's future. It is about our competitiveness. It is about providing businesses and local and State governments the certainty that they need, and it is about good-paying jobs for working families.

It is time to end this culture of crisis and bring to the floor a long-term, sustainable solution to authorize the highway trust fund.

□ 1215

HOPEFULLY THE PRESIDENT CHANGES COURSE

(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, I am grateful for the President's decision to target Abu Sayyaf where Special Operations Forces heroically carried out a successful mission. I hope this is a change of course where the President takes action to stop further attacks on American families for a strategy of victory.

Sadly, the same day, ISIL murderers seized the Anbar capital of Ramadi, holding one-third of Iraq, revealing the President's failure to negotiate a Status of Forces Agreement. This follows the mass murder of Muslim pilgrims in Karachi, Pakistan, and Egyptian Christians in Libya. Radical Islamic attacks are increasing worldwide with the murder of Jews in Paris, the killing of troops at Fort Hood, and the stabbing in London.

Incredibly, the President continues negotiations with the murderous ideology of Tehran while they continue development of intercontinental ballistic missiles to fulfill their goal of death to America, death to Israel. Hopefully, the President will divert policies to establish a legacy of peace through strength. The President can avoid a legacy of continued attacks by terrorists who have declared war on the American people.

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

COMMEMORATING THE HONORABLE SERVICE OF WARREN JACKSON AND ROY DUMONT

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the honorable service of Mr. Warren Jackson and Mr. Roy Dumont, both who bravely fought in the United States Army in World War II. Both gentlemen, who are from my hometown of Flint, Michigan, are in Washington today to visit the World War II Memorial and to pay their respects to their fellow men and women in uniform who paid the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Jackson served honorably in the 3758th Quartermaster Truck Company throughout World War II and retired from the 41st Artillery in 1966. Mr. Dumont served honorably in the 87th Infantry Division, the Golden Acorns, from 1942 through 1945. These men risked their lives to defend freedoms that we cherish and often take for granted as Americans, and our country is and should be forever grateful to them for their service.

Mr. Jackson and Mr. Dumont, on behalf of the people of the Fifth Congressional District and on behalf of the entire 114th Congress, I thank you for wearing the uniform of the United States and defending this great Nation. You will forever have our lasting gratitude.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND OPEN MARKETS: KEYS TO A HEALTHY AND GROWING ECONOMY

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, policies that support free enterprise and open markets are the key to building a strong economy. Texas is a prime example.

For the 11th year in a row, Texas has been ranked by Chief Executive magazine as the number one State to relocate your business to; and for more than 20 years straight, Texas job creation has outpaced the rest of the country by a factor of 2 to 1.

Behind this lasting success are policies that have enhanced economic agreement and allowed Texas-made goods to be sold at markets across the world. It is no surprise Texas has also led the Nation in exports for the last 13 years running.

Allowing free enterprise and open markets to thrive has fueled decades of Texas growth. It has also created millions of good-paying jobs for Texas families. Let's build on these successful free market policies and bring lasting strength to our American economy.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, from city halls to the Halls of Congress, there is universal agreement that our national infrastructure, once the envy of the world, is eroding around us. It is eroding from simple political inattention and inaction.

We must stop short-term fixes for our long-term infrastructure. We must develop a sustainable funding solution to repair, to restore, and to upgrade our infrastructure.

The remaining question is: How do we solve it here and now? Are we going to do a responsible, long-term funding solution or are we just going to kick the can down the road? Are we going to wait for more bridges to collapse, for trains to derail, and more roads to fall into gridlock?

Mr. Speaker, we must come together to solve this problem. The safety of every American, the efficiency of every business, and the momentum of our national economy depend on us and are at risk.

HONORING FIRE CHIEF BILL MUND OF THE CITY OF ST. CLOUD, MINNESOTA

(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 in honor of Chief Bill Mund, who retires this week after more than a decade as fire chief of the City of St. Cloud, Minnesota.

Chief Mund is a St. Cloud boy through and through. He not only grew up in the Granite City, but after graduating from Apollo High School in 1977 and serving in the United States Navy, he returned to his hometown. He has dedicated his career to his hometown community, joining the St. Cloud Fire Department 32 years ago.

Before becoming St. Cloud's fire chief, he was the assistant chief to his predecessor, Mike Holman. Now as chief, he has overseen five fire stations and 63 firefighters that respond to approximately 4,000 incidents each year.

Thank you for all you have done for the St. Cloud community, Chief Mund. Enjoy your retirement. You deserve it.

HONORING AND REMEMBERING SIX HEROIC UNITED STATES MARINES

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember six heroic United States marines who died last week serving our country during a humanitarian lifesaving mission halfway around the world. They were killed in a tragic helicopter crash in Nepal as they delivered badly needed supplies to that nation's suffering earthquake victims.

Among the six are two men with close ties to Nebraska. One of the helicopter's decorated pilots, 29-year-old Captain Dustin Lukasiewicz, grew up in Wilcox, Nebraska. Prior to serving in Nepal, he was deployed in Afghanistan. Captain Lukasiewicz leaves behind his wife, Ashley, and one daughter. Ashley is also pregnant and due to deliver next month.

Twenty-two-year-old Lance Corporal Jacob Hug, a decorated combat videographer from Arizona, leaves behind several family members and close friends who live in Omaha and neighboring Council Bluffs, Iowa. Corporal Hug was capturing images of the Marine Corps' relief efforts in Nepal. Prior to deploying to Nepal, Corporal Hug filmed and photographed marines from South Korea, Thailand, Australia, Japan, Guam, and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in keeping these brave, selfless individuals and their families in your thoughts and prayers.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL R. MARTIN UMBARGER OF THE INDIANA NATIONAL GUARD

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Hoosier, a true patriot, and my friend, Major General R. Martin Umbarger of the Indiana National Guard. He is retiring at the end of this month.

General Umbarger started his career in public service as an enlisted soldier in the Indiana Army National Guard in 1969. Over the next three decades, Marty rose through the ranks and stood out as a remarkable leader. In 2004, then-Governor Mitch Daniels appointed him Adjutant General of the State of Indiana, where he served as the highest ranking military officer in our great State's National Guard for more than 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, General Umbarger is a true Hoosier hero. His shoes will be big ones to fill.

Best of luck in your retirement, sir, and thank you for your incredible service to our State and our Nation.

DEFERRED ACTION FOR PARENTAL ACCOUNTABILITY APPLICATIONS

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, today the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement was supposed to begin accepting Deferred Action for Parental Accountability, or DAPA, applications. It was to be a day of hope, not disappointment, for millions of families across the country. But because of a politically motivated decision by a Texas judge, implementation has been halted. Now 17,000 hardworking men and women in Clark County, Nevada, must wait for relief in fear of being torn from their families.

Mr. Speaker, Nevada is the State with the largest share of undocumented immigrants in its total population—210,000 people, or 7.6 percent, and that is equal to 10.2 percent of our workforce. They are our colleagues, our neighbors, our classmates, and our friends, and they play a vital role in the success of our community.

Congress needs to pass comprehensive immigration reform so families across the country and in Nevada can come out of the shadows, legally work, go to school, and contribute to the only community they call home.

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I realize, like my friends across the aisle, that we find ourselves in a crisis situation of our own making. The Federal highway trust fund is set to run out of money, and with our current infrastructure needs, the fund's moneys are simply not enough. But instead of addressing the issue during the last several Congresses, short-term fixes have been passed, and Congress has kicked the can down the road. We need more than rhetoric on the importance of infrastructure. We need solutions.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday I will introduce the Prioritizing American Roads and Jobs Act. This bill will roll back 100 percent Medicaid expansion reimbursement rates to be equal to traditional Medicaid rates, with the savings transferring to the highway trust fund. This bill will add $15 billion a year to the trust fund and put it back on the path to financial stability for the long term, while freeing up $150 billion for deficit reduction over the next 10 years.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of continuing investments in early childhood education.

Yesterday marked the 50th anniversary launch of Head Start. Head Start programs give students an opportunity to start out strong and help to close the achievement gap that plagues many low-income communities.

As a mother, grandmother, and retired educator, I recognize that early education provides students with the resources they need in the most critical learning years. More than 27 percent of the people in my district live below the poverty line. Students in low-income families have obvious disadvantages that are exacerbated when they arrive in kindergarten less prepared than their peers.

More than 3,000 children in my district benefit from Head Start programs. These programs give many children the jump-start and the confidence

they need. Research shows that children enrolled in high-quality education programs are more likely to graduate from high school, go to college, and secure high-paying jobs.

Mr. Speaker, an investment in early education is an investment in our future. I will continue fighting for early learning initiatives and commonsense education reform that prepare all of our students to succeed, and I call on my colleagues to do the same.

COMMENDING CADET JONATHAN CHASE STRICKLAND

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend Cadet Jonathan Chase Strickland of the University of North Georgia Corps of Cadets for being selected as the top ROTC cadet in the Nation. Cadet Strickland was also selected as the United States Army Cadet Command's Cadet of the Year for 2015.

Mr. Speaker, Chase was selected out of 5,617 Army ROTC cadets across the Nation based on outstanding performance in physical fitness, campus leadership, and academic record. A factor in his selection was his successful completion of the Army's Leadership Development and Assessment Course.

Chase is a native of Gainesville, Georgia, attended North Hall High School, and will graduate this spring from my alma mater, the University of North Georgia, with a degree in international affairs. He will be commissioned into the Army as a 2nd lieutenant in military intelligence. He plans on attending the Infantry Officer Leadership School at Fort Benning and the Ranger School.

After watching Chase grow up, knowing his father and his grandfather and his fine family, it is not surprising that he rose to the top. Please join me in congratulating Cadet Strickland on this truly great accomplishment, and wish him the very best and a successful career of service to our country.

□ 1230

CONGRESS MUST ADDRESS OUR BROKEN IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, today should have been a great day of celebration of hope and relief for the millions of hard-working immigrant families across the country who would be able to register for the expanded DACA and DAPA programs.

DACA's expansion and the new DAPA program would provide welcome relief to thousands of hard-working immigrant families, allowing them to pay a fine, register, get right with the law, and work legally. Unfortunately, they sit in limbo while they wait for a judge to decide the fate of the DACA and DAPA programs.

It should be incumbent on any politician who seeks to thwart or undermine these programs to propose a legislative solution through Congress. That is everybody's first choice. Only Congress can provide a pathway to citizenship. Only Congress can permanently replace our broken immigration system with one that works, one that restores the rule of law, one that secures our border, and one that provides a pathway to citizenship.

I hope the fifth circuit will rule on the side of justice and the rule of law by lifting the injunction; but no matter what happens, this judicial mess is just further proof of Congress' failure to act.

I call upon Congress to address our broken immigration system and move forward with restoring the rule of law.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 19, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 19, 2015 at 9:30 am.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 43.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,
Deputy Clerk.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 19, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 19, 2015 at 11:27 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2252.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,
Deputy Clerk.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1806, AMERICA COMPETES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2250, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2353, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 271 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 271

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1806) to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-15. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the

fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2353) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, H. Res. 271, providing for consideration of three important bills.

This rule provides for consideration of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015 and the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2016 under structured rules, and the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015 under a closed rule. It is important to note that this combined rule allows for separate consideration of each bill. This House will separately debate and consider these important issues.

The Legislative Branch Appropriations bill is traditionally considered under a structured amendment process, and that practice is continued today.

The America COMPETES Act makes a dozen amendments in order, with more than half—eight amendments—coming from Democratic sponsors.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1806 is a fiscally responsible proscience bill that reauthorizes civilian research programs at the Department of Energy, the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.

The bill keeps our Nation competitive on the global stage and works to refocus the Federal Government's primary scientific role to fund basic research. This reprioritization of basic research will help ensure future U.S. economic competitiveness and security and will spur additional private sector technological innovation, which is crucial to the United States remaining a world leader in scientific and technological advances.

This bill keeps overall funding for these programs equal to the fiscal year 2015 appropriated levels and is consistent with the caps set by the Budget Control Act, prioritizing taxpayer investment in basic research without increasing overall Federal spending.

The emphasis this legislation places on Federal investment and research in the physical sciences and engineering helps to develop and advance knowledge and technologies used in fields by scientists who are dedicated to improving the lives of all Americans.

I have seen firsthand the importance of these investments while visiting the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, one of our 17 national labs, which I am proud to represent in my district, Washington's Fourth District.

The work being done at PNNL and at the national labs and research universities all across the country is critical to our country's future, and the prioritizations and reforms on this bill will enhance the work being done to the benefit of all Americans.

Additionally, H.R. 1806 reduces by $1 billion the administration's large and unjustified program, such as late stage commercialization, which picks winners and losers that compete with the private sector.

We must be responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars, and this legislation will prevent duplicative and wasteful research activities by requiring the Department of Energy to certify that the work being done is original and has not already been conducted by another Federal agency.

Overall, the America COMPETES Act will reestablish the priority of basic research in the core physical sciences and biology in the Nation's civilian science agencies. This bill sets the right priorities for our Nation's civilian research and will promote U.S. innovation, ingenuity, and competitiveness, all without increasing our national debt or deficit.

This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 2250, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2016. This legislation provides funding for all operations of the United States House of Representatives, the U.S. Capitol complex, the Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, and the many other agencies that are so important to the day-to-day functions of Congress.

H.R. 2250 provides the legislative branch with $3.3 billion in fiscal year 2016—the same amount as fiscal year 2014, as well as fiscal year 2015—continuing this Chamber's commitment to leading by example during these times of huge deficits and out-of-control debt.

The activities this bill funds are critical to the operations of the Capitol complex, which must be protected, cared for, and maintained. Visitors from my district in central Washington, as well as visitors from across the country and throughout the world, travel countless miles to visit this remarkable institution, which is a symbol of democracy and freedom for so many.

For these and many other reasons, we must ensure that the Capitol remains in this pristine condition and is able to withstand the test of time so that many future generations are able to visit this truly unique and historic place.

□ 1245

Finally, this rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015.

H.R. 2353 will extend the highway trust fund's expenditure authority for 2 months—from May 31 to July 31. It will also provide an extension for many important Federal highway and public transportation programs, such as the motor carrier and highway safety programs as well as the hazardous materials transportation program, through July 31.

Last August, Congress passed and the President signed the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, which was intended to provide enough funding for the highway trust fund to remain solvent through May 31 of this year. However, the funding is now lasting longer than was originally predicted, and this bill will extend the trust fund's expenditure authority so that transportation spending is able to continue through July while Congress works to find a solution that will ensure the trust fund remains solvent for years to come. A constructive dialogue in Congress is needed on this issue, one that will give States the certainty they need to build the roads, the bridges,

and other infrastructure that our communities and our economy need to thrive in the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule. I support its adoption, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills.

We should be celebrating today the start of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals expansion and the Deferred Action for Parents of American Citizens program that President Obama launched in light of the continued failure of this Congress to finally fix our broken immigration system. This Congress hasn't brought forth a single immigration bill, not secured our border, not ensured that employers follow our law and only employ legal American workers; but, rather, at every opportunity, it has sought to thwart the executive branch, doing what they can with the powers they have under our U.S. Constitution to restore the rule of law without the help of this body.

These three bills before us today are yet another way of kicking the ball down the road and refusing to address our broken immigration system, a problem that will continue to get worse until Congress steps up and solves it.

I hope that the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program's expansion, known as DACA—already a great success with additional success along the way with the new expansion—and the Deferred Action for Parents of American Citizens program, or DAPA, are soon unclogged by the courts to at least reduce the size of this sometimes insurmountable problem that Congress continues to refuse to tackle. That is the alternative.

If Congress continues to bring up three bills every week and if none of them are about border security and none of them are about immigration, do you know what? Instead of there being 10 million people here illegally, there are going to be 15 or 20 million here 10 years. That is exactly where this Republican Congress is leading us—towards an America where, someday, there might be more people here illegally than there are here legally. Think about that, Mr. Speaker.

This first bill that we are considering before us today is not immigration reform. It is, instead, a 2-month extension of the current surface transportation authorization. Our transportation system is the lifeblood of our country. It dictates our ability to move and manage not only people but information, ideas, products, industries, commerce, jobs. By failing to pass a long-term transportation reauthorization, which will ensure the security of our highways and transit systems for more than 60 days, we are putting our Nation's economic lifeblood in jeopardy.

The second bill we will see before us today is not immigration reform. The second bill, instead, is a partisan attempt to inject the ideological priorities of my Republican colleagues into education and research, priorities that are opposed by the very titans of research for whom this bill is ostensibly designed. I will talk more about that in a moment.

Of the third bill before us today, I am hopeful. Is it immigration reform? I ask the gentleman from Washington: Is the third bill before us today immigration reform? I am happy to yield to the gentleman for an answer.

In reclaiming my time, he is speechless. He is speechless because he knows the truth: the third bill is not immigration reform. The third bill is actually the funding bill for the legislative branch of government. Maybe if the legislative branch of government were actually doing its job we would have an immigration reform bill before us; but, no, my colleague from Washington is speechless because he knows as well as I do that this is not immigration reform, that it is, instead, a funding bill for Members of Congress' salaries and the salaries of our staffs. I guess that is more important than securing our border. I guess that is more important to the Republicans than restoring the rule of law.

Let me get into these three bills.

The Surface Transportation Act would extend the authority of the government to fund our highways for 2 months—only for 2 months. What that means is we risk wasting $51 billion and, in jeopardizing that funding, risk over 660,000 jobs by failing to do a long-term authorization of the highway trust fund.

We all have an interest in this. Any one of us can talk about the importance of transportation in our districts. If you have ever been to Colorado, you will know that there is one major artery to get to our world-class ski facilities and unparalleled 14,000 peaks from the metro area—Highway 70. If you have ever taken it, particularly on a Friday, or have come back on a Sunday, you might very well have sat in your car at a dead stop. If you have been to Fort Collins, which is the largest city in my district and is home to one of our great universities, Colorado State University, you might have found similar circumstances around the long rush hour on Highway 25 north. Waiting 45 minutes in traffic to go 5 or 10 miles is something my constituents do every day—doubling, tripling, quadrupling their commuting time.

These stories aren't unique to Colorado. They aren't unique to my district. I will bet every Member of Congress can share the importance of transportation in their districts. That is why, ostensibly, every Member of Congress says, ''We want transportation. We support roads.''

There are no Republican roads and Democratic roads. There are roads. Yet, by continuing to fail to provide a long-term funding structure for them, we are playing games with the livelihoods of the American people, hurting our own economic lifeblood, wasting people's time as they are sitting in traffic, throwing into jeopardy the status of the jobs of contractors and subcontractors, and risking lives by continuing to repair our necessary bridges and infrastructure that have accumulated safety deficits. I urge my colleagues to consider the irresponsibility inherent in this punt.

I would also like to talk about the America COMPETES Act. Now, the original genesis of this bill, which was passed in 2007, was to help America compete in an increasingly global environment across the sciences and to ensure our innovative spirit.

My district is a hub for scientific research, and we are excited to have the University of Colorado at Boulder, Colorado State University, NOAA, NREL, and NCAR. Research that is done in Colorado has ramifications and positive effects across the country, like our space weather lab in Boulder, which helps make sure that air traffic controllers and pilots have access to up-to-the-minute information about solar flares that could alter their trajectories in realtime.

This bill, instead of continuing the bipartisan legacy that the original COMPETES Act sets out or instead of replacing our broken immigration system with one that works for our country, seems to cherry-pick winners based on ideology and overturns the historic priorities of the bill. Why else would the dean of Research at CU-Boulder oppose this bill? Why else would our widely respected Secretary of Energy oppose this bill? Dozens of the largest scientific organizations and coalitions—this is supposed to be a science bill—are saying, ''Don't give us this bill. It will hurt science in our country.'' How does that even make any sense?

The efforts of the Republicans to hijack this legislation for ideological interests are utterly transparent. Scientists are saying, ''Go home Federal Government. Don't help us with this bill.'' Again, in yet another instance of Federal overreach, the Republicans are imposing their versions of science on those in the field who are doing work.

Finally, this rule brings forth H.R. 2250, also a bill that is not immigration reform. It does nothing to secure our border, but it does make sure that Members of Congress get paid. I am sure Republicans can go home happy about that. It makes sure our hard-working staff gets paid, the committees get paid, and the buildings get repaired.

No, I am not against those things. Those are fine things. If we had an all-volunteer legislature, we probably

wouldn't have the fine caliber of statesmen we have tackling our national problems here today. But it is not immigration reform, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't secure our border, and it will only continue to increase the number of people who are here illegally in our country while Congress continues to punt and to undermine the efforts of the President to do what he can with the powers he has through DACA and DAPA, which were scheduled to start today.

I do want to point out that the underlying draft of this Legislative Branch Appropriations Act is another example of the failure to address many of the needs of our country. There was an effort by my colleague DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ to put forward an amendment to ensure that House cafeteria workers receive a living wage. You would think we would want to be an example of a model employer. I would hope that we, as custodians of the U.S. Capitol, would take some pride in that we are a model employer; we are a little microcosm of what employers should do, best practices. But there is a Senate employee who is homeless because, on the salary he gets, he can't even afford to rent here in Washington. People who work every day here in the Nation's Capital are living in poverty.

I think that we can do better as a model employer. If this were my company, I would take no pride in that. I would like to think that this is our company. It is the United States of America, and we are the board. Let's have employment policies that we as employers can be proud of.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and to, instead, bring to the floor immigration reform or better versions of these bills: a science bill that, maybe, scientists support, maybe; or a transportation bill that maybe funds our highways for more than 2 months so that people can plan. It is time we begin working for the American people, not against them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I share the gentleman from Colorado's opinion that the issue of immigration reform is huge, that it is one of the biggest issues facing this country today. I agree that we need to give it adequate debate and time and consideration; although, today is not the day.

Mr. Speaker, we recently heard from colleagues on the other side of the aisle that combining multiple bills in a single rule can lead to fragmented and confusing debate.

In an effort to refocus our debate today, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me time, and who is a former member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee himself.

H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, is a pro-science, fiscally responsible bill that sets America on a path to remain the world's leader in innovation. This bill reauthorizes civilian research programs at the National Science Foundation, at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, at the Department of Energy, and at the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Since January, the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee has held numerous hearings that have provided input into this bill. This includes budget hearings with the NSF Director, the Acting NIST Director, the Secretary of Energy, and the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. But our consideration of the provisions in this bill began long before last year.

In the last Congress, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee held numerous hearings on the topics addressed by this bill as well, and many of the provisions in the bill were debated during the Science, Space, and Technology Committee's consideration of the first act last Congress, which the Science, Space, and Technology Committee passed in May.

Title I of the bill reauthorizes the National Science Foundation for 2 years and provides a 4.3 percent increase for research and related activities. The bill prioritizes funding for the directors of biology, computer science, engineering, and mathematics and physical sciences, and it recognizes the need to make strategic investments in basic R&D for the U.S. to remain the global leader in science and innovation.

The bill reprioritizes research spending at the National Science Foundation by reducing funding for the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Directorate and Geosciences. The bill, instead, focuses funds on the physical sciences from which there are almost all of the scientific breakthroughs that drive new technology, new businesses, industries, and job creation and that spurs innovation.

Tight Federal budget constraints require all taxpayers' dollars to be spent on high-value science in the national interest. Unfortunately, the National Science Foundation has funded a number of projects that do not meet the highest standards of scientific merit—from climate change musicals, to evaluating animal photographs in National Geographic, to studying human-set fires in New Zealand in the 1800s—and there are dozens of other examples.

□ 1300

The bill ensures accountability by restoring the original intent of the 1950 NSF Act and requiring that all grants serve the national interest.

Title II represents the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's commitment to enhancing STEM education programs. A healthy and viable STEM workforce is critical to American industries and ensures our future economic prosperity. The definition of STEM is expanded to include computer science, which connects all STEM subjects.

Title III includes three bipartisan bills the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology approved in March. Those bills—H.R. 1119, the Research and Development Efficiency Act; H.R. 1156, the International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2015; and H.R. 1162, the Science Prize Competitions Act—passed the committee by voice vote. Two of these bills were sponsored by Democrats.

Title IV supports the important measurement standards and technology work taking place at the National Institute for Standards and Technology laboratories, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, and the recently authorized Network for Manufacturing Innovation.

Title V reauthorizes the Department of Energy Office of Science for 2 years at a 5.4 percent increase over fiscal year 2015. It prioritizes basic research that enables researchers in all 50 States to have access to world-class user facilities, including supercomputers and high-intensity light sources. This bill also prevents duplication and requires DOE to certify that its climate science work is unique and not being undertaken by other Federal agencies.

Title VI reauthorizes the DOE applied research and development programs and activities for fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017.

H.R. 1806 refocuses some spending on late-stage commercialization efforts within the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy to research and development efforts.

Title VII proposes to cut red tape and bureaucracy in the DOE technology transfer process. Currently, the private sector has little incentive to build reactor prototypes due to regulatory uncertainty from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

H.R. 1806 sets the right priorities for Federal civilian research, which enhances innovation and U.S. competitiveness without adding to the Federal deficit and debt. I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I was told the gentleman from Washington shares a desire to address the broken immigration system. I know the chair of the Committee on Rules, Mr. SESSIONS, has indicated similarly. Just as I have posed to Mr. SESSIONS in the past, I would like to pose to the gentleman from Washington if he has a timeframe for when we can expect immigration legislation here on the floor of the House.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington to answer that.

Well, sometimes silence speaks louder than words.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a

member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to just one aspect on the floor of this rule. My colleague from Washington made a statement that we are dealing with a 2-month extension because we found some extra money to let it last longer.

No, the reason that we are having a 2-month extension is because we have not been able to resolve this problem. I made the remarks on the floor of the House last summer that extending it to May is not going to get us anyplace, and we would be right back in the same spot. I could dust off the same speech.

What is happening is that you have a little tiny bit of give, but it doesn't mean that we have enough money and that there aren't consequences. There are States across the country, because of the uncertainty of the Republican funding approach, that are already cutting back on construction projects this summer.

This will be the 33rd short-term funding extension. It is a symbol of the failure of my Republican colleagues to do anything in the 55 months that they have been in charge to deal with transportation funding. They have never even had a hearing on transportation finance.

Now, I will say that over the last 22 years there have been some bipartisan failures to step up to it. Ironically, the solution is clear, thoroughly studied, and broadly supported: raise the gas tax for the first time since 1993.

The Republican leadership doesn't have to do anything extraordinary, just allow the Committee on Ways and Means to follow regular order. Have some serious committee hearings. Listen to the experts. Invite in the stakeholders that build, that maintain, and use our transportation system. Let's have at the witness dais heads of the AFL–CIO, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—who agree we should raise the gas tax—the head of transit, the American Trucking Association, AAA, bicyclists.

They could refer back to great Republican leaders of the past. Dwight Eisenhower established the gas tax to fund the Interstate Highway System. Ronald Reagan, the conservative icon, called Congress back in November of 1982 to more than double the gas tax, which Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill did.

In fact, my Republican friends could involve Republican leaders today. Six Republican States have raised the gas tax already this year: Idaho, Iowa, Nebraska, Utah, South Dakota, Georgia.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Not exactly liberal bastions.

This is something that we can and should do. Let's step up, solve this problem, avoid this continual uncertainty for people around the country. They deserve better.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, just a note to my colleague from Colorado, I agree that this is an important issue that he keeps bringing up of immigration, and I will certainly ask my chairman for any timeframe, and I will look forward to working with him and all my colleagues on solving this important issue.

But today we are talking about highways. We are talking about science. We are talking about keeping this place running smoothly.

To get us back on subject, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me the time. I am glad to hear I am getting us back on subject.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule on H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015. This is fiscally responsible legislation that cuts wasteful government spending and prioritizes innovative scientific research and development.

A key reform included in the America COMPETES Act is reining in spending at the Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, or EERE. EERE's budget has grown by almost 60 percent in the last decade. President Obama's fiscal year 2016 budget request for EERE is over $2.7 billion, with a B, which is a requested increase of another $800 million over last fiscal year.

The Department of Energy's approach to energy research and development has also become more and more unbalanced with the EERE's continued growth. In fact, the President's proposed budget for EERE R&D is more than double the budgets for nuclear, fossil, and electricity R&D combined. In addition, the work prioritized by EERE is far too focused on increasing the use of today's existing technology. Many EERE programs are focused on reducing market barriers for existing technology or funding R&D activities already prioritized by the private sector, not conducting the fundamental research to build towards future breakthroughs.

With our national debt at $18 trillion and rising, and spending caps guiding budgets on everything from energy to national defense, Congress cannot rubberstamp this kind of out-of-control spending. It is time to adjust the Department of Energy's budget to reality.

The America COMPETES Act refocuses Federal investment on energy research and development, not deployment of today's technology. By funding the basic research and development prioritized in the America COMPETES Act, the Department of Energy can build a foundation for the private sector to bring innovative energy technology to the market and thereby grow the American economy.

So I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this rule and ''yes'' on H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS), the ranking member on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee on Space.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today both as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I can't think of a worse rule, frankly, that we could bring to the floor. We could have had bipartisan cooperation on America COMPETES so that we can invest in our science and our research and our technology, and yet that is not what is happening here today.

As to the Highway and Transportation Funding Act, it doesn't allow for any amendments to the legislation that would fix and fund our Nation's crumbling infrastructure with predictability, stability, and for the long term. The highway trust fund and the current surface transportation authorization, as we know, are set to expire on May 31, leaving just 3 legislative days to extend it or 4,000 transportation workers will be laid off and work would stop on Federal highway programs all across the country right in the middle of prime construction and building season.

Now, the responsible among us know that we can't walk away from the highway trust fund. Millions of jobs and thousands of businesses hang in the balance. But we also know that what is before us today is the least most responsible way to fund our infrastructure—2 months at a time. Can you believe it? Two months at a time, Mr. Speaker; no long-term projects, no opportunity for planning, no relief for workers, and at another pivotal moment in the construction season.

As a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, today I am joining Ranking Member DEFAZIO and ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON in introducing the GROW AMERICA Act on behalf of the administration. This bill would serve us well to provide $478 billion over 6 years for our highways, bridges, transit, rail, and highway safety programs. This long-term and robust funding bill is a 45 percent increase over our current spending on our tatterdemalion and crumbling infrastructure. It is the type of plan that we have to ensure that our major-league economy does not have the infrastructure that wouldn't even fit children playing T-ball.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle twiddle their thumbs 2 months at a time, America is falling apart. Once one of the leaders in the world in quality infrastructure, we are now number 16, according to the World Economic Forum. According to the American Society of Engineers, the overall assessment of our Nation's infrastructure ranks with a whopping D-plus.

Now look at my home State of Maryland: 5,305 bridges are deficient; they are falling apart. That is 27 percent of the bridges in our State. Just a few months ago, one of my constituents was driving along Suitland Parkway, minding her own business, when a chunk of cement fell and hit her car hood because the bridge was in disrepair.

Though it is not my preference, we have to extend the highway trust fund today, and I challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to use this time to go through a bipartisan negotiation on how to pay for our long-term and fully funded investments to construct and rebuild our roads, bridges, transit, and rail infrastructure.

Thirty-four extensions of the highway trust fund, 52 votes against ACA. Come on, let's get serious. Move away from the kids' table; get to the grown-up table and fund our highway transportation and infrastructure.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the reason you hear so many people talking about different topics is there are three completely unrelated topics in this single rule. There is the funding for all of the legislative salaries and the people who work in this building, that is one bill; another one funds roads, but only for 2 months, across the whole country; and the other one is the one that they say is for science but all the scientists oppose. So that is why it is so confusing. There are three completely unrelated bills in here, none of which do a thing about illegal immigration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

□ 1315

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we need a surface transportation bill, but the last thing in the world we need is this bill, a 2-month extension.

If this short-term plan was a necessary step to get us to a long-term bill, that would make some sense; but, as speakers have noted, this is the 33rd time in the past 5 years where Congress has failed to provide long-term and sustainable funding for our surface transportation needs. This is a habit; it is not a plan.

Mr. Speaker, this bill follows on the heels of the bill we passed 9 months ago, and that was a 9-month extension of surface transportation paid for by ''pension smoothing.'' You can't make that up.

We lowered the obligation corporations pay to pensions in order to put money in the highway transportation fund. We created a pothole in pensions to fix potholes in the highways; it makes no sense, but now, we are here on a 2-month plan—a good job, Congress.

We were given some assurances that we would have a long-term bill. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there are good long-term plans out there. Congressman RENACCI has a plan, the President has a plan, as do Congressman DELANEY and Congressman BLUMENAUER. There are policies out there. We don't need a policy debate. We need a decision.

The reality is we have got to make Congress work, do its job, and pass a long-term funding bill that is going to allow this country to modernize its airports, fix its bridges, make its railroads safer, and dredge our ports deeper.

We have to bring our 20th century infrastructure into the 21st century, and the only way we are going to get that done is by stepping up to the responsibility that we have to pass a long-term funding plan.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the Speaker himself that it is a tough job putting a bill on the floor. It always is tough when Congress has to pull the trigger on what that revenue source is going to be.

I will support any plan that is reasonable and sustainable. The only plan I won't support is no revenue plan at all.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress, I worked at the Economic Development Board for Tacoma, and in my office, I had a sign that said: ''We are competing with everyone, everywhere, every day, forever.''

That sentiment was echoed in a report by the National Academies last decade called, ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm,'' which was the main influence behind the bipartisan America COMPETES Act. The report provided us with a pathway on how to increase American competitiveness so that we don't fall behind our global competitors.

Its finding were stark. The report told us that, if we are going to compete as a nation, if we want innovation to happen here in America, if we want jobs to be created here in America, we need to make significant investments in basic research and double the funding dedicated toward research and development. That is from that report.

That is not what we are doing here today. In fact, funding for basic research in the bill that we are currently debating fails to keep up with the rate of inflation. It fails to live up to the standards set forth in that bipartisan report.

When this bill was first considered in the Science, Space, and Technology Committee last Congress, a group of my fellow members of the New Democratic Coalition developed a set of principles we thought should guide a reauthorization of America COMPETES legislation.

These principles included increasing funding for basic research, stabilizing funding for research and development, and supporting policies that spark innovation.

We were disappointed when the FIRST Act strayed away from these policies and are disappointed this America COMPETES legislation fails to make investments needed for America to remain competitive in the 21st century.

The amendment I introduced, along with my colleagues, does not call for doubling the funding for research and development in the underlying bill or put funding on pace with what was outlined in ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm.'' The amendment we put forward was a compromise. Unfortunately, this amendment was made out of order and not brought to the floor for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to make critical investments in research and innovation, America will fall behind. Let's take up a bill that lives up to the spirit of bipartisanship and the goals laid out in ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm.'' Let's compete everywhere, every day, forever.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), who represents one of the strongest science clusters in the United States in San Diego.

Mr. PETERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our country, as Mr. KILMER pointed out, is facing an ever-increasing global competition for scientific research. We can't afford to cede the leading edge we have built up in innovation to other countries, but the current level of funding in the underlying COMPETES bill does not provide adequate and constant funding for our basic scientific endeavors.

It cuts energy efficiency and renewable energy by 37 percent, cuts electric grid reliability research by 30 percent, and cuts the Advanced Research Projects Agency for Energy, or ARPA-E, by 50 percent.

These levels will not maintain strong foundations for basic scientific research and will make it even harder for us to retain young scientists in the United States. The Scripps Institution of Oceanography, a world leader in ocean research, has noted the harmful cuts to the geoscientist program, which is used to improve prediction for events, including earthquakes, tornados, hurricanes, tsunamis, drought, and solar storms. At a time of increasingly extreme weather, we should be investing in research, not cutting it.

Unfortunately, the amendment offered by Mr. KILMER, Ms. ESTY, and me to increase funding by a small but significant 3.5 percent was not even given

a chance to have a vote here on the House floor.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this rule and to stand up for America's scientists and our competitiveness.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I want to thank the gentleman from the great State of Colorado for yielding and for his leadership on the Rules Committee and on so many other important issues before this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the highway trust fund, which finances highway and transportation projects all across this country, is set to expire at the end of this month. It is coming right up. Passing a short-term fix is necessary because the Republicans have ignored our Nation's transportation needs for the past 10 months, since the last short-term extension was passed.

We don't need a short-term extension. We need long-term planning and investment in our infrastructure. The sad reality is that the United States is not investing nearly enough in its infrastructure. As a share of gross domestic product, we invest about one-half of what Europe does. We invest only one-quarter of what China does.

As you look at this chart, it shows the amount of road traffic volume is up 297 percent; yet the public spending on road maintenance is so much lower, 125 percent. It is nearly 2.5 times faster that we are spending—and having volume go up—but we are not investing in our infrastructure to keep up with this volume.

One out of every four bridges is structurally deficient or functionally obsolete in the United States. We have had two bridges with cars on them that literally collapsed in recent history.

The question of whether to fix our infrastructure is not about the money. We are already spending the money, fixing our cars when they hit yet another pothole or wasting our time sitting in traffic. Why don't we have high-speed rail like the rest of the world?

Let's save ourselves some time and money by investing wisely to support our transportation infrastructure through the highway trust fund.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this rule under this debate covers three significant but entirely unrelated bills. That is why you are hearing people discuss highway funding; you are hearing people discuss the legislative branch, and you are hearing people discuss science.

On the day that DACA expansion and DAPA were scheduled to go into effect to make sure people here illegally can pay a fine, get right with the law, and be employed legally, rather than illegally, we are doing nothing relating to restoring the rule of law and securing our borders or anything to address our broken immigration system.

We are making sure that Members of Congress and our staffs get paid. That is not the wrong thing. Our hard-working men and women who work here should get paid. It is a question of priorities. I would like to see us do something about the 10 or 12 million people here illegally before we start paying ourselves and our staff.

What about the highway trust fund? Again, this is an example of Congress kicking the ball down the road 2 months here, 2 months there, a month here, a month there. All the contractors and subcontractors don't even know how to present bids when they don't know whether a yearlong or 2-year project will be funded for more than 2 months. Taxpayers wind up paying more for the same amount of work because we lack the certainty.

Then there is the COMPETES Act—the science bill—which targets certain kinds of science which apparently Republicans don't like—for instance, the physical sciences and the geological sciences.

Handicapping the physical sciences hurts our ability to recognize the causes of things like wildfires and floods that affect my district in Colorado, foresee patterns leading to events like the great Western drought in California. It seems like, if anything, there should be a focus on a very relevant form of science that impacts quality of life every day.

They also apparently don't like, for political reasons, the social sciences. Again, going after the social sciences would harm our ability to adapt for historic storms like Hurricane Sandy or the flood in New Orleans with Katrina and mitigate against floods like those in Colorado.

There is an interface between the physical sciences and people, and that is the work of the social science programs: how public health looks, how flood evacuations look, how disease control looks.

These are important considerations and should not be politicized by this body, which is why not only I oppose this bill, but dozens of the largest scientific associations and coalitions oppose this bill that ostensibly is for the cause of science.

Having all these bills under this rule is what we call a grab-bag approach, just jamming unrelated legislation into ineffective packages that seem to confuse and muddle the meaningful debate that needs to occur.

Since 2011, when Republicans won the majority of the House, this practice of jamming several unrelated bills together into one rule has increased by 400 percent. This rule is an example of that, and it is why the American people suffer from the somewhat disjointed debate around it—one person talks about highways; another counters a point about science; another talks about the legislative branch. It is because they are all in here. This is a Christmas tree bill.

Now, if it had immigration reform in it, I would support this Christmas tree. I could swallow the others if that was in here. I offered that to the gentleman from Washington, but unfortunately, it is not, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, the very people that should be benefiting from the bills we are reviewing today, like scientists, are actually opposing the bills. That should be a signal that this body is not understanding or heeding the needs of the American people.

We can reject this rule. We can tell Congress to get back on course. We can tell Congress to do a long-term reauthorization of transportation funding. We can tell Congress to pass a COMPETES Act that actually fosters innovation and makes America more competitive and a legislative branch appropriations bill that furthers the ability of this body to deliberate and be a model employer for those who work here.

How do we do that, Mr. Speaker? We do that by rejecting this rule.

If we can bring down this grab-bag, Christmas tree rule, we can set this Congress right.

I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

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

Americans have sent us here to get things done. They are tired of gridlock. And we, in the 114th Congress, are on track to be one of the most productive Congresses in modern history.

House Republicans have an aggressive and forward-looking agenda which will help our economy recover and help create high-paying American jobs.

The use of the compound rule, which provides for separate consideration of each underlying measure under a single rule, helps expedite legislative business.

The consideration of one rule allows the House more time to debate the underlying measures, or to consider additional legislative business. We have a lot to do, and this is an efficient way to get our work done.

I appreciate the discussion that we have had over the last hour. And although we may have our differences of opinion, I believe that this rule and the underlying bills are strong measures that are important to the future of our country.

This rule provides for ample debate on the floor: the opportunity to debate and vote on three bills and numerous amendments sponsored by both Democrat and Republican Members of this Chamber. This rule will provide for a smooth and deliberative process for sending these bills to the Senate for their consideration.

These bills are solid and substantial measures that will address several critical issues facing our country.

H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, is a pro-science bill that will keep America competitive in the 21st century global economy by prioritizing taxpayer investments in basic research without increasing overall Federal spending.

H.R. 2250, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2016, keeps funding for the legislative branch level with fiscal years 2014 and 2015 and will be used efficiently and effectively for the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, will allow transportation spending to continue through July while we in Congress work diligently toward a next step to close the shortfall in the highway trust fund.

Currently, highway and transit spending authority expires at the end of this month, and officials at the Department of Transportation are concerned that Federal cash infusions to transportation projects in my State and around the country would slow or even halt as the summer construction season begins unless we extend this temporary extension.

Overall, this is a strong rule that provides for consideration of three important bills, and I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 271 and the underlying bills.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Act of 2015, a bill that was originally written to provide much needed support for our nation's res arch and development activities in science and engineering.

I thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for the opportunity to speak on the Rules for H.R. 1806.

The America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015 as written raises serious concerns among the representatives from the scientific, academic, and business communities.

The groups that oppose the bill include the American Physical Society, the American Geophysical Union, the American Anthropological Association the Association of American Universities, and the Consortium of Social Science Associations.

Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Ranking Member on the House Science Committee, the committee that authored the bill, will be offering a Managers Amendment to this bill.

The Administration has also signaled that it will not support the bill in its current form.

According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, the bill: reduces funding for several scientific disciplines; curtails the ability of federal agencies to pursue climate science; and adds burdensome new requirements to the way the National Science Foundation operates.

Perhaps most worrisome, the legislation would prevent the federal government from using Department of Energy-sponsored research to make policy.

My amendments offered for inclusion in the Rule to H.R. 1806 were simple and would have improved the bill by addressing the STEM education and training gap.

These Jackson Lee amendments focus on reducing the STEM gap that currently exists between people of different geographic regions and socio-economic backgrounds.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, reports that as many as 1.4 million new computer science jobs could soon be available in the United States, but only 400,000 students will be enrolled in programs at colleges and universities that would prepare them to take these jobs.

This disparity is often referred to as the STEM gap.

Only 1 out of 10 high schools in the U.S. offer computer science programs.

It is estimated that the education systems in 25 states do not count computer science classes toward high school graduation.

Both economists and business leaders have identified that the future of the American economy will 130 in STEM fields, which the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates win create more than 9 million jobs between 2012 and 2022.

The STEM gap is more pronounced when considering minority groups.

U.S. Census 2010 data from the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Census Bureau, showed that underrepresented minorities earned 18.6 percent of total undergraduate degrees from 4-year colleges, but only 16.4 percent of the degrees in science fields and less than 13 percent of degrees in physical sciences and engineering.

Many historically underrepresented groups, including low income urban, rural and Native American communities have difficulty accessing STEM education and job training opportunities.

By including all of the Jackson Lee Amendments in the Rule the committee could have made significant progress in reducing the STEM gap underserved populations with the chance to participate in the economy of the future.

Jackson Lee Amendments offered on H.R. 1806, included: Jackson Lee Amendment #3, which the Rules Committee has included in the Rule for the bill would create state and regional workshops to train K–12 teachers in project-based science and technology learning, which will allow them to provide instruction in initiating robotics and other STEM competition team development programs.

This amendment also leverages the collaboration among higher education, businesses, local private and public education agencies to support STEM efforts at schools located in areas with unemployment is 1 percent or more above the national rate.

Robotics competitions and other similar competitive opportunities have proven to be one of the most successful paths for engaging young minds in STEM education.

Competitions such as FIRST, a national robotics competition that engages 400,000 students each year and awards millions of dollars in scholarships are paving the way for future STEM success.

Jackson Lee Amendments Not included in the Rule: Jackson Lee Amendment #17 would have increased awareness among underrepresented groups in STEM employment and education opportunities by providing information on certification, undergraduate and graduate STEM programs.

One of the most enduring difficulties faced by underrepresented populations is a lack of awareness and understanding of the connection between STEM and employment opportunities.

In 2012, a survey found that despite the nation's growing demand for more workers in science, technology, engineering, and math, the skills gap among the largest ethnic and racial minorities groups remain stubbornly wide.

Blacks and Latinos account for only 7 percent, of the STEM workforce despite representing 28 percent of the U.S. population.

Jackson Lee Amendment #18 would have made sure that the issue of reducing the skills and education gap of underrepresented groups in STEM degree programs is considered as current STEM education federal programs were reviewed.

Jackson Lee Amendment #19 could have furthered the skills development and training of teachers who provide instruction in K–12 STEM courses where 40 percent of the students are on free or reduced lunch programs or in areas where unemployment is 1 percent or more above the national average.

Although most STEM specific education occurs in college and graduate school, interest in STEM fields must be fostered from a young age through successful K–12 programs.

Many schools serving low-income students lack the resources to provide continuity of STEM K–12 education, and as a result, students lose the opportunity to develop the skills that will prepare them for higher STEM education.

Jackson Lee Amendment #21 was an effort to identify no-cost or low-cost summer and after school science and technology education programs and have that information broadly disseminated to the public.

Throughout primary and secondary education, skills retention is one of the most pressing concerns facing underrepresented students.

Without access to after-school and summer programs, even those students with a passion for STEM risk falling behind their peers.

Jackson Lee Amendment #22 made grants available to local education agencies to support training in STEM education methods to teachers to improve their instruction at schools serving neglected, delinquent, and migrant students, English learners, at-risk students, and Native Americans as determined by the director.

Jackson Lee Amendment #23 establishes within the Directorate for Education and Human Resources an Office of STEM Education Gap Awareness with the duties of reducing the STEM gap in K–12 and post-secondary education among underrepresented populations.

The Jackson Lee amendments are intended to bridge the STEM gap in rural and urban areas where opportunities for training in STEM that can enhance the productivity of businesses large and small are lacking.

The Brookings' Metropolitan Policy Program's report ''The Hidden STEM Economy,'' reported that in 2011, 26 million jobs or 20 percent of all occupations required knowledge in 1 or more STEM areas.

Half of all STEM jobs are available to workers without a 4 year degree and these jobs pay on average $53,000 a year, which is 10 percent higher than jobs with similar education requirements.

There will be STEM winners and losers not because the skills needed are too difficult to obtain, but because people are not aware of the jobs that are going unfilled today nor do they know what education or training will create job security for the next 2 to 3 decades.

I am very aware of the importance of STEM job training and education.

A third of Houston jobs are in STEM-based fields.

Houston has the second largest concentrations of engineers (22.4 for every 1,000 workers according to the Greater Houston Partnership).

Houston has 59,070 engineers, the second largest population in the nation.

STEM jobs are at the core of Houston's economic success, but what we have done with STEM innovation and job creation in the city of Houston is not enough to satisfy the region's demand for STEM trained workers.

Houston anticipates that in the next 5 years the gap in the number of people with STEM skills and training will not keep up with the number of positions requiring those skills.

This is not just true for Houston, Texas—it is true for every region of the nation—whether you live in a rural community or urban center.

By 2018 the United States will need: 710,000 Computing workers; 160,000 Engineers; 70,000 Physical Scientists; 40,000 Life Science workers; 20,000 Mathematics workers.

STEM Computing Jobs are critical to America's future: Software engineers; Computer networking workers; Systems analysis; Computer researcher or support workers.

Types of STEM Engineering Jobs: Structural Engineers; Mechanical Engineers; Software Engineers; Electrical Engineers; Automotive Engineers; Aeronautical Engineers; Naval Engineers; Architects.

Types of STEM Physical Sciences Jobs: Biologists; Zoologists; Agricultural; Food Scientists; Conservation Scientists; Medical Scientists; Climatologists.

Types of STEM Life Scientists [PhDs]: Political Science; Economists; Anthropologists; Archaeology; Cultural Researchers; Language Experts (Linguistic and Language Skills).

Types of STEM Mathematics: Teachers; Physicists; Cryptographers; Statisticians; Accountants.

In order to ensure that underserved populations reach the level of STEM education and opportunity they choose to pursue, I believe it is integral to create an office that will focus on closing the STEM education gap.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 178.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 179, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

YEAS—242

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

NAYS—179

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

NOT VOTING—11

Brady (PA)
Capps
Chaffetz
Deutch
Donovan
Gosar
Hastings
Moore
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas
Yarmuth

□ 1359

Ms. CLARKE of New York, Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, and HONDA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 3, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

YEAS—420

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)

Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—3

Conyers
Massie
Scott (VA)

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (PA)
Capps
Chaffetz
Donovan
Grayson
Hastings
Moore
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1407

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.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT ON H.R. 2353, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H.R. 2353 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2353.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 271, I call up the bill (H.R. 2353) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2353

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015''.

(b) RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall reduce the amount apportioned or allocated for a program, project, or activity under this Act in fiscal year 2015 by amounts apportioned or allocated pursuant to the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, including the amendments made by that Act, for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Subtitle A—Federal-Aid Highways

SEC. 1001. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(a) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended by striking ''May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 1001(b)(1) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended by striking ''for the period beginning on

October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, a sum equal to 243/365 of the total amount'' and inserting ''for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, a sum equal to 304/365 of the total amount''.

(2) GENERAL FUND.—Section 1123(h)(1) of MAP–21 (23 U.S.C. 202 note) is amended by striking ''and $19,972,603 out of the general fund of the Treasury to carry out the program for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $24,986,301 out of the general fund of the Treasury to carry out the program for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(c)(1) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended—

(A) by striking ''May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015,''; and

(B) by striking ''243/365'' and inserting ''304/365''.

(2) OBLIGATION CEILING.—Section 1102 of MAP–21 (23 U.S.C. 104 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) $33,528,284,932 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.'';

(B) in subsection (b)(12) by striking '', and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, only in an amount equal to $639,000,000, less any reductions that would have otherwise been required for that year by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), then multiplied by 243/365 for that period'' and inserting '', and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, only in an amount equal to $639,000,000, less any reductions that would have otherwise been required for that year by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), then multiplied by 304/365 for that period'';

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015,''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending May 31, 2015, that is equal to 243/365 of such unobligated balance'' and inserting ''for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, that is equal to 304/365 of such unobligated balance''; and

(D) in subsection (f)(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015,''.

SEC. 1002. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

Section 1002 of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1842) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking ''for administrative expenses of the Federal-aid highway program $292,931,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.'' and inserting ''for administrative expenses of the Federal-aid highway program $366,465,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b)(2) and inserting the following:

''(2) for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015, subject to the limitations on administrative expenses under the heading 'Federal Highway Administration' in appropriations Acts that apply to that period.''.

Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

SEC. 1101. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.—

(1) HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 31101(a)(1)(C) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) $195,726,027 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(2) HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 31101(a)(2)(C) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) $94,531,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(3) NATIONAL PRIORITY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 31101(a)(3)(C) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) $226,542,466 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(4) NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.—Section 31101(a)(4)(C) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) $4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(5) HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 31101(a)(5)(C) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) $24,153,425 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(B) LAW ENFORCEMENT CAMPAIGNS.—Section 2009(a) of SAFETEA–LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note) is amended—

(i) in the first sentence by striking ''May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''; and

(ii) in the second sentence by striking ''May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015,''.

(6) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31101(a)(6)(C) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) $21,238,356 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(b) COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—Section 403(f)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $1,664,384 of the total amount available for apportionment to the States for highway safety programs under section 402(c) in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $2,082,192 of the total amount available for apportionment to the States for highway safety programs under section 402(c) in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23.—Section 31101(c) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended by striking ''May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015,''.

SEC. 1102. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS.—Section 31104(a)(10) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(10) $181,567,123 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31104(i)(1)(J) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(J) $215,715,068 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(c) GRANT PROGRAMS.—

(1) COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(1) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking ''and $19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $24,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(2) BORDER ENFORCEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(2) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking ''and $21,304,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $26,652,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(3) PERFORMANCE AND REGISTRATION INFORMATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(3) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking ''and $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(4) COMMERCIAL VEHICLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND NETWORKS DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(4) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking ''and $16,643,836 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $20,821,918 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(5) SAFETY DATA IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(5) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking ''and $1,997,260 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $2,498,630 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(d) HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—Section 31104(k)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and up to $9,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and up to $12,493,151 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

(e) NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.—Section 31144(g)(5)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and up to $21,304,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and up to $26,652,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

(f) OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—Section 4127(e) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1741) is amended by striking ''and $2,663,014 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $3,331,507 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

(g) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS.—Section 4134(c) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 31301 note) is amended by striking ''and $665,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $832,877 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

SEC. 1103. DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.

Section 4 of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A) by striking ''May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015,''.

Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs

SEC. 1201. FORMULA GRANTS FOR RURAL AREAS.

Section 5311(c)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''and $16,643,836 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $20,821,918 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

SEC. 1202. APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5336(h)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $24,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

SEC. 1203. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FORMULA GRANTS.—Section 5338(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''and $5,722,150,685 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $7,158,575,342 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''and $85,749,041 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $107,274,521 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''and $6,657,534 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $8,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''and $2,968,361,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $3,713,505,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''and $171,964,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $215,132,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(E) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) by striking ''and $404,644,932 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $506,222,466 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(ii) by striking ''and $19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $24,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''; and

(iii) by striking ''and $13,315,068 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $16,657,534 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(F) in subparagraph (F) by striking ''and $1,997,260 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $2,498,630 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(G) in subparagraph (G) by striking ''and $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(H) in subparagraph (H) by striking ''and $2,563,151 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $3,206,575 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(I) in subparagraph (I) by striking ''and $1,441,955,342 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $1,803,927,671 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(J) in subparagraph (J) by striking ''and $284,809,315 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $356,304,658 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''; and

(K) in subparagraph (K) by striking ''and $350,119,726 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $438,009,863 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

(b) RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION AND DEPLOYMENT PROJECTS.—Section 5338(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $46,602,740 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $58,301,370 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(c) TRANSIT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM.—Section 5338(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $4,660,274 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $5,830,137 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT.—Section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $4,660,274 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $5,830,137 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(e) HUMAN RESOURCES AND TRAINING.—Section 5338(e) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(f) CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.—Section 5338(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $1,269,591,781 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $1,558,295,890 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015''.

(g) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 5338(h) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''and $69,238,356 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015'' and inserting ''and $86,619,178 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015'';

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking ''and not less than $3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and not less than $4,164,384 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''; and

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking ''and not less than $665,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and not less than $832,877 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

SEC. 1204. BUS AND BUS FACILITIES FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5339(d)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and $43,606,849 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $54,553,425 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'';

(2) by striking ''$832,192 for such period'' and inserting ''$1,041,096 for such period''; and

(3) by striking ''$332,877 for such period'' and inserting ''$416,438 for such period''.

Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

SEC. 1301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5128(a)(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(3) $35,615,474 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015.''.

(b) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND.—Section 5128(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(2) FISCAL YEAR 2015.—From the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Fund established under section 5116(i), the Secretary may expend for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015—

''(A) $156,581 to carry out section 5115;

''(B) $18,156,712 to carry out subsections (a) and (b) of section 5116, of which not less than $11,368,767 shall be available to carry out section 5116(b);

''(C) $124,932 to carry out section 5116(f);

''(D) $520,548 to publish and distribute the Emergency Response Guidebook under section 5116(i)(3); and

''(E) $832,877 to carry out section 5116(j).''.

(c) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRAINING GRANTS.—Section 5128(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and $2,663,014 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,'' and inserting ''and $3,331,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,''.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 2001. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''June 1, 2015'' in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3) and inserting ''August 1, 2015'', and

(2) by striking ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014'' in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015''.

(b) SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.—Section 9504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014'' each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting ''Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015'', and

(2) by striking ''June 1, 2015'' in subsection (d)(2) and inserting ''August 1, 2015''.

(c) LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—Section 9508(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''June 1, 2015'' and inserting ''August 1, 2015''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015. This bill will extend the Federal surface transportation programs for 2 months, through July of 2015.

H.R. 2353 is a clean extension of the surface transportation programs, funded at the authorized amounts for fiscal year 2014. No transfer of funding to the highway trust fund is necessary because the trust fund will remain solvent during the period. However, we will more than likely have to pass another short-term patch before the August recess and take steps to ensure the trust fund remains solvent. I hope all of you will support H.R. 2353.

I have to say, a short-term extension through the end of July was not our

preferred path forward. Our hope was to extend the surface programs through the end of the calendar year. That would have ensured reliable funding for the States through the construction season. A longer extension would also have allowed us to focus on finding a long-term funding solution within the context of tax reform without the distraction of needing to address a shortfall in the highway trust fund later this summer. Unfortunately, we were unable to reach an agreement on a 7-month extension, and so we are left with a 2-month patch.

Mr. Speaker, we have an immediate, critical need to extend the current surface transportation law. If Congress fails to act, over 4,000 Department of Transportation personnel will be furloughed and the States will not be able to be reimbursed. Transportation projects and jobs across the country will be at risk.

I appreciate Chairman RYAN's attention to this pressing issue, as well as his commitment to addressing the long-term solvency of the highway trust fund. A long-term reauthorization bill will continue to be a top priority for this committee. I look forward to working with Chairman RYAN, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and others to achieve a long-term bill.

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

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

Well, here we are again, yet another short-term pass. It is a heck of a way to run a great nation. Our system is falling apart: 140,000 bridges on the National Highway System need repair or replacement; 40 percent of the surface National Highway System is in such bad shape we have to dig up the roadbed and resurface; and we have an $86 billion backlog in transit just to bring the existing transit up to a state of good repair. It is so bad that we are killing people in the Nation's Capital unnecessarily because of the state of disrepair of the Metro system.

It is embarrassing. The United States of America has gone from number one in the world, unparalleled in terms of its infrastructure in the Eisenhower era and through a good deal of the latter part of the last century, to 26th and falling fast. We are investing less of a percentage of our GDP in infrastructure repairs and maintenance—let alone, building out a new system—than virtually every nation in the world.

□ 1415

We are down to around 1 percent. There are many developing nations who are investing much, much more because they know they have to move their people and their goods more efficiently in a world economy.

We cannot continue to kick this can down the road. The road is at a dead end. Today, we will reluctantly go along with a 2-month patch because, if we do not act today, at the end of this month, June 1, 4,000 people will be laid off at DOT and all Federal funding for surface transportation and transit would stop. That would be the end of it. It wouldn't be authorized.

States that had bills pending couldn't be paid, and States that want to get new commitments for new projects wouldn't be able to do it, a tragedy at the height of the construction season. Sixty days should be enough time to negotiate a long-term bill.

Today, we introduce the GROW AMERICA Act written by the administration. It has many, many good points to it, especially the spending levels. We need to enhance spending. We can't pretend, Oh, we are going to do more with less. We are past that point.

Look at what has happened to the purchasing power of the gas tax, which hasn't been changed since 1993, two and a half times faster road traffic volume is going up than we are dealing with the funding issues. We are in a huge deficit situation, and there are many, many ways—many of them proposed on a bipartisan basis—to deal with this. We should be able to work that out.

More importantly, this committee writes the policy. We introduced a bill today that sets the levels for $87 billion. It is an increase in transit to deal with the backlog, an increase in highways to deal with the insufficiencies there, a new dedicated program for freight; and it puts some more money into rail—commuter rail, in particular—to deal with positive train control and other issues.

We believe that this is the last wake-up call to give Congress time. Sixty days is more than enough time to write a long-term authorization and for the Ways and Means Committee to figure out a way to fund it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank, in addition to this patch, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman RYAN for their very hard work towards a long-term reauthorization of the Federal highway bill.

Mr. Speaker, my home State of Missouri has nearly 35,000 highway miles and over 10,000 bridges that are practically begging for our attention. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, every single day I hear about the need to improve and repair our roadways in this country.

As you can imagine, this isn't a simple task. This is a job that is going to take years to complete. It requires the hard work and cooperation of thousands of men and women and relies on partnerships between the stakeholders, local governments, and Washington.

Most importantly, though, a task of this magnitude requires that those responsible for planning each project, the State and local governments, are able to do so with confidence. They need certainty not only in this year's budget, but also the budgets for the next 5 or 6 years.

This 2-month extension does not come under ideal circumstances, but it is going to ensure that States are reimbursed for their expenses on Federal projects, and it is going to give us the time to craft a bipartisan long-term reauthorization that we so desperately need.

Long-term reauthorization is critical for everyone who plays a role in improving our Nation's highways and bridges. For too long, they have been forced to operate off of short-term extension after short-term extension, and this makes the already difficult job of maintaining our roadways nearly impossible.

This Congress, we have a huge opportunity to secure a long-term highway bill that is going to improve, rebuild, and modernize America's highway system. It is time that we come together to do just that, and I hope this extension gives us the time to come up with that agreement that we need.

Again, I want to thank both chairmen for their hard work, and I look forward to finalizing a much-needed long-term reauthorization.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the ranking member of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

By July, when this new patch expires, Mr. Speaker, we shall have spent a full year since the last patch, not even trying to make progress toward a long-term authorization bill.

We have acquired a dangerous habit—33 since the last long-term bill—of patches that create no urgency to get a long-term bill done. The Ways and Means Committee, the funding committee for this bill, is holding its first hearing next month. The frustration in the States has accumulated as fast as the untenable backlog of projects. Another construction season has already been sacrificed.

The reason we are here is itself a comment on congressional neglect of the Nation's infrastructure. States have slowed down their request for reimbursements from the trust fund because the unreplenished fund, together with the short-term patches, make it impossible for States, themselves, to even begin projects of any size.

Mr. Speaker, the States have already scaled back their plans for 2015 that would have created jobs. This self-inflicted crisis is threatening other jobs, too—many Federal employees in my district and thousands of others throughout the country. If Congress fails to take action by May 31, many Federal employees will be furloughed; Federal reimbursements will stop, and the highway and transit programs will

shut down. The hidden costs are even worse, the many economic development projects in the country that can't be started until roads, bridges, and transit to accommodate them are done.

Today, the Democrats on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee have introduced the President's GROW AMERICA Act. We are putting a good bill on the table. Change it or do your own substitute, but do not leave the Nation's infrastructure twisting in the dust of another delay.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their hard work and to the rest of the committee for the hours of work already done on a long-term transportation bill.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2353 to prevent the shutdown of funding for infrastructure improvement. I believe there is shared commitment between the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and most of the Members of the House to pass a fully funded, multiyear highway bill.

With the debt crisis we continue to battle, it is becoming more and more difficult to find the much-needed resources for our most critical needs. That leaves few options at our immediate disposal, most of which are not palatable in this economic environment.

Members of both the Transportation Committee and the Ways and Means Committee will have to take a closer look at potential funding alternatives and be creative in how to finance a reliable and modern infrastructure system, and at the same time, we need to work towards getting our country back on a path of fiscal solvency.

As we work on a long-term solution, we should examine how to reform the highway trust fund to prevent finding ourselves in this same position over and over. A consistent funding mechanism, paired with a more transparent system that demonstrates effective use of taxpayer dollars, will put us in a better position to fund critical infrastructure projects and instill more confidence on the part of our constituents.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 2353 so we can continue work on a multiyear transportation bill to ensure our Nation's growth. Failure to act threatens our general contractors and their employees, suppliers, and puts at risk the jobs that are both directly and indirectly supported by these projects.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to keep our folks in business and continue any meaningful growth in our economy, then we must find a reliable, long-term solution.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill to extend highway and transit programs for 2 months, but with reservations.

The last surface transportation bill, MAP–21, expired last fall. At that time, we passed an extension to the end of this month to give us time to work on a long-term bill. We have known for months that this day was coming; yet we have made no progress finding a solution to funding highways, transit, and other important surface transportation programs.

MAP–21, itself, was only a 2-year bill, breaking the tradition of Congress passing 5- or 6-year bills to provide the reliable funding necessary to promote long-term capital plans and projects that require a commitment beyond 1 fiscal year. The last long-term bill we passed was SAFETEA-LU in 2005. That was 10 years ago, and that bill was underfunded because of a resistance to raising the gasoline tax or to identifying new revenue sources.

For over a decade, we have failed to address the funding challenges necessary to break the cycle of underinvestment and put this country back on a competitive path with the rest of the work.

Today, we spend about 1.7 percent of GDP on infrastructure, while China spends 9 percent and Europe spends 4½ to 5 percent. We used to spend 4½ to 5 percent also.

According to DOT, there is an $800 billion backlog of investment needs on highways and bridges, including $479 billion in critical repair work. Public transit has an $86 billion backlog of critical maintenance and repair needs, which increases by $2.5 billion each year as bus and rail infrastructure ages.

While our infrastructure crumbles around us, House and Senate leadership refuse to come up with the additional $60 billion needed to fill the gap in the highway trust fund just to do a long-term bill at current levels; but this week, they will put on the floor a tax extender that will cost $182 billion over 10 years, completely unpaid for. The priorities of this Congress are completely out of whack.

I am concerned that we will pass this 2-month extension and be right back here in July having this same conversation. I will support this extension, but only with the understanding that we must spend the next 2 months, once and for all, making transportation funding a priority so that our citizens don't have to risk unsafe transportation so that we can invest in our infrastructure and we can be competitive in our economy going forward.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015.

Although we must construct a long-term highway bill, this legislation is a compromise that will provide States with certainty through the vital summer construction months.

By extending the expenditure authority of the highway trust fund through the end of July, States will not have to worry about reimbursements from the Federal Government while they are in the middle of the busiest construction season of the year.

Following the passage of this extension, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to construct a long-term highway bill with a sustainable funding mechanism.

Upon its enactment in 2012, MAP–21 made important reforms by consolidating Federal highway programs and streamlining the project approval process. The next highway bill should build on MAP–21's successes to cut red tape and ensure highway trust fund dollars are spent responsibly.

We must also be good stewards of taxpayer dollars by keeping our promise to the American people that the next surface transportation bill will provide adequate funding for highway and freight infrastructure to create jobs and keep our Nation competitive.

My constituents and the hard-working people all over this country need reliable roads and bridges to commute to work, take their children to school, and get home safely at night.

Unfortunately, the President's funding proposal is not viable and, I believe, will encourage more inversions or takeovers of American companies.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2353 and encourage them to commit to crafting a long-term fiscally responsible highway bill that will provide the much-needed certainty to States, industry, and the American people.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I appreciate his leadership on this matter. He hit it right on the nail.

We are in a situation, I am sad to say, having listened to my colleague a moment ago; the States will still have to worry. Two months doesn't give them a straight shot at a construction season, and there is still uncertainty.

I could have dusted off the speech I gave last summer where I said we would be right back here in the same spot, with uncertainty around the country; and the local governments, the State governments, the contractors don't deserve that.

But it is not the problem of the T and I Committee, as much as Ways and Means. You can't craft a bill unless you know how much money you have got to spend. I am embarrassed as a member of that committee that, in the 55 months my Republican colleagues have been in charge, we have not had a single hearing on transportation finance.

We hear certain things are off the table or not acceptable. It is interesting, we haven't raised the gas tax in

22 years, but six States—six red States—have raised the gas tax already this year. Utah, Idaho, Georgia, South Dakota—these are not flaming bastions of liberalism. These are people who looked at the problem and decided they needed to step up, and they stepped up not to take the place of the Federal responsibility, but in anticipation that at some point, the Federal Government would meet its obligation for almost half of the major construction projects.

I would respectfully request that we dive in and see what we can do over the course of the next couple of months, but that the Ways and Means Committee spend one week listening to the men and women who build, operate, and use our Nation's infrastructure, spend a week, look at the items, consider maybe what Ronald Reagan thought was a good idea in 1982: raise the gas tax.

We can pass that bill out of committee in 1 week, and you can have the next couple of months to give America the bill it needs to rebuild and renew this great country.

□ 1430

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes from the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY).

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of long-term highway funding. I will support the bill on the floor today, but let's be clear. This is a long-term problem that needs to have a long-term solution.

We gather in hearings and we gather in meetings to discuss the various options we have for revenue. We now have to gather to make a decision, the long-term decision.

We were elected to Congress to represent our constituents and to make difficult decisions that will help us guide our Nation forward. It is time for us to accelerate and produce a solution to our highway funding problems. Our highways and our bridges are falling into disrepair.

Before I became involved in public service, I was a contractor in Nevada where I worked on roads, bridges, and dams. I know the wear and tear that our infrastructure is experiencing. I know the uncertainty that States are facing when it comes to highway projects.

Our inaction has created a difficult environment for the States to make decisions. So I stand here today to support long-term funding. It is a long-term problem that requires a long-term solution.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the leadership of this committee for getting to this point. I am very, very sorry that this is another kicking the can down the road, but we don't have much choice but to support the bill before us today.

We have missed a major construction season already. Bridges are falling; accidents are happening; traffic jams increase because of the crumbling infrastructure. This is all very costly, and it is more costly when we have a winter like we just had that hits already crumbling infrastructure.

We must address this costly neglect of our infrastructure around the country. It is not partisan. There are no Democrat and Republican bridges or streets. We must address our responsibility to this Nation.

Sensible, large projects must have time to plan for those long-term projects. They cannot do that. No city or State can do that kind of planning without knowing whether we have a long-term source of funding that will keep it going.

It is unwise for us to continue just to put this off. We have got to pay for it no matter when we do it. The time is now. We have extended this time too long. The Nation has suffered too long. Traffic is jamming; accidents are happening; and it will not get better until we take on our responsibility.

I would urge all of us today to support this short-term bill for the last time. It is time for us to have a long-term infrastructure bill for this Nation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the Chair the balance of time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 19 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, the funding and authorization for our Federal highway program expires in just 12 days. This is a deadline that Congress, the Department of Transportation, and the American people have known about for almost a year now. And the bill before us today is not the long-term solution that we were hoping for, but it is the necessary step forward at this time while we continue to work on a longer term solution for our highway funding.

I appreciate very much the attention that Chairman SHUSTER has given to this important issue. He has taken a very keen interest in what we need on a national level, and many of us from the Houston area appreciate his coming to our part of America to learn and see what our needs are in the State of Texas. I am confident that the chairman and those of us on the relevant committees in the House and the Senate will come together and deliver a long-term solution for our highway programs and will strengthen them for every Texan and every American.

While this bill before us isn't ideal, the choice is very simple. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''yes'' on this bill to keep our State Department of Transportation on the job through the summer building months and to keep Congress working on a long-term solution.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, here we go again, passing another extension and failing in our duty to provide a world-class transportation system.

Transportation programs are much too critical to our economy to be delayed any longer. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership in Washington continues its long-running failure to fund surface transportation infrastructure programs. Just last week, House Republicans passed a bill, with no offsets, that cut taxes by $269 billion for the richest 1 percent of Americans, but they failed to pass a real transportation authorization bill that would put Americans to work. We know, for every billion dollars we invest in transportation, it generates 44,000 permanent jobs.

In closing, Secretary Anthony Foxx said that all of us have roles to play in shaping our Nation's infrastructure. As we saw last week during the tragic train derailment in Philadelphia, Congress urgently needs to increase funding for our Nation's passenger rail system in order to make it safer for all of the traveling public and to prevent future tragedies on our Nation's rails.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. DEFAZIO for yielding and for the work that he does on this committee.

Let me also say to the chairman of the committee, Mr. SHUSTER, how pleased I am with the kind of work that he does on the committee. Very frankly, Mr. SHUSTER is committed to getting things done and to working in a bipartisan fashion. That is good for this House, and it is good for his State, and it is good for the country. I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this 60-day extension because it is essential that we do this. The consequences of not doing it would be very, very negative. I rise to lament the fact that we have gone 10 months in our having known full well that this date was upon us and that theoretically, we thought, that funding as well as authorization would end on the 31st of this month. We have now found that funding will not end. This bill is necessary to authorize, not to fund, because funding is available for the next 60 days from the 31st.

I also rise to urge this House, under Mr. SHUSTER's and Mr. DEFAZIO's leadership, to do the work we were sent here to do—to invest in America, to invest in the growth of our economy, to invest in the creation of jobs—in fact, what the board of directors of the greatest country on the face of the Earth ought to have done many years and, certainly, months ago.

I am absolutely convinced that this House has the capacity, the intellect, and the ability within 60 days to come

to this floor with a bill that will invest in our infrastructure and provide sufficient funds to make America competitive and to pay for it, not to pass the expense along to future generations—my children, my grandchildren, my great grandchildren. They are going to have to buy for themselves the infrastructure of their generations, and they ought not to have to pay the bills of our generation.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. It is a moral responsibility that this generation pays for the investments that it needs to make in the infrastructure that will be used today and tomorrow.

Mr. SHUSTER, I know, wants to do that. Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO have the courage to do that. The issue is going to be whether this body, on both sides of the aisle, comes forward with a responsible, paid-for infrastructure bill, particularly for highways and roads and bridges, but for other investments as well.

I want to tell Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO that I will work closely with them and that I will urge the Members on my side of the aisle to work closely with the Members on Mr. SHUSTER's side of the aisle to effect this end. But let us not pretend on July 30 that we can extend until December 31 or until a year from then. Today, let us commit ourselves to using the next 70 days, approximately, to come up with a paid-for, 6-year reauthorization that will make America stronger, grow our economy, and be a pride of the American people, whom we serve.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished whip for his kind words, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, again, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining on my side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 14 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this failure to write a long-term, paid-for surface transportation bill for this country has become a national embarrassment. Quite frankly, it is an international embarrassment. Passenger trains and oil trains are coming off the tracks, are taking lives, are causing untold amounts of damage. The simple truth is that we can't fix those lives who were lost, but we can fix our transportation system. Isn't it about time that we do that? It is not only a national embarrassment, our failure here, but it is a failure of the Congress. It is a failure of the legislative process. It is a failure of the committee process. That is what is happening here.

We held hearings in the last session. We heard from the Chamber of Commerce; we heard from the unions; we heard from the retailers; we heard from the truckers. Everybody said three things: one, our transportation system is falling apart. They had that right. Two, it is hurting our ability to grow our economy and to create jobs. They had that right. Three, they said we need to find some new revenue. None of it could be more obvious. Yet the Transportation Committee held hearings from all of those people in the last session, and we held hearings again in this session, but we never took up the markup and the writing of a transportation bill.

□ 1445

That is the simple truth, Mr. Speaker, and I am calling on the leadership here to either instruct the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or allow the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to write a transportation bill. I have absolute confidence that we can come together if we do.

It is through the committee process that we find common ground. That is where we reach our bipartisanship. That is how we fix things here in the Congress. That is how we get things done. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, allow or instruct the committee to do its job, to do its business, and we will write a transportation plan for this country that gets this country moving again, saves lives, and builds an economy.

Mr. SHUSTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), a member of the committee.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, why are we debating an extension of the surface transportation authorization instead of doing the right thing and passing a bill that invests in our future? We should be playing the long game, not betting on the come, as they say in Nevada.

For the 2 million residents who live in the Las Vegas valley and the more than 42 million visitors who come to our city from around the world, we must commit to the passage of a long-term surface transportation bill this summer. We can't do yet another extension that creates uncertainty, stifles development, and puts us further behind.

We must pass a bill that includes investment that is real, sustainable, and goes beyond just maintaining our current infrastructure but instead sets our Nation on a road that is built to last.

Mr. SHUSTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), a member of the committee.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just want to start by thanking Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO for their bipartisan leadership. I am going to vote for this 2-month extension for the highway trust fund in order to avoid a shutdown of America's transit building and repair.

But with that said, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is like fixing our roads and bridges with Silly Putty. It is just not strong enough to hold our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. So I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to say it is time to make those long-term investments necessary for people and goods to get to their destination safely and timely.

Mr. Speaker, transportation moves our economy. It is time for Congress to get going.

Mr. SHUSTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a strong advocate for all things transportation, a member of the powerful Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and the chairman. I am not going to vote for this piece of legislation—not even close.

Everyone talks about how we must maintain the roads. If you listened over the last 45 minutes, all of these infrastructure issues are in bad shape, terrible shape. We know the problem. So long speeches about this and the problem don't make much sense.

Here is my question to every Member of this body: What are you prepared to do? Make believe you are doing something? Hide under the desk in your office?

How much money have we used, Mr. Speaker, from the general fund to bail out transportation? The percentage of general funds increases each budget that we are using. So without a clear source of long-term funding, our States cannot plan for the future. In fact, many States are not putting money into their trust fund. My own State, the State of New Jersey, I guess the money is going to fall out of the sky. So 2 months, 4 months, 7 months, it is all a joke.

Ensuring the solvency of the trust fund is not only a key component of meeting our transportation challenges, it is our job. The Committee on Ways and Means has not even had one hearing, Mr. Ranking Member, Mr. Chairman. How many States have put themselves in the same position as the Federal Government?

I understand that some Members are already planning another short-term extension in July because you say now we are ready to have a long-term solution, but you are already planning for another short-term in July. In fact, we are moving towards the omnibus bill, where we will put everything together. It will be like a stew: trade, transportation, lollipops, put them all in there. Put it all in there, and then we will vote on it and have some of our Members vote against motherhood so that they will be on the block a year from this November.

Look, let me suggest something novel for this group. Let's spend the next 8 weeks resuscitating a system

where users of the system pay to maintain and grow the system. International tax can be a part of the solution. I say to the President and the Congress, it is not nearly enough money.

A group of us presented a bipartisan plan—Republicans and Democrats—to fund the Federal highway trust fund. Through Democratic Presidents, Republican Presidents, through Democratic Houses and Republican Houses, we have always been able to come to a resolution on this until the last 3 or 4 years. Why? Why is this?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, neither party has the wherewithal to deal with the problem. I believe our model must receive serious consideration as the clock counts down on the trust fund's expiration. Our legislation has the support of both business and labor.

I am done with extensions, and I plan to vote ''no'' today. I ask my colleagues to show support for a long-term bill and cosponsor the Renacci-Pascrell plan, because if we don't change something, we will be right back here in July talking to each other.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 20½ minutes remaining.

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

First off, I want to join in what many others have said: transportation infrastructure has not been historically nor should it become a partisan issue. I appreciate the chairman's willingness to work together on many aspects. We will at times disagree over elements of bills, but in general we agree that what makes this country great, what makes us competitive in the world is a world-class system of transportation infrastructure and other critical infrastructure, and today we are deficient. I talked during my introductory remarks about some of the needs. Let me just talk about the revenues.

Back in 1993, when the gas tax was raised by a bipartisan coalition in the House—actually, on the Republican side, led by the chairman's father, Bud Shuster—we paid about 14 percent. Every time you went to the pump, with the increase in the gas tax in 1993, 14 percent of your bill went to invest in the Nation's infrastructure. Yet today, some 22 years later, 7 percent goes to the infrastructure. Population has grown, road miles have increased, and the Eisenhower infrastructure has aged.

Infrastructure doesn't just age a little bit each year. It reaches a point where it accelerates dramatically, so a bridge that you could fix for $15 million or $20 million today, 2 years from now you might have to totally replace for $100 million. So not delaying these needed investments, unless we want to see people detouring around all the rivers in America because of bridge outages, is really, really critical for a just-in-time economy, for our world competitiveness, to save on fuel efficiency.

Now, a number of States have stepped in to fill the void; 14 States have voted to raise their own gas taxes since 2013. As the gentleman from Oregon pointed out, six deep red Republican States have voted to raise their gas tax this year.

Just to assure my colleagues, for those who raised it before the last election, nobody lost their election because they raised the gas tax in those States. People recognize it as a user fee. They are tired of blowing out tires and car repairs because of potholes. They are tired of detours. The trucking industry is tired of detours, and they don't want a proliferation of tolls across America. The solution is a Federal partnership.

The chairman held a hearing recently where we had the Department of Transportation director from Wyoming, a deep red State, talking about the fact that they had increased their gas tax, but they still need the Federal partnership; it is critical. We had the Governor of North Carolina—has one of the highest gas taxes in the country, deep red State these days—saying the Federal partnership was more critical than ever. The same with the mayor of Salt Lake City, the Federal partnership is critical. No State can do it on its own.

I propose that we index the gas tax to construction costs, inflation, fleet fuel economy. That would mean next year the gas tax would go up by 1.7 cents. I would like to see the Member of Congress who thinks they are going to lose their election over a 1.7 cent investment in America's infrastructure to avoid those potholes, the congestion, the detours, the delays, or the additional tolling to maintain what we have. It won't happen. It hasn't happened recently in red States that have raised it much more than 1.7 cents.

But if we index to inflation, fleet fuel economy, and construction costs inflation, we could borrow upfront for the trust fund, let's say, $150 billion, a nice increase over the current levels of spending, and we could pay it back in about 15 years with that increment, just the indexed increment that would grow a tiny bit each year.

And again, you drive by the gas station on your way to work, and when you drive home at night, ExxonMobil has raised it a nickel because there were rumors of war in the Middle East or a refinery had an outage or something or this. Where did that nickel go? It went into the pockets of ExxonMobil or speculators on Wall Street. It didn't go into our Nation's infrastructure.

The American people would sure as heck rather pay 1.7 cents to rebuild our system and make America more competitive and put hundreds of thousands of people to work than another nickel in the coffers of OPEC or ExxonMobil or Wall Street speculators.

It is time to suck it up around here, act like men and women who were sent here to make tough decisions, to regain our legacy, to begin to bring America back toward a world-class infrastructure. It would take many years and many tens or hundreds of billions of dollars to reclaim the legacy of the Eisenhower era, but it is only a lack of will—will—that prevents us from doing that. There is no major impediment. Nobody is going to lose their election over 1.7 cents a gallon. In fact, people will thank you at home.

The trucking industry is begging—begging—for an increase in the diesel tax. The United States Chamber of Commerce, when is the last time they asked for an increase in a tax? Look, all across the spectrum, the retailers, the business community, all across this country people are saying: Help us; get us out of congestion; fix the system; bring it up to a state of good repair. There is another whole contingent of American people who are saying: We need jobs.

There is no more certain way to create jobs in this country than investing in America's infrastructure. And they are not just construction jobs. They are engineering jobs. They are manufacturing jobs. In the case of mass transit, they are high-tech jobs. They are small business jobs. They are disadvantaged business enterprise jobs. It goes through the entire economy. No American will be left behind.

We could create hundreds of thousands of jobs and make America number one again. All we lack is the will here in this House. Let's say this is the last 60-day delay. Let's work together, and let's get a real 6-year bill by the end of July.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to announce we introduced the GROW AMERICA Act comprehensive bill with which we could begin policy discussions, H.R. 2410, today, with 19 cosponsors.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate the passion of the ranking member, my friend, Mr. DEFAZIO, on these issues. I have to say that much of what has been said on this floor by both sides, I agree with. The need to invest in our infrastructure is real. It is critical. Our infrastructure is crumbling all around us.

I also agree that we need to find a long-term solution to the trust fund to make sure it is fiscally responsible, and most importantly, I agree that we need to act. This 2-month extension was not my preference. What my preference is, is to buckle down, work hard, find the dollars, and have a long-term surface transportation bill that is sustainable.

Again, I stand here today urging all my colleagues to vote for this essential

2-month extension to get us through to July. I am committed to continue to work to find the solution so we can have a long-term bill, but a vote against this bill is a vote in favor of shutting down these vital programs, stopping the work of thousands of highway projects around the country and laying off thousands of construction workers and Federal employees.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the highway trust fund has enough money to pay for projects through the end of July, but its legal authority to spend that money expires at the end of this month. I would have preferred to pass an extension that lasted through the end of the year, but we just couldn't come to a bipartisan agreement on how to pay for it. That's unfortunate because the more time we spend on these short-term patches, the less time we'll have to find a long-term solution.

And ultimately, the only real solution is a long-term solution. At the very least, this legislation will allow the trust find to continue to fund projects through July, while we continue to work on an extension for the rest of the year. But if we really want to solve this problem, both parties need to confront the serious challenges facing the trust fund. That's the only way we'll come up with a plan to give states the certainty they need to build the roads and bridges our families need to thrive.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bill, H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015 but with reservations.

I support Chairman SHUSTER's efforts to ensure the Highway Bill does not expire and cost the economy jobs and cause important projects to stop progress.

I am, however, disappointed we once again face this issue.

We need to pass a long-term highway bill so that our communities and businesses have the certainty they need to invest in our future.

I understand the fiscal challenges we face but I believe that we must do more to improve our nation's transportation system.

Transportation funding, particularly for highways and transit, is particularly important for my constituents and the entirety of the Greater Houston area.

We have a congestion problem in Houston.

We have done a lot to reduce this congestion, but more must be done.

We also have the largest port for foreign tonnage and largest petrochemical complex in our country along the banks of the Port of Houston.

In the years ahead, we will face a much higher traffic volume due to population growth and the expansion of the Panama Canal, which will bring more truck traffic and economic development to the area.

In order for Houston and our Port to continue to be a hub for commerce, we must strengthen our rail and road infrastructure.

Both a successful port and a growing local economy rely on well maintained roads and bridges.

Communities around our country must improve its transportation infrastructure in order to encourage businesses and economic development.

While I understand the strain the Highway Trust Fund is experiencing, it is important that we fund important highway projects throughout the country.

We are at a critical time for our nation in terms of transportation funding.

We must fix bridges, expand highways, and increase the capacity of our infrastructure.

Highway and transit projects are important to our constituents, so they can get to work and school and they are important to our businesses so they can move commerce.

Everyone wins when we increase our investments in our transportation infrastructure.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2353 but I also urge my colleagues to fix the problem and craft a long-term highway bill for the benefit of all our citizens.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2353. This bill will mark the thirty-third time we've passed a short-term extension to the Highway bill in eight years. Enough is enough. Our roads and bridges are crumbling. We owe it to the American people to pass a robust long-term surface transportation bill and make real investments in our transportation infrastructure. These short-tern extensions not only diminish our economic competitiveness as a nation but they erode the safety of all of the folks we were sent here to represent. I will not support any more short-term gimmicks and implore my colleagues to join me in rejecting this proposal and instead pass a long-term bill and once again invest in our national infrastructure.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Ms. ESTY. I am, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Esty moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2353 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle E—Passenger Rail Positive Train Control Funding

SEC. 1401. PASSENGER RAIL POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL FUNDING.

Section 20158(c) of title 49, United States Code is amended by inserting '', and $750,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2015,'' after ''2013''.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

My amendment provides $750 million to passenger railroads to help them implement positive train control. Tragically, last week, Amtrak 188 derailed, killing 8 people and injuring more than 200. My thoughts and prayers are with the victims and their loved ones.

Unfortunately, last week's tragic accident is just the latest in a series of incidents that are unacceptable and largely preventable.

According to National Transportation Safety Board member Robert Sumwalt, the lead investigator of last week's Amtrak derailment in Philadelphia: ''Had PTC''—positive train control—''been installed on the section of track, this accident would not have occurred.''

Now, what is positive train control? Positive train control, commonly referred to as PTC, is a communications and signaling system that uses GPS technology and sensors to communicate train location, speed, restrictions, and moving authority.

Most importantly, PTC can save lives. For instance, positive train control technology can detect if a train is going too fast for an area and use onboard equipment to automatically slow or stop the train.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last week's derailment is not the first time NTSB has recommended implementing positive train control. This recommendation has been made since 1969, following an investigation of a head-on collision of two Penn Central commuter trains near Darien, Connecticut, in my home State. That collision killed 4 people and left 43 injured.

Forty-six years after that deadly collision in Connecticut, the NTSB is still demanding and waiting for action. During this time, the NTSB has investigated 144 accidents that would have been preventable if railroads had installed PTC. Not surprisingly, positive train control has been on the NTSB's most wanted list of safety improvements since 1990.

144 accidents over 43 years—try and think about that, and try to comprehend 6,532 preventable injuries and 288 preventable deaths.

This just isn't an issue only on the Northeast corridor. In 2008, a tragic accident in California killed 25 people and injured 102. After that accident, this House enacted legislation requiring PTC on commuter and intercity passenger rails by December 31 of this year; but protecting lives requires leadership from this Congress.

The American Public Transportation Association asked Congress to provide Federal funding for 80 percent of the installation costs on passenger rails. We in Congress can help. We can and must make this investment before another terrible accident, before another life is tragically and needlessly lost. We can't afford to wait.

Less than 2 years ago, a Metro-North Railroad engineer fell asleep as the train he was operating sped up to 82 miles an hour through a tight curve. The restriction for that section was only 30 miles an hour. As a result of the derailment, 4 people died, and 61 were injured. With tragic predictability, the NTSB investigation determined that positive train control could have prevented that tragedy as well.

How many more times does the NTSB need to repeat its recommendation before PTC is implemented?

There is no reason why this Congress should continue to ignore its responsibility to help passenger railroads implement the lifesaving technology as soon as possible.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to provide the necessary funding to help passenger railroads implement PTC across the United States.

Let me be clear: this funding won't prevent every single accident. The fact that PTC will not prevent every accident should not—cannot—be an excuse for this Congress' failure to act.

Failure to act today on implementing positive train control is wrong. It is unworthy of a great country. A great country does not respond to crises with duct tape; a great country leads with action.

I ask all House Members to join me to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. SHUSTER. I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion. We certainly know of the tragedy that happened in Philadelphia, in my home State, but this really is not the place to address this.

We need to pass a clean extension. We have got to pass it and get it to the Senate, so we make sure that these vital programs keep people working, we keep projects moving forward, and that they don't shut down.

Again, this is a clean extension. We want it to be a clean extension because we know that time is of the essence to get this over to the Senate, as I said, and pass it. You are talking about 4,000 people in the government that will be furloughed and thousands of workers across America. Projects will stop, and they won't be working.

Again, we have an immediate need to extend the highway transit and safety programs. I am confident and remain committed to working with Chairman RYAN; but this is not the time to slow this down. This the time to get it done so that we can get it to the Senate as quickly as possible.

Again, I am opposed to this motion. I urge a ''no'' vote on the motion and continue to ask my colleagues to support the underlying bill that gets the job done and gets us past this critical time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE STABILIZATION OF IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–40)

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 stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2015.

Obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in the country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Accordingly, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 19, 2015.*

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on consideration of H.R. 2250, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 271 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2250.

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

□ 1516

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. CARTER of Georgia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When I joined the Appropriations Committee a little over 4 years ago, I said that I wanted this committee to be known as a place where taxpayer money was saved and not spent. In recent years, there has been a major change in the perception of this committee.

Thanks in large part to the leadership of Chairman ROGERS and the members of the committee, the process is open, and it is transparent, and this committee has made a priority of ensuring every taxpayer dollar is spent wisely.

In keeping with that trend, the bill that we are here to debate today holds the line on spending. It is a bill that honors and respects the taxpayer while preserving the beauty of the Capitol campus, providing essential security for visitors and staff, and ensuring that we are able to provide the services that our constituents expect and deserve.

This bill is a total of $3.3 billion for the legislative branch, excluding all Senate items. The bill continues the freeze on funding for the House of Representatives, including leadership, committees, and Member office budgets. It also continues the Member pay freeze that was put in place in 2010.

In all, this represents a 14 percent reduction in funding for the House of Representatives since Republicans have gained control of Congress in January of 2011.

Now, more specifically, this bill increases funding for the Capitol Police and allows small increases for several other agencies while trimming budgets in less critical areas.

This bill recognizes the continuing challenges faced by our Architect of the Capitol. There is a balance that must be struck between preserving these historic buildings and funding other critical projects, including life-safety projects.

Overall, the Architect's budget is one that was trimmed. This bill puts a new emphasis on transparency and accountability in major construction projects under the Architect. That is why this bill transitions to direct appropriations for the Cannon restoration project, rather than continuing to use the House historic building revitalization fund. This change will significantly improve the committee's ability to provide oversight for this major project.

Additionally, this bill includes language that places a 25 percent cap on the amount available for larger projects within the legislative branch. In order to receive the remaining 75 percent of their appropriations, this new oversight feature requires a plan for any project over $5 million to be submitted to the GAO and our committee for approval.

The plan must address any projected changes to the project's schedule and cost, and it must include a description of the safeguards taken to ensure that the project remains on time and on budget.

Now, regarding the Library of Congress, this bill includes funding to meet the Library's current needs, including an increase for the U.S. Copyright Office to reduce claims processing and analyze possible process improvements.

Additionally, the committee will be working with the Library in the upcoming months to track its progress in addressing its critical IT infrastructure problems which have been identified in a recent GAO report.

In closing, I would like to thank Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Chairman ROGERS, Mrs. LOWEY, and the members of our subcommittee and full committee and staff for their hard work throughout this entire process. This is a product that we can be proud of.

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

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2250)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
Payment to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress	---	---	174	+174	+174
Salaries and Expenses					
House Leadership Offices					
Office of the Speaker	6,645	6,645	6,645	---	---
Office of the Majority Floor Leader	2,180	2,180	2,180	---	---
Office of the Minority Floor Leader	7,114	7,114	7,114	---	---
Office of the Majority Whip	1,887	1,887	1,887	---	---
Office of the Minority Whip	1,460	1,460	1,460	---	---
Republican Conference	1,505	1,505	1,505	---	---
Democratic Caucus	1,487	1,487	1,487	---	---
Subtotal, House Leadership Offices	22,278	22,278	22,278	---	---
Members' Representational Allowances Including Members' Clerk Hire, Official Expenses of Members, and Official Mail					
Expenses	554,318	554,318	554,318	---	---
Committee Employees					
Standing Committees, Special and Select	123,903	123,903	123,903	---	---
Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations)	23,271	23,271	23,271	---	---
Subtotal, Committee employees	147,174	147,174	147,174	---	---
Salaries, Officers and Employees					
Office of the Clerk	24,009	24,981	24,981	+972	---
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	11,927	14,827	14,827	+2,900	---
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer	113,100	117,165	115,010	+1,910	-2,155
Office of the Inspector General	4,742	4,742	4,742	---	---
Office of General Counsel	1,341	1,413	1,413	+72	---
Office of the Parliamentarian	1,952	1,975	1,975	+23	---
Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House	4,088	3,120	3,120	-968	---
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House	8,893	8,353	8,353	-540	---
Office of Interparliamentary Affairs	814	814	814	---	---
Other authorized employees	479	479	479	---	---
Subtotal, Salaries, officers and employees	171,345	177,869	175,714	+4,369	-2,155
Allowances and Expenses					
Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims	4,153	3,625	3,625	-528	---
Official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House	190	190	190	---	---
Government contributions	256,636	252,164	254,448	-2,188	+2,284
Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery	16,217	16,289	16,217	---	-72
Transition activities	3,737	2,084	2,084	-1,653	---
Wounded Warrior program	2,500	2,500	2,500	---	---
Office of Congressional Ethics	1,467	1,524	1,467	---	-57
Miscellaneous items	720	720	720	---	---
Subtotal, Allowances and expenses	285,620	279,096	281,251	-4,369	+2,155
Total, House of Representatives (discretionary)	1,180,735	1,180,735	1,180,735	---	---
Total, House of Representatives (mandatory)	---	---	174	+174	+174

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2250)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Economic Committee	4,203	4,254	4,203	---	-51
Joint Committee on Taxation	10,095	10,300	10,095	---	-205
Office of the Attending Physician					
Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances	3,371	3,797	3,784	+413	-13
Office of Congressional Accessibility Services	1,387	1,416	1,387	---	-29
Total, Joint items	19,056	19,767	19,469	+413	-298
CAPITOL POLICE					
Salaries	286,500	307,428	300,000	+13,500	-7,428
General expenses	61,459	71,472	69,000	+7,541	-2,472
Total, Capitol Police	347,959	378,900	369,000	+21,041	-9,900
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE					
Salaries and expenses	3,959	4,020	3,959	---	-61
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	45,700	47,270	47,270	+1,570	---
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Capitol Construction and Operations 1/	91,455	95,396	90,946	-509	-4,450
Capitol building	54,665	58,052	46,737	-7,928	-11,315
Capitol grounds	11,973	15,273	11,880	-93	-3,393
House of Representatives buildings:					
House office buildings	89,447	90,282	149,962	+60,515	+59,680
House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund	70,000	70,000	10,000	-60,000	-60,000
Capitol Power Plant	99,652	129,803	100,550	+898	-29,253
Offsetting collections	-9,000	-9,000	-9,000	---	---
Subtotal, Capitol Power Plant	90,652	120,803	91,550	+898	-29,253
Library buildings and grounds	42,180	65,801	36,589	-5,591	-29,212
Capitol police buildings, grounds, and security	19,159	28,247	22,058	+2,899	-6,189
Botanic Garden	15,573	12,113	11,892	-3,681	-221
Capitol Visitor Center:					
CVC operations	20,844	21,043	20,557	-287	-486
Total, Architect of the Capitol	505,948	577,010	492,171	-13,777	-84,839
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Salaries and expenses	419,357	444,370	419,357	---	-25,013
Authority to spend receipts	-6,350	-6,350	-6,350	---	---
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	413,007	438,020	413,007	---	-25,013
Copyright Office, Salaries and expenses	54,303	58,875	57,008	+2,705	-1,867
Authority to spend receipts	-33,582	-35,777	-35,777	-2,195	---
Subtotal, Copyright Office	20,721	23,098	21,231	+510	-1,867
Congressional Research Service, Salaries and expenses	106,945	111,956	106,945	---	-5,011
Books for the blind and physically handicapped, Salaries and expenses	50,248	51,428	50,248	---	-1,180
Total, Library of Congress	590,921	624,502	591,431	+510	-33,071

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2250)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE					
Congressional publishing	79,736	79,736	79,736	---	---
Public Information Programs of the Superintendent of Documents,					
Salaries and expenses	31,500	30,500	30,500	-1,000	---
Government Publishing Office Business Operations Revolving Fund	8,757	9,764	---	-8,757	-9,764
Total, Government Publishing Office	119,993	120,000	110,236	-9,757	-9,764
GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	545,750	578,508	547,450	+1,700	-31,058
Offsetting collections	-23,750	-25,450	-25,450	-1,700	---
Total, Government Accountability Office	522,000	553,058	522,000	---	-31,058
OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TRUST FUND					
Payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund	5,700	8,000	5,700	---	-2,300
JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT					
Stennis Center for Public Service	430	430	430	---	---
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Scorekeeping adjustment (CBO estimate)	-1,000	---	-1,000	---	-1,000
Grand total	3,341,401	3,513,692	3,341,575	+174	-172,117
Discretionary	(3,341,401)	(3,513,692)	(3,341,401)	---	(-172,291)
Mandatory	---	---	(174)	(+174)	(+174)

1/ Formerly named General Administration

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2250)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAPITULATION					
House of Representatives (discretionary)	1,180,735	1,180,735	1,180,735	---	---
House of Representatives (mandatory)	---	---	174	+174	+174
Joint Items	19,056	19,767	19,469	+413	-298
Capitol Police	347,959	378,900	369,000	+21,041	-9,900
Office of Compliance	3,959	4,020	3,959	---	-61
Congressional Budget Office	45,700	47,270	47,270	+1,570	---
Architect of the Capitol	505,948	577,010	492,171	-13,777	-84,839
Library of Congress	590,921	624,502	591,431	+510	-33,071
Government Publishing Office	119,993	120,000	110,236	-9,757	-9,764
Government Accountability Office	522,000	553,058	522,000	---	-31,058
Open World Leadership Center	5,700	8,000	5,700	---	-2,300
Stennis Center for Public Service	430	430	430	---	---
General Provisions	-1,000	---	-1,000	---	-1,000
Grand total	3,341,401	3,513,692	3,341,575	+174	-172,117
Discretionary	(3,341,401)	(3,513,692)	(3,341,401)	---	(-172,291)
Mandatory	---	---	(174)	(+174)	(+174)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by congratulating Chairman GRAVES on his maiden voyage as a chair of an appropriations subcommittee. I know that he was diligent and focused, and we found agreement where we could, and where we could not agree, I appreciate his willingness to discuss it in a congenial and thoughtful manner.

Today, we consider the smallest of the appropriations bills; and, while that is the case, it is one that does fund an entire branch of our government. The bill provides, as the chairman mentioned, $3.3 billion to the legislative branch, without Senate items, and is equal to the amount provided in fiscal year 2015.

Unfortunately, this represents the third year in a row of flat funding for the overall legislative branch. Certain agencies—the Architect of the Capitol and the Government Publishing Office—are cut below fiscal year 2015 to support increases in other agencies.

I know if there was overall relief in the budget allocation, we would see more investment in the staff and facilities in the legislative branch, but we are starting to cut into bone in some places, and it is truly unwise.

It is regrettable that this bill is, as are all of the other appropriations bills, bound by spending limits set by the Republican budget resolution that continues sequestration.

The President put forward a plan that will avoid sequestration's harmful budget cuts and reduce the deficit in a balanced way. Unfortunately, the Republican budget does not at least meet the President's plan halfway.

As we look to conference with the Senate later in the year on appropriations bills, I am hopeful that both parties and the President can come together for another reasonable bargain that gives us more room for discretionary programs.

This bill is being considered under a structured rule, as is tradition. Twenty amendments were filed, seven of which were filed by Democratic Members. Regrettably, the Rules Committee only made three Republican amendments in order, all of which would further erode the Legislative Branch bill's funding.

No Democratic amendments were made in order, even though several were aimed at improving the lives of our restaurant workers whose plight was played out in very public display in the last several weeks.

Last night, in the Rules Committee, I asked the committee to attempt to find some parity, Mr. Chairman, between the majority and minority with regard to amendments made in order; instead of parity, the minority was completely shut out of the process.

As a result of the allocation, several infrastructure projects with life and safety elements are not funded in this bill, even though we have been committed to funding those in past years. Cutting necessary upgrades to our elevators will not get us out of debt; what it will do is get people stuck in our elevators. We should not be surprised if an accident happens because we didn't address important life-safety projects.

This bill, as I have said many times before, is not the sexiest of the 13 appropriations bills, but it is one that is incredibly important, and it is important that we keep the people who visit the Capitol and work in the Capitol safe, and this bill makes it less likely that we will be able to do that.

There are not many new initiatives in the bill, given the allocation, but I am pleased that the bill recognized the importance of the Nation's copyright laws by providing some of the requested increase.

The Copyright Office must improve the backlog of registrations, as well as their business processes. Currently, customers can only submit documents on paper, which the Copyright Office turns into a digital format, which is a glaring inefficiency. It is 2015, the 21st century. Our Copyright Office should not be conducting 21st century business in a 20th century format.

The Copyright Office said it best itself in a report released in February of this year:

> There is a widespread perception that our licensing system is broken. Songwriters and recording artists are concerned that they cannot make a living under the existing structure, which raises serious and systemic concerns for the future. Music publishers and performance rights organizations are frustrated that so much of their licensing activity is subject to government control, so they are constrained in the marketplace. Record labels and digital services complain that the licensing process is burdensome and inefficient, making it difficult to innovate.

I am glad to see that this bill is beginning to address necessary upgrades.

Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned with the cut to the Government Publishing Office in the underlying bill. This office was formerly known as the Government Printing Office. Congress changed the name in December to reflect what the agency actually does in this digital world. The office publishes information online and plays a vital role in Congress' transparency.

Unfortunately, GPO's request to continue to improve its online site, as it has been allowed to do each year before this one, even under full sequestration, was denied in the bill. The cut to GPO's online site continues to raise the concern from some that GPO could ultimately decide to charge the public for access to legislative documents, as was recommended to them by the National Academy of Public Administration in 2013.

I agree with Representatives CANDICE MILLER and BOB BRADY, the chair and ranking member of House Administration, who wrote to GPO, stating: ''Charging the public to access legislative data and documents would be a colossal setback to the progress Congress has made to improve transparency and access to legislative information.''

They also said charging the public ''would be a direct assault on our ability to engage Americans in a process that is of great consequence to their livelihoods.''

GPO indicated at the time of the Miller-Brady letter that it had no plans to charge users for what should be public information; but what choice are we leaving them if we don't continue investing in their online systems?

Also included in the bill is a requirement that the Architect seek approval, as the chairman described, from the House Committee on Appropriations and the Government Accountability Office for any project or phase of a project over $5 million.

I support strong oversight, as I have demonstrated many times over the last 8 years, but I do question whether or not the low threshold would unnecessarily hold up the progress of essential projects.

We should require the assistance of GAO to review projects on the scale of the Cannon building restoration. I have asked GAO to come in and get involved very specifically in a number of things where accountability was a concern, but I question the use of GAO's resources on projects as small as $5 million. That begins to micromanage beyond what is reasonable.

To end on a more positive note, I am pleased that we were able to provide $10 million to add to the House historic buildings revitalization trust fund. We have been banking funds for our large projects over the last several years, which is imperative to help ensure we avoid getting caught flatfooted if we experience unexpected costs in the future.

As I conclude, I want to, again, thank Chairman GRAVES for an open dialogue as he crafted this bill. I did have a lot of opportunity to talk with him about the details of this bill and offer suggestions, many of which he took. Again, I look forward to continuing to work with the chairman as the bill moves to the Senate and then on to conference.

I particularly want to thank our incredible staff, one of whom is sitting next to me, Shalanda Young, and the rest of our staff, Liz Dawson, Chuck Turner, on the majority side; and Jenny Panone, as well as Jason Murphy, with Chairman GRAVES' personal office; and Rosalyn Kumar, on my personal staff. Thank you so much.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to our full committee chairman, I do want to thank the ranking member for her work on this, her input. She worked diligently through the process and was supportive in subcommittee and full committee, and I wanted to thank her for that publicly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Chairman GRAVES, thank you for yielding the

time, and thank you for the great work.

This is the first bill that Chairman GRAVES has brought to the floor of the House. He is the newest cardinal that we have, one of the 12 subcommittee chairmen—they are called cardinals—and this is his first bill.

I want to congratulate him and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for putting together what I think is a pretty high standard for fiscal responsibility for the House, freezing funding at last year's level, $3.3 billion.

That is the third year in a row, Mr. Chairman, that we have frozen the budget of the House of Representatives, making good on our promise to rein in spending and do more with less.

□ 1530

This level maintains the 14 percent reduction in House funding that began when Republicans took control of the House 4 years ago.

In addition, we have continued the freeze on Member pay that has been in place since 2010. We believe that in order for us to ask others to sacrifice throughout the government, that we have to sacrifice, ourselves, first; and that is what this bill does.

The bill includes numerous provisions designed to guarantee that the House and its support agencies are spending their tax dollars appropriately and to keep them accountable to the taxpayers. This includes enhancing oversight of the Cannon building restoration project and making sure that Congress approves any large-scale construction project.

These steps will help ensure that this type of major undertaking stays on time and on budget and are especially important given the historical significance of our buildings and the importance of their use.

The $3.3 billion this bill provides for the House is directed to support the most important functions of our legislative branch: keeping our Member and committee offices open for business, protecting the safety of those who work in and visit the Capitol complex, and improving the way we support our agencies—and the importance of doing just that.

For instance, the Capitol Police budget has been increased by $21 million to ensure our men in blue have the resources needed to protect this hallowed building and its grounds. And where we have seen issues in the agencies funded by the bill—for example, IT infrastructure challenges at the Library of Congress—we have taken the steps to make sure that these will be fixed moving forward.

Again, I want to thank Chairman GRAVES, Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and this great staff that has worked hard on this bill. They have demonstrated their love of this institution and these grounds by the hard work and devotion they have put into making this bill possible. So we want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for putting together this small but mighty bill. So I thank them for all of their work.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud that the House can lead by example when it comes to restoring fiscal discipline to the operations of the Federal Government. This bill will allow the House to fulfill its core duties within a responsible, realistic budget and preserve the democracy that makes this Nation so great.

I thank the chairman for the time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee as well as the ranking member of the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Subcommittee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GRAVES and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for their hard work on this bill.

Today, during what the majority has labeled ''Innovation Week,'' we consider the smallest of the appropriation bills, which funds the operations of our Nation's legislative branch.

Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely nothing innovative about this bill. Without Senate items, the bill is $3.341 billion. Despite years of ''tightening our belts,'' the majority has, yet again, kept funding flat and further damaged this institution's reputation and ability to function at the highest level.

Member representational allowances, or MRAs, would be frozen for a third consecutive year and will continue to strain the House's ability to serve the American people due to fewer staff for constituent casework, the inability to effectively communicate with our constituents, and fewer district offices.

Furthermore, we will consider amendments to the bill which would compound the problems legislative branch agencies face: our buildings are crumbling, life and safety projects are postponed, and agencies have hit the limits of what they can do with inadequate funding. Further cuts proposed today will have even greater implications for the operations of the Congress.

I am concerned that the majority continues funding for a partisan lawsuit against the President. At a time when we are putting appropriation bills under tight budgetary restrictions, this waste of taxpayer dollars only distracts us from the serious work Congress should get done.

Notwithstanding my misgivings, I want to again congratulate the chairman for putting forth his first bill and working with the ranking member, where possible. We need more cooperation between the majority and the minority.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise on this bill, as a member of the subcommittee, with very mixed emotions. There are some very good things in this bill, but there is also some bad stuff. The question is whether the bill is 51 percent good or 51 percent bad.

I came to Congress because I believe that government can play a positive role in American lives. Government is not the enemy.

But it makes me wonder then why this body refuses to invest in the tools to do the job of government and, by extension, to do the job of the American people. This bill contains the same funding levels it did last year, and that is $172 million less than the budget request.

Any good corporation plots its investments so the company can prosper. In terms of the House of Representatives, that would mean setting spending at a level that would maximize its ability to serve the people. By failing to make those investments, we disrespect the American people, and we tell them that we are not worth the investment, not worth the effort, not worth doing the job well.

This bill fails to invest in the very institution we depend upon to make government function properly. This body is being given short shrift.

I am on the Appropriations Committee. I think it is our responsibility to meet the needs of the Nation in every respect, and that includes investing in the legislative branch of government so it can do its job.

Those low polling numbers that Congress gets—everybody here talks about how low it is—I think they are the self-fulfilled policy of a Congress that refuses to provide itself the tools they need to serve the public.

Skimping isn't going to make this place work any better. Using taxpayer dollars more wisely will.

Having said that, I am also supportive of what the committee brought to the floor in a program called the Open World Leadership Center. It is operated out of funds from Congress with the Library of Congress.

What Members may not know is that this program was begun as the brainchild of the late Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska and the Librarian of Congress. It was to expose young and emerging leaders—average age about 38—in Russia and former Eastern bloc countries. Some of those countries include Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, Kazakhstan.

I think President Putin would love to see this program go away, the way USAID has left the region.

It makes a difference to those young leaders to visit congressional districts, to see how city councils work, to see how school boards work, to see the United States, the State legislators, the judges. The program belongs in the legislative branch because peer-to-peer relationships do work.

The program reaches out to all 50 States. More than 23,000 rising leaders have been hosted by the United States Government since the program's inception. Eighty percent of those have met with Members of Congress and visited their congressional districts. This is a very robust exchange program.

I had a group in my district out in the central coast of California, and one of the visitors had been a member of the Duma, their Congress. He told me that he had been invited by our country to be here at least about a dozen times. But only in visiting the communities and seeing the local government in action did he actually understand what democracy was all about, a bottom's-up process in America that is never learned just visiting Washington or getting taught in a classroom. The value of hands-on, from-the-ground-up democracy is a lesson that can't be learned from a book. Open World experiences show these participants that democracy is not just a dream. It is actually a working reality, one that they can have in their home countries if they work at it. And America shows them how.

There is an amendment coming up, the Ratcliffe amendment, and I hope that all the Members of Congress will reject that amendment to delete this program.

Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the work of the gentleman from Georgia, our new chairman. He has done a great job. I hope that we will spend, though, a little bit more money investing in this institution so that we can get the job done, not just talk about how we can cut, squeeze, and trim, sacrificing the ability of Congress to be its best.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR). He is a great member of the subcommittee and a strong advocate for a lot of elements within our budget. The truth is, we had tough choices to make. It wasn't easy. We are held within the constraints of what current law is.

The President may have submitted a budget that didn't comply with the constraints that we have to comply with, but that doesn't mean that we can adhere to his budget numbers. So we are $170-something million below what the President requested or what the budget request was, but we are within the limits that are provided by law that many of the Members within this body voted for—excluding myself—and the President signed it into law.

At some point, we have to grapple with that, as a House, and understand that is the law. And until that law is changed, tough choices we will have to make.

As the chairman of the full committee so eloquently stated earlier, it is up to us to lead by example, and that is who we have elected to be our leaders and to represent our districts by example. So these are tough choices, no doubt. I agree with the gentleman from California.

I know we had a goal, as a committee, and it was really bipartisan, our objective; and that was to honor and respect taxpayers today and preserve the institution for future generations, given the limited resources we had to work with.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, let me just point out that the chairman is right: we do have to lead by example.

Leading by example, as we have in the past, like last fiscal year—after the President submitted his budget, we certainly could have and should have, as a Congress, sat down with the President and negotiated an adjustment to the sequester, which we were able to successfully do last year, and that was to the betterment of making sure that people who are simply trying to succeed have the opportunity to do so in this country instead of living under the severe cuts and caps that sequestration forced us into. That is Congress' job, which we abdicated. That was not the choice of the minority; it was the choice of the majority.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I appreciate my colleague from Florida yielding, and I appreciate the work that she and colleagues on both sides of the aisle have done on this bill. I want to commend them for their work.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to address an amendment yet to come, one that I hope this body will reject. This is an amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE). It will be an amendment to undo the bipartisan work of our Appropriations Committee. It would terminate the Open World program at the Library of Congress, which is a major outreach effort of our legislative branch in Russia and former Soviet and Soviet bloc countries.

At a time when these countries' democracies and sovereignty are under threat, the Open World program, I believe, is more important than ever. This isn't President Putin's favorite activity, as others have stated. That puts it very mildly, believe me. But he has not been able to stop it.

It is now more important than ever, not just in Russia but in fragile democracies and would-be democracies, such as Ukraine, Moldova, Kyrgyzstan, and Georgia.

This is the best program of its kind that I have ever seen. And I have a lot of personal experience with Open World groups that have come to Washington and have come to my district.

This is a program unique in both scope and concept. Most participants aren't the people who typically participate in international exchange programs. They are teachers, judges, local officials, young activists, people who live in rural areas and small towns. This program penetrates deeply, rather than just being another run-of-the-mill exchange program.

□ 1545

I invite any colleague to talk to any of our diplomats in the participant countries. You will leave with no doubt about how unique and how valuable the network of Open World participants is in the struggle for democracy in those countries and for the way our country is regarded, and there is a long list of veterans of Open World who are now public and private sector leaders in their countries.

Mr. Chairman, some may question the placement of Open World in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill. In fact, I think that is a huge asset. Because the program is not tied to a specific administration with its goals and politics, there is no hurdle to participation. There is no possibility that it will get lost as the State Department focuses on our other regions or on other priorities.

Now, unlike the other programs in this bill, sure enough, Open World is not about us. It is not about our salaries. It is not about our staffs. It is not about our operations. It is not about us. But I assure you, it is about our country. It is about what we stand for at home and around the world. It is about projecting the value of our democratic principles to countries with histories of oppressive rule.

The Appropriations Committee included funding for Open World following a bipartisan effort led by Representatives FORTENBERRY and FARR. Hopefully, today that wise decision will be sustained.

I strongly encourage this body to stand with the pro-democracy advocates, many, many brave and courageous people in a critical part of the world. Oppose the Ratcliffe amendment.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Point of clarification because I know these proceedings are documented well, and I know the ranking member stated that sequestration was a decision of the majority and not the minority. In some aspects, she is very correct, because at the time sequestration was implemented, the majority of the Senate was held by Democrats, and the concept came from Jack Lew, which is heavily documented, from the President's administration. So just to make sure there is full clarity here of majority and minority perspectives, there was a different majority at the time when that was taking place.

If I could, just for a moment, address the Open World discussion here. This is a program that has been ongoing for several years—it has been decades, quite frankly—with great intentions in the beginning. What hasn't been stated

today is that its intention was to be a one-time program to assist during a transitional phase of the Soviet bloc countries at that time, back in the Bill Clinton administration, to assist them with some dialogue with free markets and diplomacy and such as we were experiencing during that time.

As we know, with a lot of government programs that have good intentions of being one time, singular, they tend to go on into perpetuity. Yet we have heard claims today that there is not enough money, that we don't have enough to spend on things that are so vital and so critical to this body, to the institution, to meeting our constituents' needs, to the $1.5 billion in deferred maintenance of buildings, to MRAs not being enough, or whatever it might be. Yet there is still this clinging to $5 million of training Russian diplomats or Russian civic leaders is more important, more important than meeting the critical needs that we have here as a body, whether it is the Library of Congress, whether it is making sure that there is security provided through the Capitol Police, that they are fully funded where they need to be, whatever it might be.

I would claim, Mr. Chairman, that today, if we cannot cut $5 million from a program that is duplicative, that there are 95 other programs that do very similar things, a program that has not been transparent, a program that has outlived its day, that is training Russians at a time when Russia is causing aggression against our allies and it is assisting our enemies, if we can't cut $5 million today and the gentleman from Texas' amendment fails today, God help us, when can we cut something from this budget?

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

While I intend to claim time in opposition to the amendment that addresses Open World a little bit later, which I know will come as a surprise to the chairman, I do want to point out now that what the chairman says is not quite accurate, which is why I am going to oppose the amendment. Because were we—and there were a number of options available to the Rules Committee—taking the $5 million that is going to Open World in the Legislative Branch bill now and putting it in to some other place in the Legislative Branch bill, life safety programs, restoring the cuts to GPO, or doing something that is going to make sure that the legislative branch can be competitive and has the ability to get our work done, then that would have been fine, because I agree that Open World is actually a square peg in a round hole and shouldn't be funded out of this bill, and I have made that case for many years.

Instead, what the majority did is they took an amendment that takes that $5 million and puts it into the spending reduction account. We are already $106 million below 2010 levels in our MRA, in our office accounts. This bill is flat-funded for 3 years in a row. We are doing ourselves a disservice and making it difficult for us to do our jobs when we had a ripe opportunity to take that $5 million—which I would have been for—and put it somewhere in the Legislative Branch bill instead of sending it out of here. That is not responsible.

Additionally, I will point out that perhaps the chairman's comments about sequestration demonstrate that he thinks that Congress' hands are tied and that we don't have the ability to actually make changes. The President has proposed what he believes we should do as an alternative to the sequester. That was his proposed budget.

Like last year, we also have the ability to set aside and work with the administration—set aside at least part of the sequester—so we could provide improved allocations for each of these appropriations bills and make sure that we can make life better for more Americans. Unfortunately, the majority continues to act as if somehow we are frozen in time and that we are paralyzed by sequestration as the law. The last time I checked, the Founding Fathers in the Constitution gave Congress the ability to change the law, which we should do.

Mr. Chairman, I will look forward to discussing some of the amendments that we will be debating in a few moments.

Again, I want to thank the chairman for, really, the opportunity to spend some time focusing on the needs of the legislative branch and giving us the ability to at least move forward in some ways towards addressing our role as a coequal branch of government. I think this bill could have been far better. It has made several positive changes, but as I have outlined, we have places where we disagree, but we did it without being disagreeable.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the ranking member, and I appreciate her acknowledgment of her opposition to the amendment that will arrive earlier. I would point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that I am not a member of the Rules Committee. I did not make that decision as to what amendment would be adopted or not. There were three amendments very similar. They were bipartisan. So there was bipartisan opposition to this program. We have the amendment before us that is before us, and, for the record, I will be supporting that amendment.

Let me say this has been a process that has been difficult. I understand that. We have had some tough choices to make, but we have made them. We made them in a bipartisan way in which we had unanimous support out of subcommittee; we had no opposition that I recall in full committee. And so I expect today that we might maintain some of that bipartisanship, some of that ability to get something done here for the American people and show them that we have priorities in place that honor and respect them and preserve this institution for future generations.

Mr. Chairman, to sum up what this bill does is we are here to hold the line on spending. We are keeping it flat-funded, as we have for the last year or two. This is a bill that is going to honor and respect our taxpayers. It is one that is preserving the beauty of this Capitol campus, providing a central security for all visitors and staff, and ensuring that we are able to provide the services that our constituents expect and deserve.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2250

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PAYMENT TO WIDOWS AND HEIRS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

For payment to Tori B. Nunnelee, widow of Alan Nunnelee, late a Representative from the State of Mississippi, $174,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, $1,180,736,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, $22,278,891, including: Office of the Speaker, $6,645,417, including $25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, $2,180,048, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, $7,114,471, including $10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, $1,886,632, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, $1,459,639, including $5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Republican Conference, $1,505,426; Democratic Caucus, $1,487,258: *Provided*, That such amount for salaries and expenses shall remain available from January 3, 2016 until January 2, 2017.

MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES

INCLUDING MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE, OFFICIAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS, AND OFFICIAL MAIL

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, $554,317,732.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, $123,903,173: *Provided*, That

such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2016.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, $23,271,004, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed: *Provided*, That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2016.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, $175,713,679, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including the positions of the Chaplain and the Historian, and including not more than $25,000, of which not more than $20,000 is for the Family Room and not more than $2,000 is for the Office of the Chaplain, for official representation and reception expenses, $24,980,898; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages and the Office of Emergency Management, and including not more than $3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $14,827,120 of which $4,784,229 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer including not more than $3,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $115,010,000, of which $1,350,000 shall remain available until expended; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, $4,741,809; for salaries and expenses of the Office of General Counsel, $1,413,450; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian, $2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, and not more than $1,000 for official representation and reception expenses, $1,974,606; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, $3,119,766; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, $8,352,975; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Interparliamentary Affairs, $814,069; for other authorized employees, $478,986.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, $281,251,521, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, $3,625,236; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, $190,486; Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, $254,447,514, to remain available until March 31, 2017; Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery, $16,217,008 of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended; transition activities for new members and staff, $2,084,000, to remain available until expended; Wounded Warrior Program $2,500,000, to remain available until expended; Office of Congressional Ethics, $1,467,030; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, $720,247.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. (a) REQUIRING AMOUNTS REMAINING IN MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES TO BE USED FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION OR TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amounts appropriated under this Act for ''HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SALARIES AND EXPENSES—MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES'' shall be available only for fiscal year 2016. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for fiscal year 2016 shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction (or, if there is no Federal budget deficit after all such payments have been made, for reducing the Federal debt, in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''Member of the House of Representatives'' means a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

DELIVERY OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

SEC. 102. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of a bill, joint resolution, or resolution to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) unless the Member requests a copy.

DELIVERY OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SEC. 103. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of any version of the Congressional Record to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

LIMITATION ON AMOUNT AVAILABLE TO LEASE VEHICLES

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives to make any payments from any Members' Representational Allowance for the leasing of a vehicle, excluding mobile district offices, in an aggregate amount that exceeds $1,000 for the vehicle in any month.

LIMITATION ON PRINTED COPIES OF U.S. CODE TO HOUSE

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide an aggregate number of more than 50 printed copies of any edition of the United States Code to all offices of the House of Representatives.

DELIVERY OF REPORTS OF DISBURSEMENTS

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the report of disbursements for the operations of the House of Representatives under section 106 of the House of Representatives Administrative Reform Technical Corrections Act (2 U.S.C. 5535) to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

DELIVERY OF DAILY CALENDAR

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) a printed copy of the Daily Calendar of the House of Representatives which is prepared by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, $4,203,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, $10,095,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including:

(1) an allowance of $2,175 per month to the Attending Physician;

(2) an allowance of $1,300 per month to the Senior Medical Officer;

(3) an allowance of $725 per month each to three medical officers while on duty in the Office of the Attending Physician;

(4) an allowance of $725 per month to 2 assistants and $580 per month each not to exceed 11 assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistants; and

(5) $2,692,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, $3,784,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, $1,387,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For salaries of employees of the Capitol Police, including overtime, hazardous duty pay, and Government contributions for health, retirement, social security, professional liability insurance, and other applicable employee benefits, $300,000,000 of which overtime shall not exceed $30,928,000 unless the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate are notified, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, security equipment and installation, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, personal and professional services, the employee assistance program, the awards program, postage, communication services, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and not more than $5,000 to be expended on the certification of the Chief of the Capitol Police in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $69,000,000, to be disbursed by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 2016 shall be paid by the Secretary of Homeland Security from funds available to the Department of Homeland Security.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

DEPOSIT OF REIMBURSEMENTS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 1001. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2802(a)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1905(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''District of Columbia)'' and inserting the following: ''District of Columbia), and from any other source in the case of assistance provided in connection with an

activity that was not sponsored by Congress''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2802(a)(2) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1905(a)(2)) is amended by striking ''law enforcement assistance to any Federal, State, or local government agency (including any agency of the District of Columbia)'' and inserting ''any law enforcement assistance for which reimbursement described in paragraph (1) is made''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to any reimbursement received before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), $3,959,000, of which $450,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That not more than $500 may be expended on the certification of the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance in connection with official representation and reception expenses.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary for operation of the Congressional Budget Office, including not more than $6,000 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $47,270,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATIONS

For salaries for the Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law; for all necessary expenses for surveys and studies, construction, operation, and general and administrative support in connection with facilities and activities under the care of the Architect of the Capitol including the Botanic Garden; electrical substations of the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol; including furnishings and office equipment; including not more than $5,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; for purchase or exchange, maintenance, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle, $90,946,000.

CAPITOL BUILDING

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol, $46,737,000, of which $22,737,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, $11,880,000, of which $2,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, $149,962,000, of which $23,886,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020, and of which $62,000,000 shall remain available until expended for the restoration and renovation of the Cannon House Office Building.

In addition, for a payment to the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, the Union Station complex, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, $91,549,898, of which $14,408,898 shall remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That not more than $9,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2016.

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, $36,589,000, of which $11,646,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

CAPITOL POLICE BUILDINGS, GROUNDS AND SECURITY

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of buildings, grounds and security enhancements of the United States Capitol Police, wherever located, the Alternate Computer Facility, and AOC security operations, $22,058,000, of which $4,525,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

BOTANIC GARDEN

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, $11,892,000; of which $2,100,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, the Architect of the Capitol may obligate and expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance, care and operation of the National Garden established under section 307E of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (2 U.S.C. 2146), upon vouchers approved by the Architect of the Capitol or a duly authorized designee.

CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

For all necessary expenses for the operation of the Capitol Visitor Center, $20,557,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

NO BONUSES FOR CONTRACTORS BEHIND SCHEDULE OR OVER BUDGET

SEC. 1101. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Architect of the Capitol may be used to make incentive or award payments to contractors for work on contracts or programs for which the contractor is behind schedule or over budget, unless the Architect of the Capitol, or agency-employed designee, determines that any such deviations are due to unforeseeable events, government-driven scope changes, or are not significant within the overall scope of the project and/or program.

SCRIMS

SEC. 1102. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for scrims containing photographs of building facades during restoration or construction projects performed by the Architect of the Capitol.

ACQUISITION OF PARCEL AT FORT MEADE

SEC. 1103. (a) ACQUISITION.—The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to acquire from the Maryland State Highway Administration, at no cost to the United States, a parcel of real property (including improvements thereon) consisting of approximately 7.34 acres located within the portion of Fort George G. Meade in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, that was transferred to the Architect of the Capitol by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to section 122 of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1994 (2 U.S.C. 141 note).

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The terms and conditions applicable under subsections (b) and (d) of section 122 of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1994 (2 U.S.C. 141 note) to the property acquired by the Architect of the Capitol pursuant to such section shall apply to the real property acquired by the Architect pursuant to the authority of this section.

OVERSIGHT PLAN FOR FUNDS PROVIDED FOR LARGE SCALE PROJECTS

SEC. 1104. (a) The Architect of the Capitol may not obligate more than 25 percent of the amount made available to the Architect under this Act for any project for which $5,000,000 or more is appropriated under this Act until—

(1) the Architect submits to the Comptroller General and the Committee on Appropriations of House of Representatives a plan for the use of the funds provided for the project which includes a description of any changes to the project's schedule (including benchmarks for the timing of the completion of various stages of the project) or the project's costs (including estimates of the total costs of the project or the total life cycle costs of the project), as well as a description of the accounting and other safeguards the Architect will implement to ensure that the project will be carried out in a timely and cost-effective manner; and

(2) the Comptroller General and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives approves such plan.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Library's catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog records and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, $419,357,000, of which not more than $6,000,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2016, and shall remain available until expended, under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150) and not more than $350,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2016 and shall remain available until expended for the development and maintenance of an international legal information database and activities related thereto: *Provided*, That the Library of Congress may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under the Act of June 28, 1902, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than

$6,350,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not more than $12,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $8,231,000 shall remain available until expended for the digital collections and educational curricula program.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, $57,008,000, of which not more than $30,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2016 under section 708(d) of title 17, United States Code: *Provided*, That the Copyright Office may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under such section, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That not more than $5,777,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2016 under sections 111(d)(2), 119(b)(3), 803(e), 1005, and 1316 of such title: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than $35,777,000: *Provided further*, That not more than $100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an ''International Copyright Institute'' in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not more than $6,500 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute and for copyright delegations, visitors, and seminars: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provision of chapter 8 of title 17, United States Code, any amounts made available under this heading which are attributable to royalty fees and payments received by the Copyright Office pursuant to sections 111, 119, and chapter 10 of such title may be used for the costs incurred in the administration of the Copyright Royalty Judges program, with the exception of the costs of salaries and benefits for the Copyright Royalty Judges and staff under section 802(e).

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, $106,945,000: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), $50,248,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, not more than $650,000 shall be available to contract to provide newspapers to blind and physically handicapped residents at no cost to the individual.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

REIMBURSABLE AND REVOLVING FUND ACTIVITIES

SEC. 1201. (a) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2016, the obligational authority of the Library of Congress for the activities described in subsection (b) may not exceed $186,015,000.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—The activities referred to in subsection (a) are reimbursable and revolving fund activities that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Library in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL PUBLISHING

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For authorized publishing of congressional information and the distribution of congressional information in any format; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (section 902 of title 44, United States Code); publishing of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and publishing, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, $79,736,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under section 906 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the 2-year limitation under section 718 of title 44, United States Code, none of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act or any other Act for printing and binding and related services provided to Congress under chapter 7 of title 44, United States Code, may be expended to print a document, report, or publication after the 27-month period beginning on the date that such document, report, or publication is authorized by Congress to be printed, unless Congress reauthorizes such printing in accordance with section 718 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Publishing Office business operations revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding sections 901, 902, and 906 of title 44, United States Code, this appropriation may be used to prepare indexes to the Congressional Record on only a monthly and session basis.

PUBLIC INFORMATION PROGRAMS OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of the public information programs of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, $30,500,000: *Provided*, That amounts of not more than $2,000,000 from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional serial sets and other related publications for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 to depository and other designated libraries: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Publishing Office business operations revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE BUSINESS OPERATIONS REVOLVING FUND

The Government Publishing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Publishing Office business operations revolving fund: *Provided*, That not more than $7,500 may be expended on the certification of the Director of the Government Publishing Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the business operations revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of not more than 12 passenger motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Director of the Government Publishing Office shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the business operations revolving fund shall be available for temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the business operations revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the business operations revolving fund and the funds provided under the heading ''Public Information Programs of the Superintendent of Documents'' may not be used for contracted security services at GPO's passport facility in the District of Columbia.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Government Accountability Office, including not more than $12,500 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with section 3324 of title 31, United States Code; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), (6), and (8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), (6), and (8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries, $522,000,000: *Provided*, That, in addition, $25,450,000 of payments received under sections 782, 791, 3521, and 9105 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental

Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of either Forum's costs as determined by the respective Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants: *Provided further*, That payments hereunder to the Forum may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DETAILS

SEC. 1301. (a) PERMITTING DETAILS FROM OTHER FEDERAL OFFICES.—Section 731 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DETAILS.—The activities of the Government Accountability Office may, in the reasonable discretion of the Comptroller General, be carried out by receiving details of personnel from other offices of the Federal Government on a reimbursable, partially-reimbursable, or nonreimbursable basis.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each succeeding fiscal year.

OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER TRUST FUND

For a payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund for financing activities of the Open World Leadership Center under section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151), $5,700,000, except that any funds made available under this heading to support Russian participants shall only be used for those engaging in free market development, humanitarian activities, and civic engagement, and shall not be used for officials of the central government of Russia.

JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund established under section 116 of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1105), $430,000.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

MAINTENANCE AND CARE OF PRIVATE VEHICLES

SEC. 201. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Administration and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FISCAL YEAR LIMITATION

SEC. 202. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 2016 unless expressly so provided in this Act.

RATES OF COMPENSATION AND DESIGNATION

SEC. 203. Whenever in this Act any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 (46 Stat. 32 et seq.) is appropriated for or the rate of compensation or designation of any office or position appropriated for is different from that specifically established by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation in this Act shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions in this Act for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

CONSULTING SERVICES

SEC. 204. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued under existing law.

COSTS OF LBFMC

SEC. 205. Amounts available for administrative expenses of any legislative branch entity which participates in the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council (LBFMC) established by charter on March 26, 1996, shall be available to finance an appropriate share of LBFMC costs as determined by the LBFMC, except that the total LBFMC costs to be shared among all participating legislative branch entities (in such allocations among the entities as the entities may determine) may not exceed $2,000.

LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE

SEC. 206. For fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the District of Columbia, is authorized to maintain and improve the landscape features, excluding streets, in Square 580 up to the beginning of I–395.

LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS

SEC. 207. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

GUIDED TOURS OF THE CAPITOL

SEC. 208. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available to the Architect of the Capitol in this Act may be used to eliminate or restrict guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by employees and interns of offices of Members of Congress and other offices of the House of Representatives and Senate

(b) At the direction of the Capitol Police Board, or at the direction of the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of the Capitol Police Board, guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by employees and interns described in subsection (a) may be suspended temporarily or otherwise subject to restriction for security or related reasons to the same extent as guided tours of the United States Capitol which are led by the Architect of the Capitol.

BATTERY RECHARGING STATIONS FOR PRIVATELY OWNED VEHICLES IN PARKING AREAS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS AT NO NET COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 209. (a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''covered employee'' means—

(1) an employee of the Library of Congress; or

(2) any other individual who is authorized to park in any parking area under the jurisdiction of the Library of Congress on the Library of Congress buildings and grounds.

(b) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), funds appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol under the heading ''CAPITOL POWER PLANT'' under the heading ''ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL'' in any fiscal year are available to construct, operate, and maintain on a reimbursable basis battery recharging stations in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the Library of Congress on Library of Congress buildings and grounds for use by privately owned vehicles used by covered employees.

(2) VENDORS AUTHORIZED.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Architect of the Capitol may use 1 or more vendors on a commission basis.

(3) APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION.—The Architect of the Capitol may construct or direct the construction of battery recharging stations described under paragraph (1) after—

(A) submission of written notice detailing the numbers and locations of the battery recharging stations to the Joint Committee on the Library; and

(B) approval by that Committee.

(c) FEES AND CHARGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Architect of the Capitol shall charge fees or charges for electricity provided to covered employees sufficient to cover the costs to the Architect of the Capitol to carry out this section, including costs to any vendors or other costs associated with maintaining the battery recharging stations.

(2) APPROVAL OF FEES OR CHARGES.—The Architect of the Capitol may establish and adjust fees or charges under paragraph (1) after—

(A) submission of written notice detailing the amount of the fee or charge to be established or adjusted to the Joint Committee on the Library; and

(B) approval by that Committee.

(d) DEPOSIT AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES, CHARGES, AND COMMISSIONS.—Any fees, charges, or commissions collected by the Architect of the Capitol under this section shall be—

(1) deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriations account described under subsection (b); and

(2) available for obligation without further appropriation during the fiscal year collected.

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report on the financial administration and cost recovery of activities under this section with respect to that fiscal year to the Joint Committee on the Library and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

(2) AVOIDING SUBSIDY.—

(A) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 3 years thereafter, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report to the Joint Committee on the Library determining whether covered employees using battery charging stations as authorized by this section are receiving a subsidy from the taxpayers.

(B) MODIFICATION OF RATES AND FEES.—If a determination is made under subparagraph (A) that a subsidy is being received, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a plan to the Joint Committee on the Library on how to update the program to ensure no subsidy is being received. If the Joint Committee does not act on the plan within 60 days, the Architect of the Capitol shall take appropriate steps to increase rates or fees to ensure reimbursement for the cost of the program consistent with an appropriate schedule for amortization, to be charged to those using the charging stations.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT

SEC. 210. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4501) (relating to cost of living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 2016.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 211. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the

House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, excluding Senate items, exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

This Act may be cited as the ''Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2016''.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114–120. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114–120.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,700,000)''.

Page 37, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,700,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GRAVES and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for their hard work in crafting this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in this fiscal environment, we have to be better stewards of taxpayer dollars, and we have to scrutinize every program that we allocate money towards. We can't ever forget that every dollar that we spend is a dollar taken from our constituents' hard-earned paychecks. It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I have offered this amendment to eliminate funding for the Open World Leadership Center—a program started in 1999 and housed in the Library of Congress with the purpose of bringing leaders from post-Soviet countries to the United States to learn about our legislative process.

The gentleman from California spoke passionately a few minutes ago about his belief that we need to have programs like this, but his comments ignore the fact that there are nearly 90 other similar or nearly identical programs throughout the government aimed at achieving this same goal. At the same time, this program has now spent more than $150 million towards that duplicative purpose.

So when you consider that duplicative purpose alongside a national debt of $18.2 trillion, we have got to honestly examine and reconsider whether this is the best use of taxpayer money. This is especially true when accounts and programs across the legislative branch have seen reductions in recent years, but yet not a single dollar has been cut from the Open World program despite the fact that, after this subcommittee's examination of this program, Chairman GRAVES reported that, ''In light of both the lack of quantifiable results from the Open World Leadership Center and its duplications of programs more appropriately offered by the State Department, the program has long outlived its short-term intent.''

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman's assessment, which is, by the way, not a partisan one. In fact, this is the all-too-rare situation and opportunity where Republicans and Democrats, alike, agree that we can cut spending without hurting American citizens.

The American people have entrusted us with the responsibility of seeing that their tax dollars don't go to waste. And while Mr. GRAVES' bill allocates funds to the legislative branch to do the important work that we need to on behalf of the American people, the Open World program is one area where we can and should make this spending cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bringing this forward. He has done a lot of work on this topic. He is new to the body—I think everybody knows that—and with haste he has moved to find an area in which we can continue to provide savings for taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment here, and I appreciate his bringing it forward.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague for bringing this amendment and for focusing in on areas where we can actually eliminate spending here in Washington. Again, you have to recognize that about 35 cents of every dollar spent is money borrowed from countries like China, so we ought to be combing every different piece of this budget and finding areas where we can say that this isn't something that the Federal Government should be doing.

It might be a noble program to have exchanges with other countries, but to be spending millions of dollars at a time when our country has needs that aren't being met and that we are borrowing money from other countries and sending that bill to our children, this is a time where we have got to be combing through these kinds of programs, and I want to thank him for his leadership.

□ 1600

This is a time where we have got to be combing through these kind of programs, and I want to thank him for his leadership. This is something that should be eliminated. We shouldn't be spending millions of dollars of taxpayer money to bring people over to this country. If they want to come, we welcome them.

Many countries do send people over here to observe how democracy works; we send people on occasion to other countries to spread democracy, but there are duplications in so many other areas of our budget where this is already being done, and this is just one more area where we ought to be saving taxpayers' money and being fiscally responsible.

This isn't something we can afford to do; it isn't something we should be doing. I am glad the gentleman is bringing the amendment to eliminate this spending. I support it and hope the House approves it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to note for the Members that this would be the first time that I am actually opposing an amendment that cuts the Open World program.

Initially, when I became chair of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee 8 years ago, this program was at $14 million. I have consistently tried to cut this program and move its funding to the State Department bill for every single year since then. We have not been successful, but we are only at $5.7 million now, which is a more appropriate amount.

We are, as I said, in general debate. This funding going somewhere else in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill would be more appropriate. Since we are sending it out of the bill in a bill that is already inadequately funded, it is not an amendment I can support.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), who wishes to speak in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for the time. I also want to thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. GRAVES, for the gentlemanly way in which we have conducted this debate.

This is a transpartisan issue. We have got Democrats and Republicans divided on each side of the aisle, which is a bit unusual, but nonetheless, this is important.

I support the Open World Leadership Center. I am on its board. It has been mentioned that this is better nested within the State Department. The State Department does have a myriad of programs. However, this is a legislative branch program, and we should not outsource our responsibility there.

This program was formed in the wake of the fall of the Soviet Union in order to give a chance for the development of legal structures, stabilized civil society, and the opportunity for democracy to evolve. While the primary focus was on Russia, that component has been suspended, and this program has taken a very substantial cut down from $10 million to about $6 million now.

To jettison it gets rid of very important deliverables. Over 23,000 judges, politicians, emerging civil society leaders, and young people have participated in this program, including 15 members of Ukraine's parliament, 15 members of Moldova's parliament, 8 Russian governors; 51 percent of the participants are women.

Mr. Chairman, the military tells me: Send us in last.

We will send billions and billions of dollars of lethal military aid to a country, but the military says: Do everything you can to build up good will and trust and relationships in stable societies so that we do not have to resort to what none of us wants to resort to.

The Open World Leadership Center fulfills that role in an effective way. There are changes that I hope will be forthcoming to make it more effective in the future. I hope we will preserve this important legislative priority which cannot be replicated, essentially, by the State Department.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. At this time, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and as someone who served as ranking member for this subcommittee back several years ago, I just want to express my support and the work for the Open World Leadership Center than the opposed amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

I am sure it is well intended, but I do want to say that I think that this amendment is not going in the right direction. We do need to keep this partnership. It is a partnership. It is a relationship that has developed with these former Soviet countries.

I think it is very important. It has served us well. It is a program that a lot of people say is duplicated in other agencies of government, but I will say it is unique. It is a unique approach to working across borders to highlight the critical role of the legislative branch in emerging democracies.

I just want to say that I support this bill as it currently is and would oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, can you tell me how much time we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for the time.

I rise in strong opposition to the Ratcliffe amendment.

If anyone has been watching, you have seen Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Now, more than ever, it is critical to engage with rising stars in the former Soviet Union because the old tactics of Soviet Russia are still being employed.

This program belongs to Congress. Yes, it is a legislative branch program, so it is small; it is efficient; it is ours. It is our one tool to reach out to these countries to their rising leaders to expand accountable governance and the rule of law. Who better to teach it than those engaged, those of us who communicate with citizens in these countries that so very much want to be free?

Open World directly connects us with changemakers in this very, very fluid region of the world. It reaches beyond the big cities, into the country side. I personally have greeted some of the leaders that have come from several countries, including Moldova and Ukraine.

Let me tell you, it will be our generation and the next that will pay the price if this amendment is passed. We simply must engage with this part of the world. We cannot leave her in the hands of the Russian bear.

I urge very strong opposition to the Ratcliffe amendment.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 30 seconds remaining. The gentlewoman from Florida has 30 seconds remaining.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. At this time, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to respond that there is no legislative program in the State Department like this. You can't transfer it there. They are not operative in these countries, so to say that this could be moved over—look, you were in professional organizations.

This is legislator to legislator, judge to judge, and we need to keep it that way.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, my constituents sent me to Washington to cut wasteful spending. The Open World program is one of many, many programs that have the same purpose throughout the Federal Government. This is a chance to cut $5 million in spending for a duplicative program that we simply don't need.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of passage of the Ratcliffe amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, what this amendment is, is a missed opportunity to be fiscally responsible.

I also support not spending money on the Open World program any longer and moving it to the State Department. Unfortunately, the majority has chosen to make a rule in order that focuses on an amendment to shift the $5.7 million completely out of the legislative branch when we have plaster falling off buildings, elevators badly in need of repair, we have cuts to our MRA—our office accounts—our staff that isn't well paid enough; and it just not responsible.

This is a missed opportunity. I urge the Members, unfortunately, to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114–120.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the Congressional Pictorial Directory to the office of a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a simple amendment to prohibit funds for delivering printed copies of the Congressional Pictorial Directory in the House of Representatives.

The pictorial directory is a book with pictures of Members of Congress printed by the Government Publishing Office. The most recent edition cost over $200,000 to print and distribute. While I realize this is not much money, I think with an $18 trillion debt, that we need to be looking for the pennies, as well as the $100 bills.

The most important thing is this book is no longer necessary to print in hard copy. We are almost 6 months into the 114th Congress, and the GPO has still not published the book. During the 113th Congress, it took the GPO 9 months, until September, to release the pictorial directory. Here is what one of them looks like.

Private groups make similar directories that are actually more useful and include contact information and biographies of Members, in addition to their pictures. I have a copy of the directory that was dropped off at my office by a trade association in the last few days, and unlike the GPO directory, it is up to date, and they keep it up to date.

Of course, pictures of Members of Congress are readily available for free online. If needed, the Clerk could ensure that appropriate photographs of current Members are available to create an online pictorial directory.

The language of this amendment mirrors several riders already in the bill that prohibit funds for the delivery of printed copies of bills and resolutions, printed copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, printed copies of the statements of disbursements, and printed copies of the daily calendar.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I think it is worth stating for the RECORD that this amendment would maybe save somewhere between $9,000 and $29,000. I mean, let's bear the full impact of that weighty sum, depending on how it is interpreted.

This is an amendment that would prevent the delivery of a printed copy that I have in my hand of the Congressional Pictorial Directory—which, by the way, Mr. FLORES, no offense, but some of us used this directory to identify you during the course of this discussion.

This is a book that is actually necessary and one that we shouldn't be farming out or relying on lobbyists to print for us.

Every year, we seem to get an amendment that stops some sort of printing or delivery of a paper copy of some document to Member offices.

Just so Members know, we have actually made real savings in this bill in the past—in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill—by no longer delivering a printed copy of a bill unless a Member requests a copy; we no longer deliver the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to Member offices; we no longer allow more than 50 printed copies of the Code to go to House offices; we no longer deliver a printed copy of the statements of disbursement to Member offices; we no longer deliver a printed copy of the daily calendar to Member offices—all of which cost far more than stopping the printing of these books.

It isn't really realistic to expect Members to print out a piece of paper—or staff—and carry around a whole bunch of printed faded copies of paper to help identify Members. We have new Members every 2 years.

My point is we are about out of low-hanging fruit here. I hope this is the last of this type of amendment because, if we want to change printing, the Members have an opportunity to take their grievances up with the Joint Committee on Printing.

The distribution of the Congressional Pictorial Directory is actually set by the Joint Committee on Printing. Maybe the gentleman is unaware of that, and it doesn't need to be legislated through this bill. We don't need to be creating a false impression that we are actually saving taxpayer dollars that would not have been saved through another means.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman from Florida made a great case for putting this book in the same stack of dinosaurs that she was talking about when it comes to eliminating all other waste in terms of government printing.

I have an app that cost me $1.99 that gives me current pictures of Members of Congress. I don't have to carry any paper around. I don't have to carry this book around. I don't have to carry this book around. I just have to have an app.

Look, we are a 21st century Congress. Why don't we act like a 21st century Congress and get rid of the dinosaurs like this?

□ 1615

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLORES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am wondering whether that app was privately produced or was produced by taxpayers. As for the $1.99 that you spent on it, were those taxpayer dollars you used to pay for it or from your own personal funds?

Mr. FLORES. That was my personal money.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, my point is that it would be one thing if a congressional tutorial directory were unnecessary, but that is not the case. It is necessary. What isn't necessary is for us to be wasting time in debate on the House floor over something that could actually be handled differently. If the gentleman or any other Member thought that the Joint Committee on Printing should handle it differently, just go talk to them.

Instead, what we are doing is pretending that we are actually saving taxpayer dollars. This is about $9,000, and what we shouldn't be doing is outsourcing the things that we need in terms of the materials to do a better job serving the public to lobbyists and the private sector. That does not make sense, and it isn't necessary, and the majority should not leave the impression that they are actually doing something fiscally responsible here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, this has been a fascinating discussion. The gentlewoman from Florida claims that the savings are between $9,000 and $29,000 while the numbers that we have are $200,000. If you ask your typical hard-working family if $9,000 is a lot of money, they will say, yes, it is. Is $29,000 a lot of money? They will say yes. Is $200,000 a lot of money? They will say yes. If you say, ''You are paying for that. Would you like the government to stop wasting that money?'' then they would say, absolutely, yes.

If the gentlewoman does not want to waste any time on this and vote ''aye,'' then let's stop.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I will point out that the gentleman's amendment does not actually stop the printing of the pictorial directory. It simply stops the delivery of the directory to Members' offices. So it does not provide the savings that the gentleman is talking about. It provides between $9,000 and $29,000 because the only cost that he is saving is on the delivery and not on the printing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I read the amendment's intent as well. As the ranking member just stated and as the argument seems to go around in a circle here, it doesn't stop the printing of these items, of these directories. It just says that Members of Congress shouldn't have somebody privately deliver them to their offices. If they want one, go get one. If they want to look it up online, look it up online. If they want to spend $1.99 and get an app, they can get an app. This just says that the Congressional Pictorial Directory is just not going to be delivered to a Member's office. I don't know how controversial that can be.

I thank the gentleman for his amendment.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I conclude by pointing out that the offerer of the amendment, and the chairman, are suggesting that now we should print things that we don't use. If that isn't an example of a waste of taxpayer dollars in suggesting that we should print this document but not make sure that it is delivered to Members' offices for their utilization, that pretty much sounds like government waste under the classic definition.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 114–120.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to—

(1) accounts under the heading ''Capitol Police'';

(2) ''Architect of the Capitol—Capitol Police Buildings, Grounds and Security''; or

(3) the amount provided for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms under the heading ''House of Representatives—Salaries, Officers and Employees''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to begin by thanking the subcommittee chairman for his hard work on this effort that is in front of us and for the committee's identifying ways to reduce what the Federal Government spends, especially in the leg branch.

The fiscal year 2016 proposed funding level is $3.3 billion. That is $173 billion below the President's request. I think there is more work that we could do, and my 1 percent across-the-board spending reduction will save taxpayers an additional $29 million in budget authority and $25 million in outlays for fiscal year 2016. It is a targeted cut in discretionary spending that exempts the Capitol Police, the Sergeant at Arms, and security maintained by the Architect of the Capitol.

Again, as I said, I want to recognize the work of Chairman GRAVES and his committee. They have done several very important things that, I think, we ought to highlight.

First, this measure continues to freeze Member pay in place, where it has been since 2010. Second, it continues a 14 percent reduction in funding for the House of Representatives, which Republicans began in 2011. I appreciate that Chairman ROGERS brought attention to that as general debate began. Third, the bill cuts funding for programs such as the Government Publishing Office, which we have just been discussing—many programs that have outlived their usefulness.

We can cut more, and a penny on a dollar is worth the effort. We are a country that has over $18 trillion in debt. Financial security has become an issue of national security. Admiral Mullen said the greatest threat to our Nation's security is our growing national debt. That is a reason for our getting our fiscal house in order and looking to future generations and saying, let's go in and cut one more penny out of a dollar. This effort that I bring before you would do just that—one more cent—and do it for future generations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

It takes a meat-ax approach to cutting this bill by over $29 million with an across-the-board cut of 1 percent. I want to point out that it also exempts the Capitol Police and its buildings, as well as the Sergeant at Arms.

If the gentlewoman, who I know offers these amendments over and over again, were truly committed to an across-the-board cut, then she would just simply offer an across-the-board cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this.

This is a mindless but easy cut. Tough words. By the way, this is sequester, which is a Republican proposal. It started in about 2011 but, really, before that with all of these across-the-board cuts because you don't have to make any choices, and you don't have to make priorities. You just say, Oh, let's save money.

Frankly, so many of the people in this country want this Congress to have vigorous oversight of the executive department, which has expanded very substantially while the legislature has continued to undermine its ability to function as an effective oversight agency of the American people. The legislative branch is underfunded. We do not have the capacity to do the effective oversight as we ought to be doing. The Department of Veterans Affairs is a perfect example of that where we were not vigorous enough in oversight to ensure that money was being applied properly.

If you want to cut and if you want to say something—this is not good; that is not good; we are wasting money there—then specify it. Debate that issue up or down. That is why sequester is so abysmally wrong and why the chairman of the committee called it unrealistic and ill-conceived. This is not Obama's proposal of a sequester. I am not talking about this amendment, but to say, as you repeatedly say on your side of the aisle, that this is Obama's proposal is baloney. In fact, the only reason Jack Lew suggested that to Reid as an option was because you—and I refer to the Republican friends on the other side of the aisle—were threatening not to honor the Nation's debt.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. That is the only reason we passed sequester, and nobody intended sequester to go into effect. It was always a backup. Because we have failed to come to an agreement on a fiscally responsible, sustainable path, we have repaired to this ill-conceived, unrealistic concept of sequester. This 1 percent across the board is exactly that. It puts intellect on hold and judgment on hold. That is not why the American people sent us here.

Reject this amendment. Respect this institution, and respect our responsibility to the American people.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words about one part of the bill that I find very troubling. This is a cut that is a penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Last year, we named the GPO as the Government Publishing Office, and that is because of the range of digital services that it provides. This year, the Legislative Branch Subcommittee voted to cut those operations by eliminating the appropriated funding for the GPO's Federal digital system, which provides free digital access to more than a million congressional and other government document titles that have been downloaded by the public more than 1 billion times over the past 5 years. It does not make sense. Cutting this will severely eliminate money to upgrade the GPO's Federal digital system and the new search and retrieval system.

In recognition of the fiscal pressures we all face, the GPO came in with a flat budget request this year, asking only that we support the commitment to their digital transformation. We said ''yes'' to it last year, and I am hopeful that we can restore that funding this year. It makes no sense to cut this. There are millions of people in local libraries all across this country who depend on this digital system, and we do not need to cut it. This is penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Mr. Chair, as a former Member of the House Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, I wanted to say a few words about one part of this year's spending bill which I find very troubling.

A year ago, Congress and the President agreed to rename GPO as the Government Publishing Office, based on the broad range of

digital services the agency now provides. The Subcommittee supported this legislative change.

This year, the House Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee voted to cut those operations by eliminating appropriated funding for GPO's Federal Digital System, which provides free digital access to more than 1 million congressional and other Government document titles that have been downloaded by the public more than 1 billion times over the past five years. This cut just doesn't make sense.

It will severely curtail GPO's ability to add new digital documents to its Federal Digital System. It will zero out the funding for initiatives that support the missions of congressional and legislative branch organizations such as the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Library of Congress who rely on information from the Federal Digital System to feed websites such as Congress.gov and Docs.House.gov.

GPO's Federal Digital System, though just 5 years old, is already beginning to show its age. The rapid changes in today's digital technical environment remind us why it's essential for GPO to keep up with the times.

But this funding cut will eliminate money to upgrade GPO's Federal Digital System with a new search and retrieval system, an improved user interface, and other needed hardware and software improvements, including migrating the system to the cloud. Due to the critical role the Federal Digital System plays in making our legislative information transparent and available online, we need to make this investment.

In recognition of the fiscal pressures we all face, GPO came in with a flat budget request this year, asking only that we support their commitment to their digital transformation. We said yes to that transformation last year, and I am hopeful that we can restore this funding in the final legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I find it so interesting that this is called a ''meat-ax approach.'' Yes, I do come regularly to offer these amendments, because I care what happens with our Nation. I care about our future, and I want to make certain that we are on solid financial footing. We have a responsibility to be good stewards of the taxpayers' money. It is their money.

To say this is mindless and easy, how interesting that is. Go tell all of the Governors from coast to coast—Democrat and Republican—who use across-the-board spending cuts to get budgets in balance. Tell that to mayors who use this same process. The reason it is done is it works. It helps the bureaucracy hold itself accountable, and that is absolutely what we ought to be doing at this point in time.

As you can see, cutting is a very emotional issue. Cutting brings forward a lot of emotions. Talking about doing more with less, being resourceful, that is what we should do every single day. In order to be a good steward of the taxpayers' money, we should want to do more with less. We should do it in the name of freedom, for freedom's sake—for the sovereignty of this Nation.

Ill-conceived and unrealistic? When is operating by a balanced budget and spending and living within the means the taxpayers have said they are going to have for this Federal Government ever considered ill-conceived? When would it be considered unrealistic? It is what we ought to be doing. Indeed, if every department did what the legislative branch did of cutting 14 percent, we would be getting close to budget.

To say that we are suspending intellect and judgment, do you know that is almost frivolous and almost silly to say.

□ 1630

We spend less and should be spending less and should try to continue to spend less and reform this government and hold it accountable to the taxpayer who is footing the bill because, yes, the Nation's future depends on it; our national security, yes, depends on it; and respect, it is respecting future generations and the taxpayer to be a wise steward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield 30 seconds of my remaining time to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I wish the gentlewoman had made that same speech when we were discussing defense, the biggest spending bill we have, but she didn't offer this amendment at all.

I happen to come from a State where the legislators didn't have enough guts to raise taxes, so the people went out and did it because they want their government to run wisely and smartly, and they knew they didn't have enough money to do it.

Look, we are cutting this budget; yet the Senate, which we don't vote on their bit, is increasing their budget by 12 percent. They are going to be able to give cost-of-living adjustments to every one of their Members. Nobody sitting in this room who works for us is going to get a cost-of-living adjustment because of cuts like this. This is ridiculous. We are penalizing our whole House, not the Senate. This is not a smart way to make legislative business.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 15 seconds remaining.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. To close, Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is that what would be fiscally responsible and responsible in general is to not further take a meat ax to a bill that has already been flat-funded for the last 3 years. Our employees deserve a raise. We deserve to be able to be a coequal branch of government, funded well enough to be able to hold the administration accountable and make sure we can do our jobs. This bill does not allow us to achieve that.

I urge the Members to oppose this irresponsible amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 114–120 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. RATCLIFFE of Texas.

Amendment No. 3 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 199, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 245]

AYES—224

Abraham	Crenshaw	Hartzler
Allen	Cuellar	Heck (NV)
Amash	Culberson	Hensarling
Amodei	Curbelo (FL)	Herrera Beutler
Babin	Davis, Rodney	Hice, Jody B.
Barletta	Denham	Hill
Barr	DeSantis	Holding
Barton	DesJarlais	Hudson
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Huelskamp
Bishop (MI)	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Black	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Blackburn	Ellmers (NC)	Hurd (TX)
Blum	Emmer (MN)	Hurt (VA)
Bost	Farenthold	Issa
Boustany	Fincher	Jenkins (KS)
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (WV)
Brat	Fleischmann	Johnson (OH)
Bridenstine	Fleming	Johnson, Sam
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Jolly
Brooks (IN)	Forbes	Jones
Buchanan	Foxx	Jordan
Buck	Franks (AZ)	Joyce
Bucshon	Garrett	Katko
Burgess	Gibbs	Kelly (PA)
Byrne	Gohmert	King (IA)
Calvert	Goodlatte	King (NY)
Carter (GA)	Gosar	Kirkpatrick
Carter (TX)	Gowdy	Kline
Chabot	Granger	Knight
Clawson (FL)	Graves (GA)	Labrador
Coffman	Graves (LA)	LaMalfa
Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)	Lamborn
Collins (NY)	Griffith	Lance
Comstock	Grothman	Latta
Conaway	Guinta	LoBiondo
Cook	Guthrie	Long
Costello (PA)	Hardy	Loudermilk
Cramer	Harper	Love
Crawford	Harris	Lucas

Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—199

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

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (PA)
Capps
Chaffetz
Donovan
Fattah
Garamendi
Moore
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas

□ 1700

Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Messrs. HANNA, SCHWEIKERT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. YODER, HIMES, and DENT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. WESTMORELAND, GRAVES of Missouri, SHUSTER, CRAWFORD, and SMITH of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 246]

AYES—172

Allen
Amash
Ashford
Babin
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Crawford
Curbelo (FL)
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Katko
King (IA)
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Olson
Palmer
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—250

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik

Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Brady (PA)
Capps
Chaffetz
Donovan
Fattah
Meeks
Mica
Moore
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1707

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 246 my voting card did not record and if it had recorded, it would be a ''yes.'' I would have recorded my vote as ''yes.''

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 271, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, this 5-minute vote on passage of H.R. 2250 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to recommit on H.R. 2353, and passage of H.R. 2353, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 357, nays 67, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

YEAS—357

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—67

Amash
Bass
Blumenauer
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Cárdenas
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cummings
DeGette
Deutch
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Franks (AZ)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hastings
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kennedy
Kind
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowey
Massie
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Napolitano
Neal
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Schakowsky
Smith (WA)
Thompson (MS)
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Brady (PA)
Capps
Chaffetz
Donovan
Fattah
Moore
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas

□ 1716

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

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 2353) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 241, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

YEAS—182

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

NAYS—241

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

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (PA)
Capps
Chaffetz
Donovan
Duffy
Fattah
Moore
Sanchez, Loretta
Tsongas

□ 1723

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

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 387, noes 35, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

AYES—387

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema

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

NOES—35

Amash	Duffy	Renacci
Becerra	Duncan (SC)	Ribble
Bridenstine	Jordan	Rice (NY)
Carney	Kildee	Richmond
Clawson (FL)	Kind	Roskam
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Salmon
Clyburn	Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda T.
Courtney	Moulton	Schrader
Crowley	Mulvaney	Sensenbrenner
DeGette	Pascrell	Visclosky
DeLauro	Perlmutter	Welch
DeSaulnier	Polis	

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Amodei

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (PA)	Donovan	Rice (SC)
Capps	Fattah	Sanchez, Loretta
Chaffetz	Moore	Tsongas

□ 1731

So 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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall votes on May 19, 2015 and would like the record to reflect that I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 243: ''no,'' rollcall No. 244: ''yes,'' rollcall No. 245: ''no,'' rollcall No. 246: ''no,'' rollcall No. 247: ''yes,'' rollcall No. 248: ''yes,'' rollcall No. 249: ''yes.''

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 1909

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members be removed as cosponsors of the bill, H.R. 1909: Mr. FARENTHOLD of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING of Texas, Mr. HUELSKAMP of Kansas, and Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

AMERICAN SUPER COMPUTING LEADERSHIP ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 874) to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 874

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''American Super Computing Leadership Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 2 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5541) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (5) and inserting the following:

''(1) CO-DESIGN.—The term 'co-design' means the joint development of application algorithms, models, and codes with computer technology architectures and operating systems to maximize effective use of high-end computing systems.

''(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term 'Department' means the Department of Energy.

''(3) EXASCALE.—The term 'exascale' means computing system performance at or near 10 to the 18th power floating point operations per second.

''(4) HIGH-END COMPUTING SYSTEM.—The term 'high-end computing system' means a computing system with performance that substantially exceeds that of systems that are commonly available for advanced scientific and engineering applications.

''(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).

''(6) LEADERSHIP SYSTEM.—The term 'leadership system' means a high-end computing system that is among the most advanced in the world in terms of performance in solving scientific and engineering problems.

''(7) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term 'National Laboratory' means any one of the seventeen laboratories owned by the Department.

''(8) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Energy.

''(9) SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY.—The term 'software technology' includes optimal algorithms, programming environments, tools, languages, and operating systems for high-end computing systems.''.

SEC. 3. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY HIGH-END COMPUTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 3 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5542) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''program'' and inserting ''coordinated program across the Department'';

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1);

(C) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(3) partner with universities, National Laboratories, and industry to ensure the broadest possible application of the technology developed in this program to other challenges in science, engineering, medicine, and industry.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''vector'' and all that follows through ''architectures'' and inserting ''computer technologies that show promise of substantial reductions in power requirements and substantial gains in parallelism of multicore processors, concurrency, memory and storage, bandwidth, and reliability''; and

(3) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

''(d) EXASCALE COMPUTING PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a coordinated research program to develop exascale computing systems to advance the missions of the Department.

''(2) EXECUTION.—The Secretary shall, through competitive merit review, establish two or more National Laboratory-industry-university partnerships to conduct integrated research, development, and engineering of multiple exascale architectures, and—

''(A) conduct mission-related co-design activities in developing such exascale platforms;

''(B) develop those advancements in hardware and software technology required to fully realize the potential of an exascale production system in addressing Department target applications and solving scientific problems involving predictive modeling and simulation and large-scale data analytics and management; and

''(C) explore the use of exascale computing technologies to advance a broad range of science and engineering.

''(3) ADMINISTRATION.—In carrying out this program, the Secretary shall—

''(A) provide, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, access for researchers in United States industry, institutions of higher education, National Laboratories, and other Federal agencies to these exascale systems, as appropriate; and

''(B) conduct outreach programs to increase the readiness for the use of such platforms by domestic industries, including manufacturers.

''(4) REPORTS.—

''(A) INTEGRATED STRATEGY AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the American Super Computing Leadership Act, a report outlining an integrated strategy and program management plan, including target dates for prototypical and production exascale platforms, interim milestones to reaching these targets, functional requirements, roles and responsibilities of National Laboratories and industry, acquisition strategy, and estimated resources required, to achieve this exascale system capability. The report shall include the Secretary's plan for Departmental organization to manage and execute the Exascale Computing Program, including definition of the roles and responsibilities within the Department to ensure an integrated program across the Department. The report shall also include a plan for ensuring balance and prioritizing across ASCR subprograms in a flat or slow-growth budget environment.

''(B) STATUS REPORTS.—At the time of the budget submission of the Department for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that describes the status of milestones and costs in achieving the objectives of the exascale computing program.

''(C) EXASCALE MERIT REPORT.—At least 18 months prior to the initiation of construction or installation of any exascale-class computing facility, the Secretary shall transmit a plan to the Congress detailing—

''(i) the proposed facility's cost projections and capabilities to significantly accelerate the development of new energy technologies;

''(ii) technical risks and challenges that must be overcome to achieve successful completion and operation of the facility; and

''(iii) an independent assessment of the scientific and technological advances expected from such a facility relative to those expected from a comparable investment in expanded research and applications at terascale-class and petascale-class computing facilities, including an evaluation of where investments should be made in the system software and algorithms to enable these advances.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 874, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 874, the American Super Computing Leadership Act, requires the Department of Energy to develop a plan to bring the United States into the next generation of supercomputing, also known as exascale computing. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for taking the initiative on this issue.

DOE's Advanced Scientific Computing Research program is the primary Federal research and development program for innovation in computing technology. High-performance computing has paved the way for breakthroughs in medical imaging, genetics research, manufacturing, engineering, and weapons development.

Faster computing speeds have revolutionized the energy sector, improved the efficiency of energy production, and aided in distribution technologies. Advances in computer modeling offer opportunities for scientific discovery in fields where experiments are too difficult, costly, or dangerous to conduct. These advances reduce costs and open the door to more innovative discoveries.

The country with the strongest computing capability will host the world's next scientific breakthroughs. Unfortunately, China currently holds the world's fastest computer, not the United States. This bill should reverse this trend and help advance American competitiveness.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY), and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for their initiative on this issue.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 874, the American Super Computing Leadership Act. This is bipartisan legislation that I have had the pleasure of working on with my colleague, Mr. HULTGREN, as well as others from both sides of the aisle in developing, including, as the chairman said, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. ESTY. This bill would authorize an exascale computing program to ensure that the fastest computers in the world, as well as their software and algorithms, which will help us use these machines to the maximum efficiency, are developed here in the United States.

The term ''exascale'' is often used to refer to the next generation of supercomputers in general and is used interchangeably with ''extreme scale.'' This term is often applied to computing systems that are capable of carrying out a million trillion operations per second. That rate is approximately 50 times faster than the current fastest computer in the world.

Through this legislation, the Secretary of Energy would be empowered to significantly increase the computing power that is accessible to scientists from Federal agencies as well as industry and academia. These investments would have a wide range of impacts by giving the Nation's best scientists the resources and support they need to flourish.

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous fields of research in both the academic and industrial areas that would be greatly aided by this increased computing power. Fields such as pharmaceutical development, aerodynamic modeling for aircraft and vehicle design, advanced nuclear reactor design and fusion plasma modeling, combustion simulation to assist in the design of fuel-efficient clean engines, and high temperature superconductivity to significantly reduce energy losses while transmitting electricity.

As a result of this legislation, the Department of Energy would be required to submit regular reports as well as a management plan to Congress describing how DOE intends to institute this program and its current projects. Lemont, Illinois' Argonne National Laboratory is a world leader in developing this new capability, so I am happy that just last month the Department of Energy announced a major award to support and significantly upgrade Argonne's advanced computing research and facilities. This bill will ensure that these investments are part of a transparent, long-term, coordinated strategy to keep the United States on top in this field. I also anticipate that the benefits that we will see from this legislation may well surpass the impacts that we can even imagine today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 874, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), who is a sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to thank my good friend and distinguished chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Chairman SMITH from Texas, as well as my good friend, Congressman LIPINSKI from Illinois, as well as my other good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) all for helping to bring this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 874 will help ensure that America stays at the forefront of supercomputing technology by getting to the exascale level of computing—close to the speed of the human brain. These capabilities are vital for our national security, the economy, and, more broadly, the research capabilities of our Nation.

While America and American companies are still leading the way for much of this current technology, it is important to point out that the National University of Defense Technology in China now houses the world's fastest computer.

One of the Department of Energy's primary responsibilities within the National Nuclear Security Administration is the maintenance of our current nuclear stockpile. This stockpile stewardship responsibility is carried out with increasingly complex simulations as our stockpile ages. The need for improved parallelism capabilities and decreased energy requirements are spelled out in this legislation to ensure the Department carries out a targeted basic research program to overcome the most pressing needs.

I would like to point out, however, that I believe, in agreement with the Secretary, that exascale is not the end point. It is just a step towards the greater goal of American leadership in this field.

This legislation will ensure that the broader scientific community has access to these facilities on a competitive merit review basis. The scientific drivers and the national security responsibilities should be the primary focus for computing research, but we must also make sure that the crosscutting benefits of this research are not left at the wayside.

H.R. 874 would create partnerships with universities, industry, and the national labs to conduct this research, ensuring that the Nation, as a whole, benefits from this research more quickly and efficiently. With all parties at the table, businesses will be better able

to utilize the new technologies and algorithms that will result.

Having the pleasure to represent the great State of Illinois, I have been able to witness how an ecosystem of innovation can best be fostered. For our Nation to reap the greatest yields from our research, our research facilities must be open to the public when it makes sense and does not interfere with the core missions of our Federal agencies and the labs.

The user facilities in our national labs already serve over 30,000 researchers every year, with university researchers taking precedence over others. And other user facilities, such as the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne, Illinois, have given a tremendous research capability to industry partners, such as pharmaceutical companies, where research that once took weeks is now done in hours, with samples spending more time in overnight mail.

Mr. Speaker, the computing capabilities this legislation will help bring about will similarly have tremendous application in health care and drug development. We are just now getting to the point where computer simulations are giving us higher resolution images at the molecular level than we can get with microscopes when trying to understand how diseases, our bodies, and new treatments interact. And the modeling simulations these systems make available also allow manufacturers to build better prototypes that have already been tested thousands of times virtually before they come off the line.

But perhaps most importantly, these capabilities will keep America competitive on the global scale. And the graduate students and postdocs that learn on these machines will take what they know wherever they decide to go, whether it be business or the Department of Defense.

□ 1745

He said the best form of technology transfer wears shoes. That is why I thank my colleagues for helping me bring this similar legislation to the floor again this Congress, and I recommend all my colleagues support this bill.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, does the gentleman from Texas have any more speakers on this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers on this side, so I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time after the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close here.

I want to thank Mr. HULTGREN again. He represents Fermilab. I represent part of Argonne National Laboratory. It is good to work with him on this legislation and others to advance science in the United States. Even though there are few people who really understand what this means, we will all see the results of it.

I thank the chairman for moving this bill forward. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 874.

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.

SCIENCE PRIZE COMPETITIONS ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1162) to make technical changes to provisions authorizing prize competitions under the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1162

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 ''Science Prize Competitions Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO PRIZE COMPETITIONS.

Section 24 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3719) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting ''competition'' after ''section, a prize'';

(B) by inserting ''types'' after ''following''; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking ''prizes'' and inserting ''prize competitions'';

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking ''in the Federal Register'' and inserting ''on a publicly accessible Government website, such as www.challenge.gov,''; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking ''prize'' and inserting ''cash prize purse'';

(3) in subsection (g), by striking ''prize'' and inserting ''cash prize purse'';

(4) in subsection (h), by inserting ''prize'' before ''competition'' both places it appears;

(5) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting ''prize'' before ''competition'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting ''prize'' before ''competition'' both places it appears;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) WAIVER.—An agency may waive the requirement under paragraph (2). The annual report under subsection (p) shall include a list of such waivers granted during the preceding fiscal year, along with a detailed explanation of the reasons for granting the waivers.'';

(6) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting ''prize'' before ''competition''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''prize'' before ''competitions'' both places it appears;

(7) in subsection (l), by striking all after ''may enter into'' and inserting ''a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other agreement with a private sector for-profit or nonprofit entity to administer the prize competition, subject to the provisions of this section.'';

(8) in subsection (m)—

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

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Support for a prize competition under this section, including financial support for the design and administration of a prize competition or funds for a cash prize purse, may consist of Federal appropriated funds and funds provided by private sector for-profit and nonprofit entities. The head of an agency may accept funds from other Federal agencies, private sector for-profit entities, and nonprofit entities, to be available to the extent provided by appropriations Acts, to support such prize competitions. The head of an agency may not give any special consideration to any private sector for-profit or nonprofit entity in return for a donation.'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''prize awards'' and inserting ''cash prize purses'';

(C) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(i) by striking ''No prize'' and inserting ''No prize competition''; and

(ii) by striking ''the prize'' and inserting ''the cash prize purse'';

(D) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking ''a prize'' and inserting ''a cash prize purse'';

(E) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by inserting ''competition'' after ''prize'';

(F) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ''a prize'' and inserting ''a cash prize purse''; and

(G) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking ''cash prizes'' and inserting ''cash prize purses'';

(9) in subsection (n), by inserting ''for both for-profit and nonprofit entities,'' after ''contract vehicle'';

(10) in subsection (o)(1), by striking ''or providing a prize'' and insert ''a prize competition or providing a cash prize purse''; and

(11) in subsection (p)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''cash prizes'' both places it occurs and inserting ''cash prize purses''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) PLAN.—A description of crosscutting topical areas and agency-specific mission needs that may be the strongest opportunities for prize competitions during the upcoming 2 fiscal years.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1162, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 1162, the Science Prize Competitions Act, promotes increased utilization of prize competitions within the Federal Government.

I want to thank the ranking member of the Oversight Subcommittee, Mr. BEYER, for introducing this legislation. I also thank the bipartisan cosponsors, which include the vice chair of the Oversight Subcommittee, Mr. BILL JOHNSON, as well as the full committee ranking member, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

Prize competitions help spur innovation. They give innovators incentives to produce groundbreaking, outside-the-box ideas. Used effectively, prize competitions can be a tool to generate revolutionary results that wouldn't happen otherwise.

For example, after the Deepwater Horizon explosion, the X Prize Foundation sponsored a competition to elicit new oil removal technologies that needed to be better than state of the art. With the incentive of a million-dollar prize for first place, the winning team designed technology capable of extracting 89 percent of the oil from the water.

Thanks to the incentives provided by the competition, the winner, in a few months, blew the competition and the then best available oil skimmers out of the water.

Another example of a novel idea for a prize involves the Head Health Challenge. This is a joint effort by the National Football League, Under Armour, General Electric, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to produce ''viable materials that will result in increased safety and protection for athletes, the warfighter, and civilians.''

This is a competition that could yield a solution that would benefit a diverse section of the population, from athletes to soldiers.

H.R. 1162 makes important changes to the prize competitions section of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980. It better defines the role of the private sector in various aspects of prize competitions. H.R. 1162 will have a positive impact on science prize competitions, which have bipartisan support.

A letter from the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy proclaims the values of such competitions by stating:

> This report details the remarkable benefits the Federal Government has reaped from more than 400 prize competitions and challenges implemented by over 72 agencies to date, the steps the administration has taken to establish a lasting foundation for use of the COMPETES prize authority, and detailed examples from fiscal year 2014 of how the COMPETES prize authority is increasing the number of agencies that use prizes to achieve their missions more efficiently and effectively.

Again, I want to thank Mr. BEYER of Virginia and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio for introducing this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would like to thank two Texans, Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON, for their leadership on this important issue and remind them that Samuel Houston and Stephen Austin were both born in Virginia. I also would like to thank my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) for cosponsoring.

The 2010 COMPETES reauthorization granted all Federal agencies the authority to hold prize competitions as an incentive for scientific and technological innovations.

This authority supports agencies' increased use of prizes to incentivize more high-risk, high-reward research and reach out to a new audience of researchers and innovators across all areas of science and technology.

Prize competitions go back at least 300 years, to the 1714 Longitude Prize offered by the British Government to develop a practical method to precisely measure a ship's longitude. The 1919 Orteig Prize spurred Charles Lindbergh to make the first transatlantic flight. Of course, it took 8 years from the prize to the flight itself.

In more recent years, prize competitions have accelerated technological development for space exploration, public health, automobiles, lighting, and much more. Many of these competitions have been privately sponsored, but several have been sponsored by our Federal agencies, including NASA, DARPA, and the Department of Energy.

Prize competitions have also proven to be an effective tool to invigorate our Nation's brightest innovators from all corners. They allow our science agencies to case a wide net to draw in new talent.

I think one of the most interesting facts is that NASA found that over 80 percent of NASA prize competitors have never before responded to NASA or other government requests for proposals. We are bringing in our best and brightest to solve these problems.

If we are to continue leading the world in science and technology, we must draw up on all of our Nation's talent, whether they are researchers in a university lab, owners of a technology start-up, or independent innovators working in their own garages.

Imagine if more of our Federal science agencies took full advantage of the potential of prizes to address some of our Nation's most pressing technological challenges. How might the world be changed in 2025 from a prize offered today?

Private organizations have spent years perfecting the design of prize competitions to address big challenges. We hope that our science agencies will see this same success, and we must continue to support Federal agencies as they implement this authority.

The legislation we are considering today addresses some real and some perceived hurdles in the 2010 authority that were identified once agencies began to implement prize competitions.

It also aligns the terminology with the industry standard to eliminate any confusion in the interpretation of the law. These are technical amendments, which should make it easier for all agencies to make full use of the 2010 authority. In trying to rebalance our Federal budget, we have had to make very hard choices about where to cut funding, including in R&D programs.

While prize competitions should never be used as an excuse to cut our investments in R&D, prizes do allow the Federal Government to continue to fund high-reward research with minimal risk to the taxpayer. They are another valuable tool for agencies to deploy to meet their critical mission responsibilities.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill and ask my colleagues for their support. I am very grateful for the chairman for his bipartisan leadership on this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for reminding me that Stephen Austin and Samuel Houston were born in Virginia, and I have to confess, I have a number of ancestors who came from Virginia as well, and I am told one of them may have even been the Governor of Virginia, but that is as much as I am going to say about the great Commonwealth tonight.

I will say that I have no other requests for time; and I, again, reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe I misspoke. I would love to acknowledge my colleague from Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia ask unanimous consent to reclaim his time?

Mr. BEYER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I just was going to say I concur and agree to yield to the gentleman from Illinois as well.

Mr. BEYER. As I slowly develop my mastery of this parliamentary procedure, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BEYER for yielding and for his introduction, his authorship of this bill on prize competitions.

I want to add my voice in strong support of this bill. I have long been a strong supporter of prize competitions to spur innovation not as a substitute for Federal grants in other aid, but as an additional tool.

Back in 2007, I wrote language in the Energy Independence and Security Act that directed DOE to create a hydrogen energy prize, a competition now called the H-Prize that is currently ongoing and, hopefully, will yield some results

in innovation in using hydrogen as a transportation fuel.

In the 2010 COMPETES bill, I added language to that bill that authorized prize competitions at the National Science Foundation. I believe that these prize competitions are an excellent way to unlock the innovative potential of researchers, the private sector, and even hobbyists working in a garage, all while protecting taxpayer dollars.

This bill will clarify prize competition authority so that more agencies of the Federal Government will be able to run competitions. It is a good bill. I thank Mr. BEYER, again, for introducing it; I thank Chairman SMITH for moving it and Ranking Member JOHNSON for moving it.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1162, 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.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1119) to improve the efficiency of Federal research and development, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1119

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 ''Research and Development Efficiency Act''.

SEC. 2. REGULATORY EFFICIENCY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) high and increasing administrative burdens and costs in Federal research administration, particularly in the higher education sector where most federally sponsored research is performed, are eroding funds available to carry out basic scientific research;

(2) progress has been made over the last decade in streamlining the pre-award grant application process through Grants.gov, the Federal Government's website portal;

(3) post-award administrative costs have grown as Federal research agencies have continued to impose agency-unique compliance and reporting requirements on researchers and research institutions;

(4) facilities and administration costs at research universities can exceed 50 percent of the total value of Federal research grants, and it is estimated that nearly 30 percent of the funds invested annually in federally funded research is consumed by paperwork and other administrative processes required by Federal agencies; and

(5) it is a matter of critical importance to American competitiveness that administrative costs of federally funded research be streamlined so that a higher proportion of taxpayer dollars flow into direct research activities.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish a working group under the authority of the National Science and Technology Council, to include the Office of Management and Budget. The working group shall be responsible for reviewing Federal regulations affecting research and research universities and making recommendations on how to—

(1) harmonize, streamline, and eliminate duplicative Federal regulations and reporting requirements;

(2) minimize the regulatory burden on United States institutions of higher education performing federally funded research while maintaining accountability for Federal tax dollars; and

(3) identify and update specific regulations to refocus on performance-based goals rather than on process while still meeting the desired outcome.

(c) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—In carrying out the responsibilities under subsection (b), the working group shall take into account input and recommendations from non-Federal stakeholders, including federally funded and nonfederally funded researchers, institutions of higher education, scientific disciplinary societies and associations, nonprofit research institutions, industry, including small businesses, federally funded research and development centers, and others with a stake in ensuring effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability in the performance of scientific research.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 3 years, the Director shall report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on what steps have been taken to carry out the recommendations of the working group established under subsection (b).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1119, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), the Science Committee's Research and Technology Subcommittee chairwoman and the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 1119, the Research and Development Efficiency Act, which I introduced with the chairman and ranking member of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, as well as the ranking member of the Research and Technology Subcommittee earlier this year.

H.R. 1119 requires the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to establish a working group under the National Science and Technology Council to review Federal regulations that affect research and research universities.

The working group is tasked with making recommendations on how to harmonize, streamline, and eliminate duplicative Federal regulations and reporting requirements and make recommendations on how to minimize the regulatory burden on research institutions.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, there is a long history to support the need for this legislation. In 2012, the National Academies issued a report that included a key recommendation to ''reduce or eliminate regulations that increase administrative costs, impede research productivity, and deflect creative energy without substantially improving the research environment.''

Last year, the National Science Board referenced the results of two Federal Demonstration Partnership surveys on faculty workload—one in 2005 and one in 2012—that, on average, researchers spend 42 percent of their time on meeting administrative requirements. This drain on researchers' time and resources to answer Federal regulatory and reporting requirements leaves less time for researchers to spend on actual scientific work.

To be clear, H.R. 1119 does not eliminate reporting requirements, because there is a need for such information for the purposes of oversight and transparency. Instead, the bill would initiate the process that should ultimately help researchers and research universities by reducing redundant regulations. This is accomplished by promoting efficiencies and getting the most out of our research investments.

The National Academies is currently conducting a study of Federal regulations and reporting requirements, paying particular attention to those directed at research universities. H.R. 1119 would ensure that more of our Federal research dollars are spent on research and not on regulatory requirements. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1119, the Research and Development Efficiency Act.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill, and I want to thank Congresswoman COMSTOCK and Ranking Member JOHNSON for their leadership in introducing the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree that administrative requirements serve an important purpose. They ensure transparency, the protection of human and animal subjects, and the wise use of Federal resources. But sometimes they

go too far, so we need to find a much better balance than we currently have.

The statistic often cited is that federally funded researchers spend an average of 42 percent of their time on administrative tasks. That is time and money spent not doing science. It is not an efficient use of some of our Nation's greatest scientific brain power, nor is it an efficient use of Federal research funds, especially as Federal spending for R&D continues to decline as a share of the overall budget.

Back in the 112th Congress, the Research Subcommittee, which I served on as ranking member and which was led by then-Chairman MO BROOKS, held an important hearing on this matter to help get the ball rolling, which eventually led to this bill.

H.R. 1119 requires the Office of Science and Technology Policy to convene an interagency working group to review the requirements governing the conduct of federally funded R&D at our Nation's research institutions. The working group is further charged with making recommendations on how to best streamline and harmonize such requirements across the government in order to minimize the administrative burden on universities while maintaining full accountability for Federal funds.

This administration has long recognized the problems that this bill addresses. An interagency working group will not be starting from scratch. The Office of Management and Budget took some small steps in the right direction in their recent rewrite of the Federal regulations governing research grants. Agencies have also taken steps to harmonize the grant proposal process and are exploring additional ways to reduce the paperwork burden associated with grant proposals.

I applaud these efforts. Last Congress, I helped further them by writing a letter to OMB, urging them to make some of the reforms they had agreed to. However, there is still room to go. The National Academies have begun a detailed review of administrative burdens on federally funded research. I hope that this review will yield specific recommendations for the agencies on how to proceed. While it may be preferable to wait for this report to be published before the interagency committee begins its own work, the Academies' review does not preclude the need for an interagency group.

I understand that there may be bureaucratic hurdles to overcome. This will take some time. However, we cannot afford to delay action any longer. The vitality of our Nation's research universities and of our overall competitiveness will suffer if we do not reduce the administrative workload on our Nation's scientific talent. H.R. 1119 is an important step in that direction.

Once again, I want to thank Chairwoman Comstock and Ranking Member JOHNSON of the Research and Technology Subcommittee for introducing this legislation, and I thank Chairman SMITH for bringing it to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Again, I want to thank Chairwoman COMSTOCK, Chairman SMITH, and Ranking Member JOHNSON for moving this bill.

I used to be a university researcher. I know of the heavy burdens in terms of administrative tasks that need to be done. I would say some of these are absolutely necessary, but we now know that we can reduce the burden without reducing the protections that they provide. I am very happy to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, really quickly, I want to thank Mrs. COMSTOCK for introducing this bill and Mr. LIPINSKI for cosponsoring it. As well, it is a great bipartisan piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1119, 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.

INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1156) to authorize the establishment of a body under the National Science and Technology Council to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation opportunities, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1156

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 ''International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. COORDINATION OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish or designate a working group under the National Science and Technology Council with the responsibility to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation that can strengthen the United States science and technology enterprise, improve economic and national security, and support United States foreign policy goals.

(b) NSTC WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP.—The working group established under subsection (a) shall be co-chaired by officials from the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Department of State.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The working group established under subsection (a) shall—

(1) plan and coordinate interagency international science and technology cooperative research and training activities and partnerships supported or managed by Federal agencies and work with other National Science and Technology Council committees to help plan and coordinate the international component of national science and technology priorities;

(2) establish Federal priorities and policies for aligning, as appropriate, international science and technology cooperative research and training activities and partnerships supported or managed by Federal agencies with the foreign policy goals of the United States;

(3) identify opportunities for new international science and technology cooperative research and training partnerships that advance both the science and technology and the foreign policy priorities of the United States;

(4) in carrying out paragraph (3), solicit input and recommendations from non-Federal science and technology stakeholders, including universities, scientific and professional societies, industry, and relevant organizations and institutions; and

(5) identify broad issues that influence the ability of United States scientists and engineers to collaborate with foreign counterparts, including barriers to collaboration and access to scientific information.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall transmit a report, to be updated every 2 years, to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. The report shall also be made available to the public on the reporting agency's website. The report shall contain a description of—

(1) the priorities and policies established under subsection (c)(2);

(2) the ongoing and new partnerships established since the last update to the report;

(3) the means by which stakeholder input was received, as well as summary views of stakeholder input; and

(4) the issues influencing the ability of United States scientists and engineers to collaborate with foreign counterparts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1156, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 1156, the International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2015, directs the Office of Science and Technology Policy to establish a working group to identify and coordinate international science and technology efforts to strengthen the U.S. research enterprise.

I thank the ranking member of the Research and Technology Subcommittee, Mr. LIPINSKI, for introducing this bill. I also thank the subcommittee's vice chair, Mr. MOOLENAAR, the ranking member of the full committee, Ms. JOHNSON, as well as our colleagues Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. SWALWELL for being bipartisan cosponsors.

The Office of Science and Technology Policy, in coordination with the State Department, represents the United States in bilateral and multilateral meetings with foreign nations. It works closely with government science agencies, nongovernmental organizations, and independent research and scientific institutions to promote science and technology initiatives and to strengthen global science cooperation.

H.R. 1156 improves our Nation's collaborative efforts with international partners on scientific issues. While many Federal agencies are engaged with international partners on science and technology projects, there is a need to coordinate these projects across the Federal Government. Better collaboration with our partners will strengthen U.S. scientific activities and further promote the free exchange of ideas with other nations. Interagency coordination ensures that taxpayer dollars are used efficiently and that U.S. priorities are consistently addressed when working with our international partners on science and technology issues.

Science and technology research addresses some of the major challenges that face our Nation, including public health, energy production, national security, and economic development. Coordinated international collaboration on scientific issues, which H.R. 1156 promotes, also will improve economic and national security and support U.S. foreign policy goals.

Again, I want to thank Mr. LIPINSKI for his continued hard work on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1156, the International Science and Technology Cooperation Act, which I reintroduced earlier this year.

A similar bill, which I authored in the last Congress, passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support by a vote of 346–41. I am hopeful that we can do the same this week and then work to get this bill through the Senate and onto the President's desk.

I want to thank Mr. MOOLENAAR for cosponsoring this bill with me, and I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for helping advance it through the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and for getting it to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, the laws of science know no political boundaries. While the United States arguably has the most brilliant scientists in the world and has developed some of the greatest technology, no country has a monopoly on great minds in science and technology. So, if we want to advance science in ways that benefit Americans and the rest of the world, we need to encourage international collaboration.

Improvements in areas such as energy security, infectious diseases, space exploration, telecommunications and the Internet, and many more are due, in part, to international cooperation, to the benefit of all nations involved. By collaborating with international partnerships on science, we also strengthen the U.S. scientific enterprise, which helps us get the best return on our research investment.

In addition, international collaborations make possible research endeavors on a grander scale than the U.S. can accomplish on its own. For example, CERN, the U.S. Department of Energy, and the National Science Foundation signed a cooperative agreement 2 weeks ago expanding their collaboration on particle physics. Not only will this provide for our scientists to continue work at the highest energy accelerator in the world at CERN, it will also allow CERN to provide equipment to an upcoming neutrino experiment at Fermilab in Batavia, Illinois.

CERN was the site of one of the most significant technological advances that impacts us every day. At CERN in 1989, Tim Berners-Lee was working on the problem of allowing international researchers to see data instantaneously around the globe. The solution that was developed was the World Wide Web, which has completely transformed the way we communicate and get information today.

H.R. 1156 makes more collaborations like this possible. It requires the National Science and Technology Council at the White House to continue to maintain a working group to coordinate the U.S. interagency strategy for international science and technology cooperation. Many Federal agencies already work with international counterparts on scientific and technological issues, but, until recently, there was no coordinating body to identify new partnerships and to fully leverage existing collaborations.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we find ways to collaborate with other countries on scientific discoveries that push the boundaries of knowledge and improve our lives. This bill will do that. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Again, I want to thank the chairman for his support on this. As I said, we have passed this bill before with wide bipartisan support. I am very hopeful we can do that again today.

International cooperation is very critical to doing more than we alone can do. We have, arguably, the best researchers in the world, producing the most advanced technology, but in working together with others, we can do even more than we have. The impact that it can have on the everyday lives of Americans is tremendous, so I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1815

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1156, 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 authorize the establishment or designation of a working group under the National Science and Technology Council to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation opportunities.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1561) to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1561

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 ''Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. PUBLIC SAFETY PRIORITY.

In accordance with NOAA's critical mission to provide science, service, and stewardship, the Under Secretary shall prioritize weather research, across all weather programs, to improve weather data, forecasts, and warnings for the protection of life and property and the enhancement of the national economy.

SEC. 3. WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING INNOVATION.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Assistant Administrator for OAR shall conduct a program to develop improved understanding of and forecast capabilities for atmospheric events and their impacts, placing priority on developing more accurate, timely, and effective warnings and fore-casts of high impact weather events that endanger life and property.

(b) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—The program described in subsection (a) shall focus on the following activities:

(1) Improving the fundamental understanding of weather consistent with section

2, including the boundary layer and other atmospheric processes affecting high impact weather events.

(2) Improving the understanding of how the public receives, interprets, and responds to warnings and forecasts of high impact weather events that endanger life and property.

(3) Research and development, and transfer of knowledge, technologies, and applications to the NWS and other appropriate agencies and entities, including the American weather industry and academic partners, related to—

(A) advanced radar, radar networking technologies, and other ground-based technologies, including those emphasizing rapid, fine-scale sensing of the boundary layer and lower troposphere, and the use of innovative, dual-polarization, phased array technologies;

(B) aerial weather observing systems;

(C) high performance computing and information technology and wireless communication networks;

(D) advanced numerical weather prediction systems and forecasting tools and techniques that improve the forecasting of timing, track, intensity, and severity of high impact weather, including through—

(i) the development of more effective mesoscale models;

(ii) more effective use of existing, and the development of new, regional and national cloud-resolving models;

(iii) enhanced global weather models; and

(iv) integrated assessment models;

(E) quantitative assessment tools for measuring the impact and value of data and observing systems, including OSSEs (as described in section 8), OSEs, and AOAs;

(F) atmospheric chemistry and interactions essential to accurately characterizing atmospheric composition and predicting meteorological processes, including cloud microphysical, precipitation, and atmospheric electrification processes, to more effectively understand their role in severe weather; and

(G) additional sources of weather data and information, including commercial observing systems.

(4) A technology transfer initiative, carried out jointly and in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, and in cooperation with the American weather industry and academic partners, to ensure continuous development and transition of the latest scientific and technological advances into NWS operations and to establish a process to sunset outdated and expensive operational methods and tools to enable cost-effective transfer of new methods and tools into operations.

(c) EXTRAMURAL RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program under this section, the Assistant Administrator for OAR shall collaborate with and support the non-Federal weather research community, which includes institutions of higher education, private entities, and nongovernmental organizations, by making funds available through competitive grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that not less than 30 percent of the funds for weather research and development at OAR should be made available for the purpose described in paragraph (1).

(d) REPORT.—The Under Secretary shall transmit to Congress annually, concurrently with NOAA's budget request, a description of current and planned activities under this section.

SEC. 4. TORNADO WARNING IMPROVEMENT AND EXTENSION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary, in collaboration with the American weather industry and academic partners, shall establish a tornado warning improvement and extension program.

(b) GOAL.—The goal of such program shall be to reduce the loss of life and economic losses from tornadoes through the development and extension of accurate, effective, and timely tornado forecasts, predictions, and warnings, including the prediction of tornadoes beyond one hour in advance.

(c) PROGRAM PLAN.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall develop a program plan that details the specific research, development, and technology transfer activities, as well as corresponding resources and timelines, necessary to achieve the program goal.

(d) BUDGET FOR PLAN.—Following completion of the plan, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall transmit annually to Congress a proposed budget corresponding to the activities identified in the plan.

SEC. 5. HURRICANE FORECAST IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary, in collaboration with the American weather industry and academic partners, shall maintain the Hurricane Forecast Improvement Program (HFIP).

(b) GOAL.—The goal of such program shall be to develop and extend accurate hurricane forecasts and warnings in order to reduce loss of life, injury, and damage to the economy.

(c) PROGRAM PLAN.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in consultation with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall develop a program plan that details the specific research, development, and technology transfer activities, as well as corresponding resources and timelines, necessary to achieve the program goal.

(d) BUDGET FOR PLAN.—Following completion of the plan, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in consultation with the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall transmit annually to Congress a proposed budget corresponding to the activities identified in the plan.

SEC. 6. WEATHER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for OAR, in coordination with the Assistant Administrators for NWS and NESDIS, shall issue a research and development and research to operations plan to restore and maintain United States leadership in numerical weather prediction and forecasting that—

(1) describes the forecasting skill and technology goals, objectives, and progress of NOAA in carrying out the program conducted under section 3;

(2) identifies and prioritizes specific research and development activities, and performance metrics, weighted to meet the operational weather mission of NWS to achieve a weather-ready Nation;

(3) describes how the program will collaborate with stakeholders, including the American weather industry and academic partners; and

(4) identifies, through consultation with the National Science Foundation, American weather industry, and academic partners, research necessary to enhance the integration of social science knowledge into weather forecast and warning processes, including to improve the communication of threat information necessary to enable improved severe weather planning and decisionmaking on the part of individuals and communities.

SEC. 7. OBSERVING SYSTEM PLANNING.

The Under Secretary shall—

(1) develop and maintain a prioritized list of observation data requirements necessary to ensure weather forecasting capabilities to protect life and property to the maximum extent practicable;

(2) undertake, using OSSEs, OSEs, AOAs, and other appropriate assessment tools, ongoing systematic evaluations of the combination of observing systems, data, and information needed to meet the requirements listed under paragraph (1), assessing various options to maximize observational capabilities and their cost-effectiveness;

(3) identify current and potential future data gaps in observing capabilities related to the requirements listed under paragraph (1); and

(4) determine a range of options to address gaps identified under paragraph (3).

SEC. 8. OBSERVING SYSTEM SIMULATION EXPERIMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In support of the requirements of section 7, the Assistant Administrator for OAR shall undertake OSSEs to quantitatively assess the relative value and benefits of observing capabilities and systems. Technical and scientific OSSE evaluations—

(1) may include assessments of the impact of observing capabilities on—

(A) global weather prediction;

(B) hurricane track and intensity forecasting;

(C) tornado warning lead times and accuracy;

(D) prediction of mid-latitude severe local storm outbreaks; and

(E) prediction of storms that have the potential to cause extreme precipitation and flooding lasting from 6 hours to 1 week; and

(2) shall be conducted in cooperation with other appropriate entities within NOAA, other Federal agencies, the American weather industry, and academic partners to ensure the technical and scientific merit of OSSE results.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—OSSEs shall quantitatively—

(1) determine the potential impact of proposed space-based, suborbital, and in situ observing systems on analyses and forecasts, including potential impacts on extreme weather events across all parts of the Nation;

(2) evaluate and compare observing system design options; and

(3) assess the relative capabilities and costs of various observing systems and combinations of observing systems in providing data necessary to protect life and property.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—OSSEs—

(1) shall be conducted prior to the acquisition of major Government-owned or Government-leased operational observing systems, including polar-orbiting and geostationary satellite systems, with a lifecycle cost of more than $500,000,000; and

(2) shall be conducted prior to the purchase of any major new commercially provided data with a lifecycle cost of more than $500,000,000.

(d) PRIORITY OSSEs.—

(1) GLOBAL NAVIGATION SATELLITE SYSTEM RADIO OCCULTATION.—Not later than December 31, 2015, the Assistant Administrator for OAR shall complete an OSSE to assess the value of data from Global Navigation Satellite System Radio Occultation.

(2) GEOSTATIONARY HYPERSPECTRAL SOUNDER GLOBAL CONSTELLATION.—Not later than

December 31, 2016, the Assistant Administrator for OAR shall complete an OSSE to assess the value of data from a geostationary hyperspectral sounder global constellation.

(e) RESULTS.—Upon completion of all OSSEs, results shall be publicly released and accompanied by an assessment of related private and public sector weather data sourcing options, including their availability, affordability, and cost effectiveness. Such assessments shall be developed in accordance with section 50503 of title 51, United States Code.

SEC. 9. COMPUTING RESOURCES PRIORITIZATION REPORT.

Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary, acting through the NOAA Chief Information Officer, in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for OAR and the Assistant Administrator for NWS, shall produce and make publicly available a report that explains how NOAA intends to—

(1) continually support upgrades to pursue the fastest, most powerful, and cost effective high performance computing technologies in support of its weather prediction mission;

(2) ensure a balance between the research to operations requirements to develop the next generation of regional and global models as well as highly reliable operational models;

(3) take advantage of advanced development concepts to, as appropriate, make next generation weather prediction models available in beta-test mode to operational forecasters, the American weather industry, and partners in academic and government research; and

(4) use existing computing resources to improve advanced research and operational weather prediction.

SEC. 10. COMMERCIAL WEATHER DATA.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 60161 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''This prohibition shall not extend to—

''(1) the purchase of weather data through contracts with commercial providers; or

''(2) the placement of weather satellite instruments on cohosted government or private payloads.''.

(b) STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Under Secretary, shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a strategy to enable the procurement of quality commercial weather data. The strategy shall assess the range of commercial opportunities, including public-private partnerships, for obtaining surface-based, aviation-based, and space-based weather observations. The strategy shall include the expected cost effectiveness of these opportunities as well as provide a plan for procuring data, including an expected implementation timeline, from these nongovernmental sources, as appropriate.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The strategy shall include—

(A) an analysis of financial or other benefits to, and risks associated with, acquiring commercial weather data or services, including through multiyear acquisition approaches;

(B) an identification of methods to address planning, programming, budgeting, and execution challenges to such approaches, including—

(i) how standards will be set to ensure that data is reliable and effective;

(ii) how data may be acquired through commercial experimental or innovative techniques and then evaluated for integration into operational use;

(iii) how to guarantee public access to all forecast-critical data to ensure that the American weather industry and the public continue to have access to information critical to their work; and

(iv) in accordance with section 50503 of title 51, United States Code, methods to address potential termination liability or cancellation costs associated with weather data or service contracts; and

(C) an identification of any changes needed in the requirements development and approval processes of the Department of Commerce to facilitate effective and efficient implementation of such strategy.

(3) AUTHORITY FOR AGREEMENTS.—The Assistant Administrator for NESDIS may enter into multiyear agreements necessary to carry out the strategy developed under this subsection.

(c) PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) CRITERIA.—Not later than December 31, 2015, NOAA shall publish data standards and specifications for space-based commercial weather data.

(2) PILOT CONTRACT.—

(A) CONTRACT.—Not later than October 1, 2016, NOAA shall, through an open competition, enter into at least one pilot contract with a private sector entity capable of providing data that meet the standards and specifications set by NOAA to provide commercial weather data in a manner that allows NOAA to calibrate and evaluate the data.

(B) ASSESSMENT OF DATA VIABILITY.—Not later than October 1, 2019, NOAA shall transmit to Congress the results of a determination of the extent to which data provided under the contract entered into under subparagraph (A) meet the criteria published under paragraph (1).

(3) OBTAINING FUTURE DATA.—NOAA shall, to the extent feasible, obtain commercial weather data from private sector providers.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated out of funds made available for procurement, acquisition, and construction at NESDIS, $9,000,000 for carrying out this subsection.

SEC. 11. ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION SERVICES WORKING GROUP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The NOAA Science Advisory Board shall continue to maintain a standing working group named the Environmental Information Services Working Group (in this section referred to as the ''Working Group'') to—

(1) provide advice for prioritizing weather research initiatives at NOAA to produce real improvement in weather forecasting;

(2) provide advice on existing or emerging technologies or techniques that can be found in private industry or the research community that could be incorporated into forecasting at NWS to improve forecasting skill;

(3) identify opportunities to improve communications between weather forecasters, Federal, State, local, tribal, and other emergency management personnel, and the public; and to improve communications and partnerships among NOAA and the private and academic sectors; and

(4) address such other matters as the Science Advisory Board requests of the Working Group.

(b) COMPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Working Group shall be composed of leading experts and innovators from all relevant fields of science and engineering including atmospheric chemistry, atmospheric physics, meteorology, hydrology, social science, risk communications, electrical engineering, and computer sciences. In carrying out this section, the Working Group may organize into subpanels.

(2) NUMBER.—The Working Group shall be composed of no fewer than 15 members. Nominees for the Working Group may be forwarded by the Working Group for approval by the Science Advisory Board. Members of the Working Group may choose a chair (or co-chairs) from among their number with approval by the Science Advisory Board.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Working Group shall transmit annually to the Science Advisory Board for submission to the Under Secretary a report on progress made by NOAA in adopting the Working Group's recommendations. The Science Advisory Board shall transmit this report to the Under Secretary. Within 30 days of receipt of such report, the Under Secretary shall transmit it to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

SEC. 12. INTERAGENCY WEATHER RESEARCH AND INNOVATION COORDINATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish an Inter-agency Committee for Advancing Weather Services to improve coordination of relevant weather research and forecast innovation activities across the Federal Government. The Interagency Committee shall—

(1) include participation by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, NOAA and its constituent elements, the National Science Foundation, and such other agencies involved in weather forecasting research as the President determines are appropriate;

(2) identify and prioritize top forecast needs and coordinate those needs against budget requests and program initiatives across participating offices and agencies; and

(3) share information regarding operational needs and forecasting improvements across relevant agencies.

(b) CO-CHAIR.—The Federal Coordinator for Meteorology shall serve as a co-chair of this panel.

(c) FURTHER COORDINATION.—The Director shall take such other steps as are necessary to coordinate the activities of the Federal Government with those of the American weather industry, State governments, emergency managers, and academic researchers.

SEC. 13. OAR AND NWS EXCHANGE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Administrator for OAR and the Assistant Administrator for NWS may establish a program to detail OAR personnel to the NWS and NWS personnel to OAR.

(b) GOAL.—The goal of this program is to enhance forecasting innovation through regular, direct interaction between OAR's world-class scientists and NWS's operational staff.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The program shall allow up to 10 OAR staff and NWS staff to spend up to 1 year on detail. Candidates shall be jointly selected by the Assistant Administrator for OAR and the Assistant Administrator for NWS.

(d) REPORT.—The Under Secretary shall report annually to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on participation in such program and shall highlight any innovations that come from this interaction.

SEC. 14. VISITING FELLOWS AT NWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Administrator for NWS may establish a program to host postdoctoral fellows and academic researchers at any of the National Centers for Environmental Prediction.

(b) GOAL.—This program shall be designed to provide direct interaction between forecasters and talented academic and private sector researchers in an effort to bring innovation to forecasting tools and techniques available to the NWS.

(c) SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT.—Such fellows shall be competitively selected and appointed for a term not to exceed 1 year.

SEC. 15. NOAA WEATHER READY ALL HAZARDS AWARD PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Assistant Administrator for NWS is authorized to establish the NOAA Weather Ready All Hazards Award Program. This award program shall provide annual awards to honor individuals or organizations that use or provide NOAA Weather Radio All Hazards receivers or transmitters to save lives and protect property. Individuals or organizations that utilize other early warning tools or applications also qualify for this award.

(b) GOAL.—This award program draws attention to the life-saving work of the NOAA Weather Ready All Hazards Program, as well as emerging tools and applications, that provide real-time warning to individuals and communities of severe weather or other hazardous conditions.

(c) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—

(1) NOMINATIONS.—Nominations for this award shall be made annually by the Weather Field Offices to the Assistant Administrator for NWS. Broadcast meteorologists, weather radio manufacturers and weather warning tool and application developers, emergency managers and public safety officials may nominate individuals and/or organizations to their local Weather Field Offices, but the final list of award nominees must come from the Weather Field Offices.

(2) SELECTION OF AWARDEES.—Annually, the Assistant Administrator for NWS shall choose winners of this award whose timely actions, based on NOAA weather radio all hazards receivers or transmitters or other early warning tools and applications, saved lives and/or property or demonstrated public service in support of weather or all hazard warnings.

(3) AWARD CEREMONY.—The Assistant Administrator for NWS shall establish a means of making these awards to provide maximum public awareness of the importance of NOAA Weather Radio, and such other warning tools and applications as are represented in the awards.

SEC. 16. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AOA.—The term ''AOA'' means an Analysis of Alternatives.

(2) NESDIS.—The term ''NESDIS'' means the National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service.

(3) NOAA.—The term ''NOAA'' means the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(4) NWS.—The term ''NWS'' means the National Weather Service.

(5) OAR.—The term ''OAR'' means the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research.

(6) OSE.—The term ''OSE'' means an Observing System Experiment.

(7) OSSE.—The term ''OSSE'' means an Observing System Simulation Experiment.

(8) UNDER SECRETARY.—The term ''Under Secretary'' means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

SEC. 17. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2015.—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015—

(1) $90,800,000 to OAR to carry out this Act, of which—

(A) $70,000,000 is authorized for weather laboratories and cooperative institutes; and

(B) $20,800,000 is authorized for weather and air chemistry research programs; and

(2) out of funds made available for research and development at NOAA, an additional amount of $16,000,000 for OAR to carry out the joint technology transfer initiative described in section 3(b)(4).

(b) FISCAL YEARS 2016 AND 2017.—For each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017, there are authorized to be appropriated to OAR—

(1) $100,000,000 to carry out this Act, of which—

(A) $80,000,000 is authorized for weather laboratories and cooperative institutes; and

(B) $20,000,000 is authorized for weather and air chemistry research programs; and

(2) an additional amount of $20,000,000 for the joint technology transfer initiative described in section 3(b)(4).

(c) LIMITATION.—No additional funds are authorized 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. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1561, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), who is the vice chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman SMITH, for his continued leadership on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

H.R. 1561, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015, prioritizes the protection of life and property at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration by focusing research and computing resources on improving weather forecasting, quantitative observing data planning, Next Generation modeling, and an emphasis on research to operations technology transfer.

I echo Chairman SMITH's concerns that severe weather greatly affects large parts of the country, and as a Representative from Oklahoma, I understand the need for improvement firsthand. In 2013, the deadly storms in my home State were a stark reminder that we can do better to predict severe weather events and provide longer lead times to protect Americans in harm's way.

I am proud that this legislation has a dedicated tornado warning improvement Program. The goal of this program is to reduce the loss from tornadoes by advancing the understanding of fundamental meteorological science, allowing detection and notifications that are more accurate, effective, and timely.

Constituents in my home State will benefit greatly from longer tornado warning lead times, which will save lives and better protect property. H.R. 1561 makes clear that NOAA will prioritize weather research and protect lives and property through a focused, affordable, attainable, and forward-looking research plan at the agency's research office.

This bill also helps encourage innovation and new capacities developed through NOAA's Weather Research Program, like creating a joint technology transfer from the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research. This transfer is essential to get new forecasting models and technologies out of the research side of NOAA and into our operational forecast.

This bill directs NOAA to develop plans to restore our country's leadership in weather forecasting. It is no secret that many people in our weather community are distraught that our forecasting capacities have deteriorated in recent years. While other countries are making great strides in weather advancements, Americans are paying the price for lost leadership with their lives and their wallets. This is another reminder that we can do better.

This bill prompts NOAA to actively consider new commercial data and private sector solutions to further enhance our weather forecasting capacities. This legislation includes a pilot program which will provide NOAA a clear and credible demonstration of the valuable data from commercial technologies available today.

This legislation is substantially similar to last year's bipartisan Weather Forecasting Improvement Act, which passed the House by a voice vote. The bill before us today updates authorization numbers to reflect current spending levels, adjusts dates to reflect current operating status, and incorporates minor additions and technical changes to improve the bill's clarity and intent.

This legislation is the result of a bipartisan agreement last year and again this year. I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), the Subcommittee on Environment chairman, for his active leadership on this issue in the last Congress and for getting us here today.

I also want to thank the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Environment, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), for her efforts in crafting a bipartisan agreement and joining in this most worthwhile initiative to save American lives and property through better weather forecasting.

Finally, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act has received numerous letters of support which I would like to mention, including letters from Utah State University, Space Environment Technologies, Metro Weather, Utah Science Technology and Research Initiative.

Once again, it is a good bill. It has been worked on diligently. We need to pass it.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1561, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015. This bill, introduced by my friend, Mr. LUCAS, builds on the work that subcommittee chairman Mr. BRIDENSTINE and former subcommittee chairman Mr. STEWART and I did in the last Congress.

The language before us today is the result of a truly bipartisan effort with extensive discussions and negotiations across the aisle. Although the bill is not perfect, it is a good bill and a better bill than the one that passed in the last Congress, and I ask all my colleagues to support it.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has many important tasks at the cutting edge of science and service. The agency's responsibilities for weather forecasting are critical to our country.

We are proud of the good work of NOAA and its dedicated employees. They are a committed workforce, responsible for keeping our communities safe during inclement weather.

But with the increasing frequency of severe weather events, there can and should be improvements in weather forecasting. For example, forecasts can be more precise regarding what will happen and when. Forecasts can provide more lead time, especially of severe weather events, to allow people to prepare. Forecast information can be communicated more effectively to the public and those in harm's way so we can reduce the loss of life and property.

This bill is designed to make sure that NOAA achieves these important goals. H.R. 1561 draws upon the model of innovation used by the military services where researchers work hand in hand with those on the front lines to develop innovations that have real-world practical returns.

The bill connects the research side of NOAA, the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, more effectively with the forecasting needs of the National Weather Service. The bill contains several provisions that will improve interactions and information sharing between OAR and NWS. It also establishes new ways for NOAA to hear from and work with the broader research and private weather communities.

NOAA is not the only agency that researches weather or has responsibility for communicating forecast information, so the bill establishes interagency coordination, through the Office of Science and Technology Policy, across the agencies that have these responsibilities. This coordination will leverage our limited resources and more rapidly spread the adoption of best tools and practices across agencies.

H.R. 1561 recognizes that the best forecasts in the world will not fully serve the public's needs unless we have an effective communications system. The bill directs NOAA to do more research, listen to experts, and improve its risk communication techniques. The bill also reestablishes a program that allows NOAA to make awards to people who save the lives of others through reliance on NOAA's Weather Radio All Hazards program.

This bill also establishes a pilot program at NOAA to look to the commercial sector for weather forecasting data. This is an overdue effort to ensure that Federal dollars are spent effectively and leveraged appropriately.

Additionally, the bill requires NOAA to run simulations of the effect of different configurations of instruments and datasets on forecasting accuracy so the agency can look at the benefits and costs of different arrays of sensors. It is important to make sure that these requirements are not too prescriptive so that NOAA is able to use the most efficient, accurate, and cost-effective model for the situation. I will continue to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle on how we can make these provisions work well.

In summary, the changes in this bill will bring about advances that result in better development and deployment of forecast innovations and technology. Importantly, most of these changes are coming at little or no cost. The bill is focused on changes to internal processes rather than simply spending more money. To the degree that the bill does expand the agency's authorization for weather research, it is done in line with anticipated needs in this area.

Again, I want to thank the Members on both sides of the aisle for their input and support. I am particularly grateful to Ms. JOHNSON for her support during negotiations as well as Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Also, I want to thank the hard-working staff on both sides of the aisle for their efforts to keep coming back to the table and helping to move this forward.

Mr. Chairman, we also received many letters of support for H.R. 1561 from more than 20 different organizations, including the Weather Coalition; the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, which represents more than 100 research institutions; the Global Weather Corporation; the American Weather and Climate Industry Association; the American Commercial Space Weather Association; and many others. Additionally, we received letters of support from a number of individuals who serve on the Environmental Information Services Working Group, which is one of NOAA's scientific advisory bodies.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the gentlewoman from Oregon for her work on this bill. She has been a strong advocate and an initiator on the benefits that this bill does promote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just echo the comments of my colleague from Oklahoma, the vice chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Mr. LUCAS, and of course the ranking member, Ms. BONAMICI. I think your summation of this bill is right on target.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to attest that H.R. 1561, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act, is the very first step in what will lead us to a day when we have zero deaths from tornadoes. I want to repeat that. This is the very first step of what is necessary to move us to a day where we have zero deaths from tornadoes. Those of us from the great State of Oklahoma understand this all too well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first thank Chairman SMITH, Vice Chairman LUCAS, and the Subcommittee on Environment Ranking Member BONAMICI for their tireless efforts to see this bipartisan legislation move forward.

The burgeoning commercial private sector for space-based weather data and aviation-based weather data has voiced its support for this legislation. I would like to mention letters to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology from PlanetiQ, Tempus Global Data, Panasonic Avionics Corporation, GeoOptics, and Spire Global.

H.R. 1561 builds on the foundation laid by my House-passed Weather Forecasting Improvement Act from last Congress and directs NOAA to prioritize activities that will save lives and protect property. This is critically important to my State, which is in the heart of Tornado Alley.

In fact, I just went home for the weekend. Saturday night, about midnight, all of the tornado sirens started going off. My wife and I got up. We got our kids out of bed. We brought them downstairs. We set up their beds in my closet. My wife and I turned on the TV, and we surfed the Internet trying to find out where the tornadoes were and where they were touching down.

This is critically important, and I am sure my experience this weekend, which is not unique to this weekend, is also an experience by many of my constituents and others throughout the State of Oklahoma. We must do all we can to improve our ability to predict the weather.

H.R. 1561 will help NOAA to develop more accurate and timely warnings for not only tornadoes, but also hurricanes and other high-impact weather events. It calls on NOAA to develop a plan to regain and maintain our forecasting capabilities that are second to none in the world because right now we, unfortunately, are lagging behind our counterparts in Europe, the U.K., and Canada. The bill encourages better cooperation across NOAA offices and enhances collaboration with universities such as the University of Oklahoma,

which is a national leader in weather research.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of a new section in this year's version that we have worked closely with industry, NOAA, and other Members of Congress to include. H.R. 1561 authorizes a pilot program for NOAA to purchase commercial space-based weather data and test it against NOAA's proprietary data. It also calls on NOAA to publish standards it expects from any purchased data from the commercial sector.

Mr. Speaker, this has the potential to be a major paradigm shift provision. This is the first step towards changing the business model. I believe we need to change the business model, moving to a day where the government does not purchase, own, and operate huge monolithic billion-dollar satellites but, rather, utilizes the innovation of the private sector to provide the data necessary to feed our data assimilation systems and our numerical weather models.

□ 1830

This will ultimately allow NOAA to focus its resources on the research and development necessary to improve our modeling capabilities, computing capacity, and warning lead times outlined in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there will come a time when there will be zero deaths from tornados. I think this bill will help us implement the necessary steps to get there.

I, once again, thank my colleagues on the Science Committee for all their hard work, and I look forward to working with our counterparts in the Senate to move this legislation to the President's desk.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1561 has received overwhelming support from the weather enterprise and industry. I would like to mention letters of support from AccuWeather, The Weather Company, Science and Technology Corporation, and Carmel Research Center as well.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD a full list of the 25 letters of support the Science Committee received for this legislation.

LETTERS OF SUPPORT FOR H.R. 1561—THE WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

COMPANIES

AccuWeather, American Commercial Space Weather Association, Atmospheric & Space Technology Research Associates, American Weather and Climate Industry Association, Carmel Research Center, GeoOptics, Global Weather Corporation, MetraWeather, Panasonic Avionics Corporation, Planet IQ.

Space Environment Technologies, Spire Global, Science Technology Corporation, Tempus Global Data, The Weather Company, University Corporation of Atmospheric Research, Utah Science Technology and Research Initiative, Utah State University, Weather Coalition, Weather Decision Technologies.

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION SERVICES WORKING GROUP

Walt Dabbert—Vaisala, Philip Ardanuy—Raytheon, Waren Qualley—Harris, Jean Vieux—Vieux Hydrology, Julie Winkler—Michigan State University.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other request for time, but I just want to thank the three original cosponsors we have on the floor tonight—Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Ms. BONAMICI—for sponsoring such an important piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, let me say, again, that this is a good bill that will improve weather forecasting innovation and services.

The results of the changes contained in this legislation? The public will be safer because of more timely and more accurate forecasts that will protect lives and property. We will also be growing our economy and creating jobs through this bill.

Researchers have found that annual variations in weather can produce billions of dollars in reduced U.S. gross domestic product. With stakes that large, we owe it to our Nation to improve weather forecasting.

H.R. 1561 takes intelligent steps to support NOAA and to drive needed change in how we harness research to forecasting needs.

Again, I want to thank the many leaders in the research community and the private weather sector who provided advice to the committee as we worked on this bill. I also want to extend my appreciation to the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, Dr. Kathy Sullivan, for her cooperation and advice.

I will continue working with my colleagues across the aisle and in the other body until we have a good, final bill. Again, I thank my cosponsors, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1561, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015.

I want to take a moment to acknowledge that getting to where we are today was not easy. This is an update to a bill the House passed two years ago, and we have spent several months in this Congress negotiating over how to rework that legislation.

I want to especially recognize the efforts of Environment Subcommittee Chairman JIM BRIDENSTINE and Ranking Member SUZANNE BONAMICI as well as the bill's sponsor, Mr. LUCAS. Their leadership and commitment has really driven this process forward. Today's bill is a testament to their dedication and represents one very positive step forward on the long and continuous road to improving the American weather forecasting system.

America has some of the most diverse and dangerous weather events of any country. From my home state of Texas, all the way to Maine, hurricanes and tropical storms annually batter our coasts. Likewise, the central portions of our country, from Texas to Illinois are the most tornado prone areas in the entire world.

Unfortunately, all you've had to do over the last few weeks is pick up a newspaper or turn on the television to see the true impact tornadoes can have on American families. To help our citizens cope with these potentially devastating events, we need to have the very best weather forecasting and warning capabilities.

The National Weather Service and the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research at NOAA play a central role in protecting the lives and property of every American.

The bill before us today will help accelerate innovation and the transition of cutting-edge weather research into essential weather forecasting tools and products.

The legislation accomplishes this goal by breaking down the barriers that exist between the weather research community, our nation's forecasters, and the private-sector weather enterprise. Improving collaboration and cooperation within NOAA, but also between the agency and the broader weather community will extend the accuracy and timing of our weather predictions. Such improvements will ultimately save lives and make our communities safer.

Mr. Speaker, the weather is a central part of everyday life and resiliency to severe weather events is an important part of strengthening the nation's economic security. H.R. 1561 will advance our weather forecasting capabilities and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

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

H.R. 1561, ''The Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015,'' will greatly improve our severe weather forecasting capabilities. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. LUCAS, the Vice Chairman of the Science Committee, for introducing this bill.

Severe weather routinely affects large portions of the United States. This year we already have seen the devastating effects of tornados across our country, especially in Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Kansas, Alabama, and Mississippi among other states.

The deaths and the damage from severe weather underscore our need for a world-class weather prediction system that helps protect American lives and property.

Unfortunately, our leadership has slipped in severe weather forecasting. European weather models routinely predict America's weather better than we do. We need to make up for lost ground.

H.R. 1561 improves weather observation systems and next generation modeling capabilities.

This bill prioritizes weather research at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA's) research agency. This will improve forecasts and warnings.

It prompts NOAA to actively engage new commercial data and private sector weather solutions through a corrimercial weather data pilot project.

The bill requires a cost-benefit analyses for the procurement of observing system data.

It increases forecast warning lead times for tornadoes and hurricanes. And it creates a joint technology transfer fund in NOAA's Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research to help speed technologies developed through NOAA's weather research into operation.

The enhanced prediction of major storms is of great importance to protecting the public from injury and loss of property.

In addition to Mr. LUCAS, I also want to thank the Chairman of the Environment Subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and the Environment Subcommittee Ranking Member, the gentlewoman from Oregon, Ms. BONAMICI, for their sponsorship of this bipartisan bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1561, 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.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY LABORATORY MODERNIZATION AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1158) to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1158

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 ''Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of Energy.

(2) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term ''National Laboratory'' means a Department of Energy nonmilitary national laboratory, including—

(A) Ames Laboratory;

(B) Argonne National Laboratory;

(C) Brookhaven National Laboratory;

(D) Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory;

(E) Idaho National Laboratory;

(F) Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory;

(G) National Energy Technology Laboratory;

(H) National Renewable Energy Laboratory;

(I) Oak Ridge National Laboratory;

(J) Pacific Northwest National Laboratory;

(K) Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory;

(L) Savannah River National Laboratory;

(M) Stanford Linear Accelerator Center;

(N) Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility; and

(O) any laboratory operated by the National Nuclear Security Administration, but only with respect to the civilian energy activities thereof.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act abrogates or otherwise affects the primary responsibilities of any National Laboratory to the Department.

TITLE I—INNOVATION MANAGEMENT AT DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 101. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND TRANSITIONS ASSESSMENT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report which shall include—

(1) an assessment of the Department's current ability to carry out the goals of section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391), including an assessment of the role and effectiveness of the Director of the Office of Technology Transitions; and

(2) recommended departmental policy changes and legislative changes to section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) to improve the Department's ability to successfully transfer new energy technologies to the private sector.

SEC. 102. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary should encourage the National Laboratories and federally funded research and development centers to inform small businesses of the opportunities and resources that exist pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 103. NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the National Laboratories, relevant Federal agencies, and other stakeholders, shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report assessing the Department's capabilities to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded fusion and non-light water reactor prototypes and related demonstration facilities at Department-owned sites. For purposes of this report, the Secretary shall consider the Department's capabilities to facilitate privately-funded prototypes up to 20 megawatts thermal output. The report shall address the following:

(1) The Department's safety review and oversight capabilities.

(2) Potential sites capable of hosting research, development, and demonstration of prototype reactors and related facilities for the purpose of reducing technical risk.

(3) The Department's and National Laboratories' existing physical and technical capabilities relevant to research, development, and oversight.

(4) The efficacy of the Department's available contractual mechanisms, including cooperative research and development agreements, work for others agreements, and agreements for commercializing technology.

(5) Potential cost structures related to physical security, decommissioning, liability, and other long-term project costs.

(6) Other challenges or considerations identified by the Secretary, including issues related to potential cases of demonstration reactors up to 2 gigawatts of thermal output.

TITLE II—CROSS-SECTOR PARTNERSHIPS AND GRANT COMPETITIVENESS

SEC. 201. AGREEMENTS FOR COMMERCIALIZING TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out the Agreements for Commercializing Technology pilot program of the Department, as announced by the Secretary on December 8, 2011, in accordance with this section.

(b) TERMS.—Each agreement entered into pursuant to the pilot program referred to in subsection (a) shall provide to the contractor of the applicable National Laboratory, to the maximum extent determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, increased authority to negotiate contract terms, such as intellectual property rights, payment structures, performance guarantees, and multiparty collaborations.

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any director of a National Laboratory may enter into an agreement pursuant to the pilot program referred to in subsection (a).

(2) AGREEMENTS WITH NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.—To carry out paragraph (1) and subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary shall permit the directors of the National Laboratories to execute agreements with a non-Federal entity, including a non-Federal entity already receiving Federal funding that will be used to support activities under agreements executed pursuant to paragraph (1), provided that such funding is solely used to carry out the purposes of the Federal award.

(3) RESTRICTION.—The requirements of chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Bayh-Dole Act'') shall apply if—

(A) the agreement is a funding agreement (as that term is defined in section 201 of that title); and

(B) at least 1 of the parties to the funding agreement is eligible to receive rights under that chapter.

(d) SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY.—Each affected director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary, with respect to each agreement entered into under this section—

(1) a summary of information relating to the relevant project;

(2) the total estimated costs of the project;

(3) estimated commencement and completion dates of the project; and

(4) other documentation determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(e) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall require the contractor of the affected National Laboratory to certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this section—

(1) is not in direct competition with the private sector; and

(2) does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this section.

(f) EXTENSION.—The pilot program referred to in subsection (a) shall be extended until October 31, 2017.

(g) REPORTS.—

(1) OVERALL ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date described in subsection (f), the Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that—

(A) assesses the overall effectiveness of the pilot program referred to in subsection (a);

(B) identifies opportunities to improve the effectiveness of the pilot program;

(C) assesses the potential for program activities to interfere with the responsibilities of the National Laboratories to the Department; and

(D) provides a recommendation regarding the future of the pilot program.

(2) TRANSPARENCY.—The Secretary, in coordination with directors of the National Laboratories, shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate an annual report that accounts for all incidences of, and provides a justification for, non-Federal entities using funds derived from a Federal contract or award to carry out agreements pursuant to this section.

SEC. 202. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR COMMERCIALIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall delegate to directors of the National Laboratories signature authority with respect to any agreement described in subsection (b) the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than $1,000,000, if such an agreement falls within the scope of—

(1) a strategic plan for the National Laboratory that has been approved by the Department; or

(2) the most recent Congressionally approved budget for Department activities to be carried out by the National Laboratory.

(b) AGREEMENTS.—Subsection (a) applies to—

(1) a cooperative research and development agreement;

(2) a non-Federal work-for-others agreement; and

(3) any other agreement determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, in collaboration with the directors of the National Laboratories.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall carry out an agreement under this section in accordance with applicable policies of the Department, including by ensuring that the agreement does not compromise any national security, economic, or environmental interest of the United States.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this section does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this section.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS.—Within 30 days of entering an agreement under this section, the director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary for monitoring and review all records of the National Laboratory relating to the agreement.

(4) RATES.—The director of a National Laboratory may charge higher rates for services performed under a partnership agreement entered into pursuant to this section, regardless of the full cost of recovery, if such funds are used exclusively to support further research and development activities at the respective National Laboratory.

(d) EXCEPTION.—This section does not apply to any agreement with a majority foreign-owned company.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 12 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting the subparagraphs appropriately;

(B) by striking ''Each Federal agency'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each Federal agency''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in accordance with section 202(a) of the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015, approval by the Secretary of Energy shall not be required for any technology transfer agreement proposed to be entered into by a National Laboratory of the Department of Energy, the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than $1,000,000.''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''subsection (a)(1)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (a)(1)(A)''.

SEC. 203. INCLUSION OF EARLY-STAGE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION IN AUTHORIZED TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ACTIVITIES.

Section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391) is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) EARLY-STAGE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION.—The Secretary shall permit the directors of the National Laboratories to use funds authorized to support technology transfer within the Department to carry out early-stage and pre-commercial technology demonstration activities to remove technology barriers that limit private sector interest and demonstrate potential commercial applications of any research and technologies arising from National Laboratory activities.''.

SEC. 204. FUNDING COMPETITIVENESS FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.

Section 988(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3)'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) EXEMPTION FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a research or development activity performed by an institution of higher education or nonprofit institution (as defined in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3703)).

''(B) TERMINATION DATE.—The exemption under subparagraph (A) shall apply during the 6-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this paragraph.''.

SEC. 205. PARTICIPATION IN THE INNOVATION CORPS PROGRAM.

The Secretary may enter into an agreement with the Director of the National Science Foundation to enable researchers funded by the Department to participate in the National Science Foundation Innovation Corps program.

TITLE III—ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT

SEC. 301. REPORT BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report—

(1) describing the results of the projects developed under sections 201, 202, and 203, including information regarding—

(A) partnerships initiated as a result of those projects and the potential linkages presented by those partnerships with respect to national priorities and other taxpayer-funded research; and

(B) whether the activities carried out under those projects result in—

(i) fiscal savings;

(ii) expansion of National Laboratory capabilities;

(iii) increased efficiency of technology transfers; or

(iv) an increase in general efficiency of the National Laboratory system; and

(2) assess the scale, scope, efficacy, and impact of the Department's efforts to promote technology transfer and private sector engagement at the National Laboratories, and make recommendations on how the Department can improve these activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1158, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015, enables the Department of Energy to better form partnerships with non-Federal entities and transfer research to the private sector.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for his initiative on this issue and the gentleman from Colorado, Representative ED PERLMUTTER, for cosponsoring this important piece of legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, before I get started, we also have several letters of support on this that I would submit for the RECORD. One is from the Bipartisan Policy Center on behalf of the American Energy Innovation Council; another is from Third Way. They support this bill. The final one is from the American Nuclear Society.

BIPARTISAN POLICY CENTER,
March 24, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, H–232 of the Capitol, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, H–204 of the Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the American Energy Innovation Council (AEIC), we write to urge the prompt consideration of H.R. 1158 Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act. Similar legislation (H.R. 5120) easily passed the House during the last Congress. The bill enjoys strong bipartisan support and was cosponsored by both Chairman Lamar Smith (R-TX) and Ranking Member Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX) of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology.

The AEIC is a group of America's top business executives who came together starting in 2010 to recommend ways to promote American innovation in clean energy technology. We are united in our belief that technology innovation—especially in energy—is at the heart of many of the central economic, national security, competitiveness, and environmental challenges facing our nation. We believe strong support for robust, public investments in energy innovation is critical to a vibrant American economy.

H.R. 1158 gives the National Labs needed flexibility to enter into more effective partnerships with businesses and universities, particularly with respect to early-stage technology demonstration. We anticipate that H.R. 1158 will unlock more private investment in clean energy technology R&D, and we endorse this bill.

Accelerating technology innovation is a smart investment for America's future. We look forward to working with you to once again secure House passage of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

CHAD HOLLIDAY,
Co-Chair, American Energy Innovation Council.
NORM AUGUSTINE,
Co-Chair, American Energy Innovation Council.

THIRD WAY,
March 9, 2015.

Hon. RANDY HULTGREN,
Member, House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. ED PERLMUTTER,
Member, House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HULTGREN AND CONGRESSMAN PERLMUTTER, we write in support of H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy (DOE) Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015. It is critical that the United States maximizes the ability of our national labs to partner with the private sector to develop and commercialize new energy technologies, particularly around advanced nuclear power. Your bipartisan bill, which has been approved by the Committee and sent to the House, will begin a vital assessment of the labs' capabilities and offer ways to get the best return on taxpayers' investment in energy innovation.

The world faces a profound paradox: ever-increasing global energy demand and the need to dramatically reduce carbon emissions. That's why Third Way strongly believes that the development of advanced nuclear reactors is critical. With dozens of reactor projects underway in the United States, this country has the opportunity to create enormous economic, national security, and environmental benefits if we can provide the right platform for private companies to develop and commercialize these advanced nuclear technologies. Public-private partnerships of the type envisioned in your legislation can help industry to transcend some of the technological and regulatory barriers it faces and bring this promising energy source to market

We applaud your leadership in the sponsorship of this bill. There is pent-up demand in the private sector to work with the national labs to develop innovative advanced nuclear, carbon capture, and other energy solutions. H.R. 1158 is a very important step to ensure that happens. We look forward to supporting it as it moves through the House and Senate.

Sincerely,

JOSH FREED,
Vice President for the Clean Energy Program.

AMERICAN NUCLEAR SOCIETY,
La Grange Park, IL, March 23, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space & Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
Ranking Member, Committee on Science, Space & Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MEMBER JOHNSON: I write on behalf of the 11,000 members of the American Nuclear Society to express our support for H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015.

We appreciate your efforts to harness the intellectual assets of our national laboratories through broader technology commercialization and public-private partnership initiatives. We are especially grateful for Section 104 which directs the Department of Energy to assess its ability to ''incubate'' privately-funded advanced research and test reactor prototypes at national laboratories.

ANS strongly supports expanded federal engagement in advanced, non-light water nuclear research and development. It is becoming increasingly clear that the U.S. and the world will need to significantly expand its nuclear generating capacity in the coming decades to address growing energy demands while reducing harmful emissions.

Historically, the U.S. led the world in developing new reactor technology. However, several other nations, including Russia and China, have moved aggressively to develop so-called Generation IV reactors which offer distinct advantages over their light water counterparts. As such, the U.S. must recommit itself to improving its advanced reactor technology portfolio in order to maintain its influence over global nuclear safety and nonproliferation norms. This legislation, if enacted, would provide needed support toward that objective.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL BRADY RAAP,
President, American Nuclear Society.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman, Mr. SMITH, as well as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for helping bring this legislation to the floor again this Congress.

H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act, ensures that the Department of Energy has the tools it needs to allow new startups, small businesses, universities, and the general public at large to do what they do best: react to market signals and innovate.

The Federal Government and the national labs play a vital role doing the basic research needed to maintain America's position as a safe and innovative nation. Their ability to build large research tools at our user facilities is the crown jewel in our Nation's research capabilities. This is the model other nations, like China, are copying.

Far too often, however, the discoveries made in our labs get stuck in the labs. This is due to a number of reasons, and this bill seeks to break down some of the barriers that make this happen.

Many of these problems are also outlined in chapter three of the ''Interim Report of the Commission to Review the Effectiveness of the National Energy Laboratories.''

I quote from the report: ''Over 50 prior studies and reports published over the past 40 years detail shortcomings in the relationship between the DOE and its laboratories.''

It continues:

They present a strikingly consistent pattern of criticism and recommendations for improvement.

The committee and I have reviewed many of these prior reports, and this bill attempts to act on a few of these consistent, noncontroversial recommendations.

By extending the pilot for ACT agreements within DOE, the labs are given the ability to negotiate more flexible contracts with non-Federal entities that would like to take the labs' research and turn it into viable products.

Section 201 in the bill also allows researchers using Federal funds to enter into these agreements, so long as any Federal funds are used exclusively for their intended research purposes.

Section 203 of the bill will continue to chip away at what many call the valley of death, what many startups never make it through because they cannot prove their concept.

This section would allow DOE to use their tech transfer funds for early-stage, precommercial proof of concept demonstrations so the private sector can finally pick up technologies and develop them with private funds. This legislation would also grant to the directors of national labs the signature authority for many agreements with non-Federal entities.

These are decisions that the Secretary of Energy must make under current law, meaning decisions a lab director can make over a phone call in the course of a day must weave their way through the agency's bureaucracy before it lands on the Secretary's desk.

This bill also seeks to improve the Department's relationship with small businesses that can take part in the SBIR–STTR program, and it encourages the Secretary to enter into agreement with the I–Corps program at NSF.

While I do understand that DOE has begun a similar pilot, called Lab Corps, I am worried that this pilot housed in EERE is so narrow in focus that it will

not be applicable for most of our labs' advancement. An accelerator technology being developed for medical treatments, for instance, would not be able to access the current pilot.

Section 103 of this legislation will also require DOE to undertake an honest assessment of its capabilities to authorize, host, and oversee prototype reactors at DOE sites. This is a critical issue for the United States' position as a nuclear technology leader. The United States has not hosted a new research reactor in decades, and there are not any current applications under review at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Unfortunately, the U.S. has become so risk averse that we have regulated ourselves out of business for building the concept reactors that might some day lead to commercially deployable, safer, and more efficient nuclear technologies. We are driving companies overseas. I look forward to seeing the results of this report from DOE.

Our national labs have been at the cutting edge of technological development, and we must always ensure that it is in the national interest. This bill helps to ensure that is the case because a discovery lost in the labs is a discovery wasted.

That is why I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015.

I would like to thank Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working together to produce a strong bipartisan bill. I would like to thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for getting this bill through committee and to the floor here tonight.

DOE's national labs are responsible for some of the greatest research being conducted in the world, both basic and applied. Some of this research has great potential to become new commercial technologies if our labs provide the type of support that increases the likelihood of technology transfer.

This could have enormous beneficial impacts for our Nation, not just in new technologies, but by making the most of our investments at these labs. That is why improving technology transfer from American research facilities, both national labs and universities, has been one of my top priorities on the Science Committee for the past decade.

H.R. 1158 ensures that our national labs have the resources needed to facilitate the transfer of new technologies to the private sector. It greatly increases the breadth of companies that are eligible to engage in a new pilot program that provides for more flexible partnerships, similar to those in the private sector, and lengthens the program for 2 years. This was an important issue that came up at a hearing 2 years ago, and I am happy that we are getting that done in this bill.

This bill also empowers labs to utilize technology transfer funds on projects that demonstrate commercial applications for their research and technologies, and it asks the Department of Energy for a report on activities related to the congressionally mandated technology commercialization fund which the Department is implementing through the newly formed Office of Technology Transitions.

I personally asked Secretary Moniz about past use of this fund, and so I am pleased by the recent actions of DOE in the direction of the TCF at this time. This bill has impacts beyond labs as well. It would significantly decrease financial obstacles that prevent nonprofit research organizations, including many universities, from working with the Department.

The bill includes language that I wrote that would make the National Science Foundation's highly successful Innovation Corps Program, which pairs up grant recipients with motivated entrepreneurs to help get their ideas in the commercial arena, available to the DOE through a partnership with the NSF.

Finally, the bill ensures that effective reporting and accountability systems are in place so we are able to clearly determine the performance of these new tools, as well as any further steps that will need to be taken.

Mr. Speaker, the innovations that have come out of DOE's national laboratories and research programs are second to none. Argonne National Lab, which is located in my district, is one of the best.

All these federally funded institutions and initiatives have been a critical component of our knowledge-based economy, and this bill will ensure that they not only continue, but they improve their incredible track record.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have no other requests for time on this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

□ 1845

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. LIPINSKI for his work on this bill and for yielding me this time.

I rise today to support H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act. I want to thank my friend from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) for sponsoring this bill and working with me and our colleagues on this important piece of legislation.

This legislation provides tools to spur and accelerate the transfer of new technologies developed at our national labs. It extends the Agreements for Commercializing Technology, or ACT, pilot program for 2 more years and also significantly broadens the range of companies able to participate in the program, allowing for more flexible partnership agreements.

The bill will allow labs to use their technology to transfer funds for activities which identify and demonstrate commercial opportunities for their research and technologies.

This legislation also removes burdens which currently prevent many universities and other nonprofit research institutions from working with the Department of Energy. This will encourage further collaboration between university researchers across the country and our wealth of knowledge at the national labs.

Mr. Speaker, I represent Golden, Colorado, and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Quite simply, NREL is the premier energy efficiency and renewable energy lab in the world. For more than 40 years, NREL has led the charge in research and design of renewable energy products directly affecting the way we utilize and secure American energy.

This bill will help provide labs like NREL with important tools so they can best lead our country's research on renewable and sustainable forms of energy and transportation and, ultimately, bring these life-changing innovations to consumers. I have seen the great work being done at NREL, and I know this great work is happening at other national labs all across the country.

Last year, DOE signed an agreement for commercializing technology with the Wells Fargo Foundation to utilize NREL and other DOE national labs to further research in energy-efficient buildings-related technologies, and this bill allows that agreement to be extended for at least 2 more years.

DOE's 17 national laboratories and research programs have been the birthplace to some of our most revolutionary technologies. When this research is harnessed by entrepreneurs and business leaders, startups with one or two employees can grow into companies employing dozens, if not hundreds, of people.

We want to make sure these federally funded institutions and initiatives remain an important foundation of our knowledge-based economy. That is why I am proud to cosponsor this bipartisan legislation with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), giving scientists and researchers in both the public and private sector tools and freedom they need to unlock a new wave of innovation.

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. PERLMUTTER for their leadership on this important issue.

This bill helps foster opportunities for entrepreneurs to more easily access technologies coming out of the Department of Energy and connect the brilliant minds to the equally brilliant

minds in the private sector who can then commercialize this technology.

Federal R&D is responsible for many of the industries and technologies that now drive our national wealth—the most earth-shattering example, the Internet, developed by government scientists at DARPA.

Federal research spawned the biotech and semiconductor industries; gave us tools like the laser, GPS, and MRI; and, through the World Wide Web and the Internet, has entirely changed the way we find a restaurant, talk to our children, and sell cars.

The role of the private sector in developing technology is vital, and government must lead the way in innovation, providing the patient capital necessary to perform research without any known commercial application or concern for profit.

I am reminded of the fascinating idea that mathematicians who develop things in their heads, in their offices, with no application to anything, so often, within weeks, will find that that mathematical new idea applies to real-life situations.

Einstein marveled at the power of pure mathematics, and he said, ''How can it be that mathematics, being after all a product of human thought which is independent of experience, is so admirably appropriate to the objects of reality?''

In 1959, the physicist Eugene Wigner described this problem as ''the unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics.''

H.R. 1158 helps bring these pieces together, mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and technology; and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Thank you, Chairman SMITH, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before I wrap up on the bill we are debating right now, I just wanted to thank Chairman SMITH for his work on this, along with Ranking Member JOHNSON. Working together, we were able to get these bills done here on the floor tonight.

I know that tomorrow we will have a little bit more of a contentious debate on a bill coming out of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee; but I just wanted to, again, commend the chairman and Ranking Member JOHNSON for our work together on these bills.

We know there are important things that we can get done and we need to get done and will be very helpful to our Nation, and I am glad that we were able to do those things on these bills that we have brought forward here tonight, a good bipartisan mix of bills showing bipartisan cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by asking my colleagues to support H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act.

I want to thank Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. PERLMUTTER for their work on this bill. I think there are many things that we can't even see right now that will come out of this, but I am certain that our national labs and the great value that they are to our Nation will continue, and this will allow them to continue to not only do their research, but to do an even better job of producing new technologies that will be a great benefit to all of us.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1158, the Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015, enables the Department of Energy (DOE) to better form partnerships with non-federal entities and transfer research to the private sector.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois, Rep. RANDY HULTGREN, for his initiative on this issue, and the gentleman from Colorado, Rep. ED PERLMUTTER, for it cosponsoring this important legislation.

The Department of Energy is the largest federal supporter of basic research and development and sponsors 47 percent of federal basic research in the physical sciences.

The Department's science and energy research is conducted at over 300 sites nationwide. More than 31,000 researchers take advantage of DOE user facilities each year.

This includes the Department's 17 National Labs, which provide the foundation for the Department of Energy's research and development infrastructure.

These labs keep America at the forefront of global technological capabilities. They ensure that we continue to conduct critical research in high energy physics, advanced scientific computing, biological and environmental research, nuclear physics, fusion energy sciences, basic energy sciences, and applied energy research and development in fossil, nuclear and renewable energy.

The innovative early stage research performed at the labs can have great value for the private sector, but often goes unnoticed.

Because of a communication gap between the labs and the private sector, ideas and technology are often slow to reach the market. And federal government red tape discourages the private sector from using the unique state-of-the-art facilities the national labs offer.

This bill grants lab directors signature authority for agreements with private sector entities valued at less than $1 million. And it extends a pilot program that allows for more flexible contract terms between companies and lab operators.

This bill also requires DOE to assess its capability to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded fusion research and next generation fission reactor prototypes.

Due to regulatory uncertainty from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the private sector currently has little incentive or ability to build reactor prototypes.

This legislation represents a bipartisan, bicameral agreement to modernize and increase the productivity of the DOE national lab system.

I again thank Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. PERLMUTTER for their initiative on this issue and encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1158, 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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2262, SPURRING PRIVATE AEROSPACE COMPETITIVENESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 880, AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 22, 2015, THROUGH MAY 29, 2015

Mr. STIVERS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–127) on the resolution (H. Res. 273) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2262) to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 880) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 22, 2015, through May 29, 2015, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1335, STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. STIVERS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–128) on the resolution (H. Res. 274) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

VIRGINIA TASK FORCE 1

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

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to thank the brave men and

women of Virginia Task Force 1, a domestic and international disaster response resource sponsored by the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department.

I was honored to welcome these miracle workers home this past Saturday morning after their 3-week deployment to Nepal.

Virginia Task Force 1, in partnership with USAID, is always at the ready to answer the call when tragedy or natural disaster strikes, either at home or abroad. Nepal was devastated by two major earthquakes, resulting in the loss of over 8,500 lives, and Virginia Task Force 1 was there to help.

With their incredible skill and teamwork, they were able to rescue a 15-year-old boy trapped in the rubble for 5 days. When the second earthquake hit, they saved a 41-year-old woman who was trapped in a four-story building. They also medically treated countless others.

When they returned home on Saturday morning, they were enthusiastically greeted by their relatives and families. Those families also endure countless hours of worry while their family members and loved ones are halfway around the world in unfamiliar and dangerous circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of Virginia Task Force 1 are truly fabulous and wonderful ambassadors for the Commonwealth of Virginia and our country, and it is an honor and a privilege to thank them for their courageous service to the people of Nepal and to the work they do every day in our country.

MANDATED FIXED WHEELCHAIR LIFTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to do a budget presentation in a couple of moments, but I wanted to actually come up here and, with my good friend from South Carolina, MICK MULVANEY, talk about a little article that popped up in The Economist last week, and there is the issue.

This place has fairly short memories, but about 2 years ago, there were a handful of us coming here and talking about sort of an esoteric issue, something called—what is it—wheelchair lifts.

For those of us who represent resort areas, I am blessed to represent the community of Scottsdale, a wonderful area. I had one of my resort owners call me, and in a fairly gruff voice, saying: ''David, do you know what the Justice Department is doing to me? I have seven pools and Jacuzzis, and apparently, I have to put permanent fixed wheelchair lifts at every pool and Jacuzzi.''

He said: ''I want to be sensitive and caring to my mobility-challenged guests.''

He went on to tell me the story that for 10 years, he had had a portable wheelchair lift, and it had never been requested. Here we are, 2 years later. He has torn up his landscaping; he has put in the units. Guess what is now happening?

He has called me and told me that now his insurance rates are starting to really bounce up because of unattractive nuisance. The very things MICK MULVANEY predicted, I like to say I predicted 2 years ago, are coming true.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY). Tell us the other side of the story of what is going on.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. SCHWEIKERT, thank you for the opportunity to talk about this a little bit without the pressures of the 2-minute timer or a 3-minute timer, actually talk about something in detail for a change in this House because it merits the discussion.

My experience with it, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, was exactly the same as yours—they are not exactly the same. I am not from the resort part of South Carolina. Mr. SANFORD and Mr. RICE get that. I am from the more rural inland part of the State; but we have got a lot of freeways and a lot of small businesses operating hotels, a lot of them owned by Asian Americans.

I was approached by a group of Indian American hotel owners last year. These are folks, mom-and-pop operations, that might own one hotel, they might own two. They told me the same story you just told about these pool lifts having to go in.

A lot of them, like your friends with the resorts, had the portable lifts, so if anybody ever asked for help getting into and out of a pool by themselves, they had the ability to do that. Of course, similar to your story, none of them had ever been asked.

The Department of Justice came in and said: You know what, we are going to require you, under the terms of the Americans with Disabilities Act, to put these fixed pool lifts in every single body of water that you have; so if you have a regular size pool, a kiddie pool, and a hot tub, that is three of these fixed lifts.

It was a tremendous burden on these small businesses who, as you mentioned, wanted to help folks who needed help in getting in and out of the pool, but just wanted to do it with a portable machine, as opposed to a standard machine.

□ 1900

They came in, and they said: Look, Mr. MULVANEY, we have seen this act before. This is how we got rid of diving boards. This is why we don't have any diving boards.

Years ago, people said they were an attractive nuisance. Kids were jumping off of them and hurting themselves, so now that entire generation of Americans has grown up without diving boards.

What is going to happen now is that the next generation of Americans is going to grow up without swimming pools at hotels for the exact reason that you have just mentioned.

We spent 40 years getting rid of these things that children could climb up on and jump off of into the pool, and now the Department of Justice has required these hotel owners to come in and put the exact same thing back in.

It is no longer a diving board. Now it is a mechanical chair. But to an 8-year-old, it looks like something to climb up and jump off of. So they were lamenting the fact not only that their business is going to be hurt but that part of the enjoyment of coming to the hotel would be gone and not available to their customers, and that eventually, you would see them start filling in their swimming pools. Unfortunately, I think that is the way that we are moving.

But they also talked about something—and this is to the point of the article that you just mentioned, The Economist from April 25, which is that there was a private right of action in the regulations that came forward. And what this means, to folks who aren't familiar with what that means, is that anybody can sue. In fact, in the United States of America, when anybody can sue, typically, anybody does sue.

The article goes into great length about one very, very energetic plaintiff who filed 529 lawsuits against small-business owners at hotels throughout the southeast. In fact, in one particular period of time, they hit 50 hotels in a row shortly after the regulation became effective so that they could file their lawsuit against the hotel owners.

I will read one of my favorite passages in the article, which is something that should be enlightening for all of us: ''There is evidence that lawyers explicitly target small businesses, which are more likely to pay up without a fight.''

There we go. That is what we have done in the name of helping people whom folks were already trying to help. But in the name of having the government tell small business and large business how to help people, what do we end up with? Essentially a jobs bill for the plaintiff's bar.

Before we started today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and I were talking about why we were going to take a few minutes to talk about this.

As my friend from Massachusetts, Barney Frank, said before he left: ''Everybody always says, 'I hate to say I told you so,' but the truth of the matter is, people love saying, 'I told you so.'''

This is exactly what we said would happen. And why the Department of Justice saw fit to single out small business hoteliers who were already trying to help people and say, You know what, we know better than you how to help people. You think these portable units are good? Well, we think the fixed units are better. And trust us because we are from the government, and we are here to help you.

What do we end up with as a result of the government trying to fix the problem? We end up with small businesses making less money. And I know not a lot of people are sympathetic to that. I certainly am. I used to be a small-business person. And believe me, the people who worked for me liked it when I made money. So did I. But I recognize the fact that a lot of people are not sympathetic to small business. But small business makes less money.

Kids are going to have less access to swimming pools as they travel the country. Think about that for a second. How absurd is that, that we are going to end up filling in swimming pools in order to prevent lawsuits.

And then lastly, and the worst is, you will end up with a situation where all we have done is empower a small group of overzealous trial lawyers and their plaintiffs.

It is a sad story but one that we hear again and again in America. And I only hope that the next time the government comes up with an idea like this on how to fix things, they will look to what is happening now to the small-business hotel owners as an example of government gone wrong.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I remember you and I having this conversation on the floor and particularly Members from the left coming to the microphone and basically scolding me on how insensitive I was.

Now I realize that my father may have been right about something. He said: ''It is almost always about the money.''

When you look at The Economist article, you start to realize that this was a jobs act for the Democrat supporters and the trial bar because they are running up and down our communities, suing small businesses.

And I believe you are absolutely correct: our future will be hotels and resorts without pools at all.

Once again, the folks in the opposition questioned our sensitivity, our love for our brothers and sisters. And we were trying to say, This is the economic argument, and here is the litigious argument. And we lost.

The administration basically gave into the trial bar, and now we do have the ''I told you so.''

Mr. MULVANEY. I would suggest to you, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, that you were, in fact, being insensitive: you were being insensitive to the trial bar.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Darn it. I knew I was doing something wrong.

Mr. MULVANEY. Listen, I had the same experience as you did, Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I was in the Longworth House Office Building a couple years back. You and I wrote a bill together to try to either delay or prevent the DOJ from putting this regulation into effect, and we had people literally protesting outside of our office, folks from the disability community who wanted this particular accommodation. And I am completely sympathetic to that.

What I think they failed to see at the time and failed to grasp was, number one, they were already being accommodated. My guess is that 99.9 percent of the people who came to protest had never asked to use one of these portable lifts at hoteliers, so they were not aware of the fact that they were there but, at the same time, they never gave any thought to the unintended consequences of this particular piece of regulation that the DOJ promulgated. And I think that, again, is a lesson to be learned.

A government that is big enough to give you everything that you want is big enough to take from you everything that you have. And this, in a very small way, is what we saw in the promulgation of this particular regulation.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. The closing thought on this colloquy:

We are already seeing the insurance world starting to charge higher and higher and higher fees for apartments, hotels, resorts that have these lifts, these permanent platforms. It is because they are already modeling the risk that someone—hopefully not with alcohol involved—but someone is going to crawl up on top of one and jump in. The same litigation profile that removed diving boards 20, 30 years ago, the other side basically has driven us to. And they are going to be our brothers and sisters out there. There are going to be some that are going to be hurt, maybe hurt severely, and ultimately, what is our future? The removal of the swimming pools.

We have got to thank the folks on the left that weren't willing to discuss rational economics and the DOJ, once again, for making a bunch of money for their trial bar friends.

Mr. MULVANEY. We will get equality, Mr. SCHWEIKERT. We will have equal access to the swimming pools under this regulation because no one will have the access. That will be the ultimate result here.

In an effort to make it accessible to everybody, we will end up making it accessible to no one, and in the final analysis, that is a sad state of equality that I don't think anybody should applaud.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. This is not a petty little issue. This is just a simple example that we talk about here almost every day of the runaway arrogance of Washington believing they are going to run our businesses, run our lives, and sort of the obvious outcomes that turn out to be fairly disastrous.

So, Mr. MULVANEY, I appreciate you coming down and giving us some of your time.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. SCHWEIKERT, thank you for the opportunity.

THE BUDGET

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to set up here in a second. I am going to actually walk through something we have been working on in our office now for the last month, and that is, what is really going on in budget numbers.

We did a budget town hall about 2 weeks ago in Scottsdale. And I always like to start it with a simple question that says, How many of you are tired of seeing us in Congress fight with each other? And the hands always go up, and they say, Yes, you have to stop fighting with each other.

And I always try to make the point: it is about the money. You need to understand how bad the underlying financial data is and what is really going on in the scale of debt and deficits and just the sheer scale of spending but also where that spending is going because we have so many of my brothers and sisters here, we go out and campaign and say things like: We are going to take care of waste and fraud. We are going to take care of this and foreign aid. We are going to do this and that. And they are not providing an honest picture of where the money is and where it actually goes.

So we are going to do about 10 of these boards. I know it is going to get technical.

When you run for Congress, one of the first things that happens, if you are a numbers guy, the pollster and the consultants sit you down and say, You can't use big numbers. People won't understand them.

In this presentation, I am going to treat everyone like adults—these aren't Republican numbers; they are not even Democrat numbers, though the majority of these slides actually do come from the White House—to understand what is actually underlying in the data and how quickly it is eroding.

Two points of reference: For decades, we used to talk about how we were going to hit this inflection point when baby boomers began moving into retirement and what was going to happen to the debt curve and what was going to happen to the curve of consumption of the entitlements.

Guess what. We are now well into that inflection point. It has begun, and Congress has done very, very, very little in regards to mandatory spending. You are going to see on these boards that that is actually what may take us down as a Republic.

So this is 2010. Let's just do this as a reference. And remember, 2010 was a year when there was still lots of stimulus money, lots of other spending out there.

You see the blue. The blue is what we refer to as mandatory spending. It is primarily Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, some transfer programs, interest, veterans, and the new health care law.

Okay. In 2010, about 63 percent of our spending was in that blue area; 37 percent was what we call discretionary. That is what we get to vote on here because what is in the blue is in formulas.

I have been here a little over 4 years. I have really had absolutely no influence on that blue area. It is a formula. You hit a certain age, you get a certain benefit.

But I want you to watch what is happening in that entitlement, in that

mandatory spending. And, yes, this is the very discussion that gets people unelected because people get very upset, but we have to have an adult conversation of what is really going on here.

So we are going to do a couple of these slides just to sort of create a reference.

Here is where we are this year. And you remember, on that slide, I think the blue area was about 63 percent of our total spending. This year, it is 69 percent of our total spending. And obviously then the discretionary, what we get to vote on as Members, has now gone down to 31 percent.

Do you notice the movement? And that is just in the last 5 years.

So where are we going? Well, right now, to give you a different way of looking at this, this is our 2015 modeling from the White House. This green area is our revenues. That is the total revenues coming into your Federal Government. That purple area is our debt. That is what we are going to borrow this year to make up for our shortfalls, though you will be happy to know that, as of about 48 hours ago, the administration changed the debt number from $576 billion for the 2015 fiscal year to—now it is going to be $582.5 billion. This continues to erode.

We are going to talk about that at the end here, what is actually going on in GDP, on economic growth in this country. And if we do not develop a growth-oriented agenda, we can't meet our obligations. We cannot keep those promises we have made.

And with that, I stand here in shock of how often we engage in these debates, and it is not a growth-oriented focus.

So one thing on this slide I really want you to get: blue over here is mandatory spending. The red is discretionary, with defense. Defense is considered discretionary. We have to borrow either every dime of defense or every dime of everything else, other than defense and mandatory or discretionary—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the debt, veterans benefits, and the new health care law.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, we have to borrow either every dime of defense or every dime of discretionary other than defense, and that is in this year's budget. That is how quickly this is moving away from us.

So what happens if we look way off into the future, like 4 years from now? 2020 is only 4 years from now. When I first got elected in 2011, I did a presentation here. The numbers I am going to show you that happen in 4 years were not supposed to happen until 9 years from now. This is to give you an idea of how quickly the numbers are eroding. Yet I hear almost no one talking about it.

So we are going to be working on that budget in 4 years. Do you remember that 2010 slide? Sixty-three percent of our spending went to Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and the new healthcare law. Well, it is going to be 76 percent—76—three-quarters of all of our spending. We are only going to be voting on 24 percent of the budget, and half of that will be defense.

I don't know if anyone knows, because these numbers are small and it is hard to watch, what we will be spending in 2020 on discretionary. So defense and all the litany of programs you think of are basically going to be almost identical to what we were spending 10 years earlier. I will hold that up as one of the successes of the Republican House. We have been very disciplined on spending on what we had the ability to influence, which was the discretionary budget, but the formulaic portion of our budget, entitlements, continues to explode. It is almost as if Washington, D.C., did not know that there was a baby boom, did not know people were going to be turning 65, did not know that 76 million of our brothers and sisters were born in about an 18-year period of time, and now we are into the third year of baby boomers beginning to retire, and that inflection has begun.

So just as a reference, because I often get asked for this slide—and we are putting these slides up on our Web site—there is the spending pie chart for this year. You will see the blue area is all the way to here: Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, the transfer programs also including the new healthcare law, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits.

Two weeks ago when we were doing a budget presentation in my hometown of Scottsdale-Phoenix, I had one woman who was absolutely positive, if we would cut foreign aid, we would be just fine here. It is important to understand. Do you see this little red area here? Foreign aid would be ultimately nothing but a small sliver within that. Yes, it is something, but in many ways, it is theater.

If you have a politician standing in front of you and they are not talking about the mandatory spending and the speed of its growth, you are not having an honest budget discussion. It is hard because in many places around the country, when you stand behind a microphone and hold up these boards and start to say that we need to have an honest conversation about the math underlying Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and what is going to happen on interest on the debt, the new healthcare law and its cost projections blowing through the ceiling, and veterans' benefits, often those Members who have tried to have that conversation get unelected.

But if you have someone walk in to our door here and say, ''David, we so desperately need new spending on this,'' we often pull out our charts and say, ''You are absolutely right. This would be wonderful. Do you have a solution to help me refine and deal with and manage the explosion of the cost in Medicare?'' And they just stare at you like we are not allowed to talk about that. But that is what is going on here.

So let's do another slide to just sort of see how the numbers really are exploding. If I came to you and said, hey, in 4 years, that 3.8—and it is actually a $3.75 billion budget we are going to have this year. So 3.756 trillion—sorry, not billion, trillion. So we are going to spend $3.8 trillion this year. In 4 years, we are going to be spending an additional $1 trillion on top of that, an additional trillion, and every dime of that is going into mandatory spending. It is not going into health research; it is not going into new parts; it is not going into building a new aircraft carrier; and it is not going into all these programs that we all talk about because it is easy politics. Every dime of that additional trillion dollars in 4 years from now will be in Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and the new healthcare law.

How many times have you heard that? This is right in front of us. This is what is going on. Your government is growing at an exponential pace, but it is not in the area where we, as Members of Congress, get to vote because it is in the formula areas, the mandatory spending.

Are you starting to see a theme in this discussion and on the slides? I am trying to build an understanding out there with both my brothers and sisters here in Congress and the public out there that if we are not willing to have honest conversations, particularly with this coming Presidential election, about entitlements, mandatory spending, and ways we can manage them—and it is not cuts, but there are much better ways we can deliver these.

You put all the programs, all the promises we have made at risk because just pretending everything is going to be fine means you are basically dooming them to a really ugly future, or the country to an ugly future. So, Mr. Speaker, this gives you an interesting projection.

Now, if we go beyond that 2020 slide, if we go 9 years out—9 years out—we will be running over trillion-dollar deficits, and that is using the current GDP projections for the future, which we are going to talk about that model on the very end slide. There is something horribly wrong in how we are modeling our future income growth into this country.

The math is real. I know it is uncomfortable and it is almost sacrilegious to many of the political people here, saying: Well, we are not allowed to talk about that. David, why are you such a downer? Don't you want to get reelected? Why aren't you doing happy talk?

I am optimistic about the country. I am optimistic about some things happening out there in the economy despite government. But you have to understand, in 9 years, interest will be $1 trillion. And think about this: it is almost going to be approaching all discretionary. At that time, in 9 years, we will be about $1.4 trillion in interest. Our best interest projection is over $1 trillion.

The chart, when you go a couple years out, we will be spending more money on interest than all of defense, all of discretionary, all of education, all of parts, all of health research, everything else. That is what we are doing. We are creating this trap where, as we build more and more debt and build more and more debt and build more and more debt, that becomes our Achilles heal. That becomes our fragility in this country.

So once again, remember that earlier slide where I went over there and marked that now this year's deficit projection is $582.5 billion, and that is coming from the White House as of about 2 days ago.

We had someone in our office earlier today. We were trying to do some modeling. If GDP continues to do what we think is happening right now, we could be having a discussion this coming October that the 2015 shortfall was almost $600 billion. You do realize that is approaching double what the optimistic projections were last year for 2015.

There is something horribly wrong out there. It is a combination of lack of economic growth and, let's be honest, the mandatory spending, the entitlements, are growing faster than the underlying models we have built.

So this is an interesting slide just to give you the point of talking about inflection. It is a fancy word that a lot of the statisticians like to use, and we politicians will use it. But there it, and it has begun. We are well into it.

Do you see where those blue lines start to explode? But do you notice something interesting? The red lines, from about here over basically stay substantially flat. That is the discretionary spending. That is what we get to vote on. That is your defense. That is everything else other than the mandatory spending.

But what is exploding through the ceiling? It looks like Washington, D.C., failed to understand the demographic issues that were heading towards this country and systematically avoided them, because I am sure it had nothing to do with my brothers and sisters often caring more about their next election than having to go through the painful process of educating our voters to understand this is your greatest threat, I believe, to our Republic.

One more slide to put this in perspective. The blue line is interest. The red line is all—all—of defense spending. Do you notice something, that in about 7 years, 6½ years, we are now spending more money in interest than all of defense? All of defense. It is 6 years away. Actually, in reality, my math is closer to 5½, but we will use the 6 years.

Think about that. We will be spending more money in interest on U.S. sovereign debt than we are spending on all defense of the Nation. It is absurd. And this is what we are about to hand to our kids. As a matter of fact, this is no longer about our kids. This is about us now. The numbers have eroded so fast, it is here. And the happy talk that we were doing just 1 year ago, particularly coming from the administration, has not turned out to be true.

So one of the things that is going on out there, can you regulate yourself to prosperity? Can you tax yourself to prosperity? Can you, in an arrogant fashion, have a bureaucracy that is so inept, its ability to even when we do bipartisan, pro-growth pieces of legislation like the JOBS Act—we all got together here 3 years ago and did the JOBS Act. You do realize there are still substantial portions of that piece of legislation that are still sitting at the SEC that still don't have their rules because of the underlying politics behind them? They are 3 years beyond their due date, but we still don't have them.

There is something horribly wrong in this government if we don't have an honest discussion and actually then do something about our Tax Code, our regulatory code, access to opportunity, and then the difficult one, the design within our entitlement state, which is something the Republicans for the last 4 years, 5 years, have been putting into our budget.

Do you all remember the television commercial of the PAUL RYAN lookalike throwing grandma over the cliff? Great politics, horrible math, because the Republicans, PAUL RYAN and the rest of us, stood up and said that we are willing to actually propose a model that saves Medicare and deals with this curve that consumes everything in our path. It is really bad politics; it is honest math. And we get the crap kicked out of us for telling the truth.

So now we get to look at a slide like this. We were projecting 3.1 percent GDP for this year. As of a few hours ago, the Atlanta Fed, which actually does this really interesting modeling of collecting current statistics and constantly adjusting their GDP projections, now has us not at 3.1 percent GDP for this year—and remember, every point of GDP is—it matters what velocity model you use—about $80 billion to $100 billion of revenue. So you start to realize that a couple of points of GDP is a big deal. The Atlanta Fed's GDP calculation on their Web site now is 0.7 percent GDP coming in in this quarter, and the indicators look like we are going to get additional downward revisions on the first quarter.

Mr. Speaker, we are in trouble. Yes, the politicians will get up here and blame each other and blame each other, but it doesn't make the math go away.

□ 1930

The other thing is also—and this is one of my pet peeves here—we systematically do not tell the truth, and this is a Republican and Democrat problem. Some of it is because we use really bad modeling data, really bad underlying statistics; we underestimate the swings during boom times and slowdowns. We systematically have blown our GDP calculation; but understand, that GDP calculation has a lot to do with what we model as our spending, has a lot to do with what ends up happening on our debt.

If you look at this chart, the red is what real GDP turned out to be; the blue was our projection, and systematically, we are dramatically under the projection. It looks like this year we are crashing and burning. I am desperately hoping the third quarter and the fourth quarter get really healthy, but there is something horribly wrong out there.

Is this administration, are my brothers and sisters on the left, finally willing to have that conversation about the Tax Code, about our regulatory state, those very things that—let's face it—are stymying future growth and our ability to save this country?

One last slide just to sort of provide an opportunity—for those of you who have an interest in watching some of these numbers, and there are those out there who are also sort of numbers geeks, this is that GDPNow. Yes, it is often a pessimistic calculator; except for the small problem is, the last couple of years, it has actually been the accurate calculator of actual GDP growth. This is right off the GDPNow Web site from the Atlanta Fed, showing it looks like, now, we are all the way down to a .7 percent GDP growth in the second quarter.

A little bit else on this and then I will stop this thing I am doing, which may be bordering on a tirade. If you are particularly geeky, last week, you would have seen the Journal of Economic Perspectives did an entire report on Social Security calculations.

There is a handful of folks here with all sorts of letters behind their names, mostly Ph.D., talking about Social Security is actually in worse shape than we tell people, that they are close to $1 trillion additional underfunded in the latest projections, and that some of the modeling are simple things like we are actually using really bad life expectancy tables.

Now, I have incredible respect for the actuaries over at Medicare and Social Security; I think they deal with some amazing data sets, but some of the Nation's finest economists and Ph.D. economists are starting to write public articles, saying: We are in real trouble here.

Remember, last year, when the Mercatus did their detailed projection on unfunded liabilities and debt for the United States, they came in with a number that scared me half to death. They actually came in with a number

of $205 trillion, as if you did GAAP standard accounting, not government accounting, standard accounting for the debt of this Nation and our unfunded liabilities.

Go on the Internet right now, and look up what is the wealth of the world. Some of the best models say the wealth of the world is about $180 trillion. We have universities out there modeling that U.S. sovereign debt and unfunded liabilities are over $200 trillion. Our unfunded liabilities are greater than the wealth of the world.

We are better than this. This is the greatest issue in front of us, and we spend so little time actually having an honest discussion about the math.

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

CAMPAIGN SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIQUIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk a little bit about spending today, like my friend and colleague from Arizona, but I am going to talk about spending of a different kind. I am going to talk about campaign spending.

Campaign spending is quite an issue, and I want to spend about an hour or less talking about its effect, and I want to talk about some of the solutions that we have out there that might make a big difference.

First, I want to say I truly believe in my heart of hearts that the United States of America is the greatest country in the world, probably the greatest country that the world has ever seen and may see in the future. You can just see that by some of the markers.

The notions of freedom that this country has had in the past have inspired nations; they have inspired individuals around the world. Our economic strength is unrivaled. Our cultural influence reaches every corner of the world. Our military power is absolutely unrivaled.

However, again, I truly believe that we can do better, and I will tell you some of the big challenges that we are facing right now, that if we take on these challenges, we will even be a greater Nation.

First of all, we need massive investments in our Nation's infrastructure, our highways, our bridges, our ports, our airports. We need it in our broadband. We just need a massive amount of investment in our Nation's infrastructure.

Our Nation's education is falling behind. Yes, we have some of the greatest schools, some of the greatest universities in the entire world, some of our public schools, some of our charter schools and private schools unrivaled; but there are a lot of schools that are struggling and producing students that really can't compete in today's world.

We need to do immigration reform. We have 12, 15 million people in this country that are undocumented that live in the shadows that may or may not pay taxes that contribute to our economy but are always afraid of being deported.

We have climate change. Climate change is here; it is progressing; it is going to get worse. We need to do something about it as soon as possible.

We have a vanishing middle class. There is a huge disparity in incomes between the richest and the poorest in this country, and it is increasing. Our middle class is vanishing. They are feeling more and more insecure. They are unable to send their kids to college. We have a huge challenge in that regard.

We have a need to establish background checks for purchase of weapons and to close the gun show loopholes.

We need to create a sustainable economy.

These are huge challenges that we need to attend from the Congress, from this body, from the House of Representatives, from the United States Senate, from the State legislatures, from local governments; but we are unable to attack these problems, in a large part, because of the way campaigns are financed.

Now, we see a growing perversion of Presidential campaigns. We have super-PACs. We have dark donors, and they are having meetings with Presidential candidates, which are allowed by the laws because the candidates are not official candidates.

No one knows what is legal and enforceable right now in Presidential candidate financing; and worse than that, foreign money is probably coming into all of these campaigns now.

I just want to say elections up and down the ballot are being more and more perverted each election. All Americans should be concerned.

While I was waiting to speak this evening, I just read an article in the National Journal Daily today that stated: ''According to data gathered in 21 states by the National Institute on Money in State Politics, $175 million was spent by them in 2006''—that is local politics; that is city council and school boards—''a number that ballooned to $245 million four years later.''

That is a delta of $70 million increases in local campaign financing in just 4 years, and that is a fraction of the total expected to be spent in future local races.

Before I go further, what I would like to do is take a break and yield to my friend and colleague from North Carolina (Mr. JONES). He wants to say a few words.

Mr. JONES. Mr. MCNERNEY, thank you very much, and I want to thank you for taking the lead tonight to be on the floor. I know you have other Members of Congress to join you in your hour, but I have been here for 20 years, and I must tell you that, since I have been here, I have never seen as much influence by the special interests as I do now, and that is because of money.

Actually, both parties—and that is why you are a Democrat, I am a Republican—but both parties seem to succumb to the influence of money to get bills to the floor.

I am a strong supporter of JOHN SARBANES, who is from Maryland. You have your bill that I have joined today, by the way, to sign my name to your resolution, and I am on JOHN SARBANES' bill, which is H.R. 20. The title is the Government By the People Act.

I will touch on four quick points. One is building a government of, by, and for the people. The second part of the bill says empower the Americans to participate. The third part is amplify the voice of the people and then fight back against Big Money special interests.

In my few minutes, Mr. MCNERNEY, what I would like to talk about is the influence of money. I am a Republican and proud to be one; you are a Democrat and proud to be one, but I will tell you that I have seen so many bills this year get to the floor of the House because, in my opinion, it is because of the influence of special interests.

You and I recently had a bill on the floor that basically said that we would change the law that would allow the mobile home companies that sell mobile homes—many people in my district, 45,000 people own mobile homes, and there will be others buying mobile homes—but they will change the contract to say that it would go from 8 to 12 percent.

Well, who did it benefit? It was Warren Buffett. I don't deny Warren Buffett his success. He is a very successful man, and I am happy for him. What this bill did was to say to the average person that maybe in California or North Carolina that needs to buy a mobile home, because that is the best they can do: we are going to let you pay more in interest.

I was the only Republican to vote ''no'' on that bill. I said this back in my district, and quite frankly, I was pleased that the majority of people agree with me that we should be considerate of those people who cannot afford to buy better than a mobile home; but there, again, that special interest influence, that is what you just said a moment ago.

I am of the firm belief that if we do not change the system—you have an H.J. Res. that you have introduced. I talk about JOHN SARBANES' H.R. 20. That will create an alternative to the system that we have.

You and I both know that Citizens United that said that a corporation is an individual has created a lot of the problems that we face today. I will say that the American people need to get behind what you are trying to do, what Mr. SARBANES is trying to do—and I, in a lesser way—to return the power of the people to the people because, too

many times, decisions here in Washington are made because special interests, whether it be a Democrat or Republican leadership, puts it on the floor.

I believe that the people, as you believe, have a right to let this be the people's House and not the special interests House.

I am delighted to be on the floor with you tonight. I will stay just a few minutes, if you want to call back on me in a couple of minutes. I will be here until a little bit after 8, but I wanted to thank you for getting on the floor tonight to speak about this issue because, if we are going to let the people own the government, then we must give the power back to the people.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Thank you, Mr. JONES.

I just want to point out, again, that this is bipartisan. Mr. JONES is a Republican; I am a Democrat. We both see the corrosive influence of money here in Washington, and we want to do something about it.

A lot of our colleagues agree with us wholeheartedly but are actually afraid to say it. They are afraid to get up here because they know, if they do, they are going to be targeted by this special interest money, by super-PAC money, by dark money.

The sad thing is that you don't know that it is coming. You could be running a good, solid, healthy campaign arguing the issues and, all of a sudden, see a $2 million television ad against you, and they would be going after you for very personal misleading ads, which could destroy you and your family, for no reason other than you don't want to see so much money in campaign spending.

□ 1945

Let me look at some of the specific risks and problems that we see today because of the way campaigns are financed.

First of all, campaign financing makes elected officials less effective in their jobs because of the time you have to spend raising money.

Here in Congress, it is not unusual to see a Member of Congress spend 2, 4, 6 hours a day on the phone, begging people for money. That lessens your effectiveness. You can't spend the time you should be spending on studying legislation, in talking to colleagues, in finding ways to compromise on issues.

The second item is negative campaign ads turn off voters and suppress votes.

Boy, we saw in this last election a turnout of 40 percent, 35 percent, and 30 percent in some districts, and a lot of that has to do with the negativity that people see on TV. They don't know what to believe. They think they are both bums, and they just close their noses and vote for the least worse or they don't vote at all. That is the second.

The effect of campaign financing makes for wasteful government spending.

This is an issue that, I think, folks like my predecessor here tonight was talking about. The Tea Party folks should be interested in this issue because the way campaigns are financed causes wasteful government spending. Boy, I will tell you that I sympathize with the Tea Party objectives. Government seems big. It seems wasteful. It seems loaded. It seems ineffective. There is wasteful spending. There are projects that shouldn't be funded. A lot of that has to do with the way campaigns are financed.

The next one is a big one. This is important. It is kind of what I mentioned before. It is the threat of negative campaign ads causes elected officials to avoid important and controversial issues:

Now, I do not care if you are a Republican or a Democrat. If you are a Republican, you have risk in your primary elections. If you are a Democrat, it is of big money coming in and trying to trash you personally in election campaigns. If you are a Democrat, you have more risk coming in in general elections. So it doesn't matter what party you are in. It doesn't matter whether you are conservative or liberal. The way campaigns are financed is causing our government to be wasteful, and it is causing it to be ineffective. I think that needs to be improved.

There is another problem that I mentioned earlier. Foreign money is coming into these campaigns now. Do you want to see foreigners, do you want to see folks from Russia or from China or from any country besides the United States having an influence on our elections?

The amount of money coming into elections continues to grows election by election. We had $6.2 million in 2010 versus $3 billion in 2012. I think I have gotten a million or a billion mixed up there. Sorry about that. Elected officials respond more to wealthy donors than they do to nonwealthy donors. It is simply a matter of access. Someone gives you money, and they are more likely to have access, and that means that you are more likely to be sympathetic to their legislative goals.

Judicial races are getting more expensive and tainted as well. Do you want to have a judge in a case that you may be bringing to court to have gotten his seat or her seat because of the way the campaign finance trashed his opponent? I do not think so.

In general, people have become very cynical about government because of the negative advertising, and people lose faith in our government. To have the greatest country in the world and the things that this country has accomplished—the innovation, the science, the freedoms that we have established throughout the world—and then have people cynical about our government because of the campaign financing is more than a tragedy. Campaign spending is a zero-sum game. Let me tell you what I mean by that.

Consider that you are in a meeting. You have got a 1 hour, and you have got 12 people, so everyone has 5 minutes to speak. Now, what if somebody takes 10 minutes? Then somebody else is going to lose out. Campaignspeak is like that too because people in this country are only willing to listen to a certain amount of campaign rhetoric, and then after that point, they turn off their minds. They don't want to hear any more. The folks with the biggest money get out there. They fill the airwaves, and they fill your mailboxes, and they have people knock on your doors. Pretty soon, you don't want to hear any more, so the guy with the lesser money is losing freedom of speech. So I think it is a freedom of speech issue. Those are some of the issues I have.

With PACs and Super PACs and dark money—this is an interesting one—campaigns are no longer going to be controlled by the candidates. You could have a situation in which Super PACs and PACs have five times more money than the candidate himself or herself, in which case they are controlling all of the levers in the campaign. So those are some of the issues that, I think, are caused by the excessive spending in our campaigns.

I again yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) to take up the case here.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate listening to you, and it reminds me of a conversation I had on the floor of the House last week.

As you know, I have been here 20 years. I came with Newt Gingrich, and Bill Clinton was the President. We did some good things for the American people, so I am kind of an older man, so to speak. I vote my conscience up here, and it gets me in trouble. I voted twice against the Speaker of the House, and it got me in trouble, but I do what I think is right.

I was sitting on the floor, and this gentleman—I will not say his name or where he is from because I don't have permission to do that. He came up to me and said, ''Walter, I am probably going to—'' He is 20 years younger than I am. I am 72 now. He said, ''I am probably going to be like you,'' and he is a Republican. He said, ''I will probably be like you and will never be a chairman or a ranking member of anything because I cannot do anything that would dampen or threaten my integrity.''

I said, ''What do you mean?''

He said, ''Well, in January, I was told that I could be a subcommittee chairman, but I would have to raise $300,000.''

The point that you are trying to make tonight—and you are doing a good job—with JOHN SARBANES' bill, H.R. 20, which I hope people look up, as well as with your resolution, is that too oftentimes—and I will say in both parties—we have people in leadership who say you have to raise X amount of dollars if you want to be a chairman. What happens to that person in eastern North Carolina, where I am from, who

makes $35,000 or $40,000 a year who can't buy influence in Washington?

That is what you are trying to do tonight, and that is why I wanted to be with you, and I admire you for taking the floor tonight. Where are their spokesmen? We are the people's House, and all of a sudden, everything is about money, winning reelections with money—big money. The average citizens are beginning to be turned off by the fact that they don't have much influence, and that is why what you are doing tonight is very special.

I was thinking about the gentleman who said to me, ''I will be like you, Walter Jones. I will probably never be a chairman or a ranking member because you are trying to keep your integrity in place.'' If we had a system that you are proposing and JOHN SARBANES is proposing that would have a system for those who don't want to be bought and paid for by special interests, they would have an alternative by raising their money in the State and in the district, and they would be rewarded for raising their money in that State. Then their allegiance would be to the State and the district.

Again, I am going to stay a few more minutes, but I want to compliment you on what you are doing tonight.

Mr. MCNERNEY. I thank the gentleman. I don't know of anyone who has more integrity in this institution than you do, so I am honored that you would come down here and talk with me tonight about this important issue.

Now, the American people, as far as I can tell, are clearly in favor of reducing campaign money, campaign spending. I have some Gallup Poll numbers here that were taken by The Huffington Post from November 7 through November 9, 2014, which was during the last election or right after the last election.

The first question:

Would you support or oppose amending the Constitution to give Congress more power to create restrictions on campaign spending?

In favor of that was 53 percent; opposed was 23 percent; and not sure was 22 percent. So it was a very strong majority in favor of a constitutional amendment like I am going to discuss in a little while.

The second question:

Do you think limiting contributions to political campaigns helps to prevent corruption in politics, or does it have no impact on corruption?

The question is will corruption be curtailed by limiting campaign spending. The answer that it helps prevent corruption: 52 percent; no impact on corruption: 28 percent; and not sure: 20 percent. Again, people feel strongly about this issue.

The last question that I will read is:

Which of the following statements do you agree with more: Elections are generally won by the candidate who raises the most money? The answer is 59 percent of Americans believe that; 18 percent don't believe that; and 23 percent are unsure. So I think this is a strong issue that we should be talking about.

How do we move forward?

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court appears to have a strong bias toward more money in politics, and it has consistently issued rulings to that effect. The Supreme Court even sought out, they even asked for, the infamous Citizens United case to be brought forward to them. Then, ultimately, they ruled that corporations have the same rights—free speech—as individual citizens do, as individual people do. The meaning of that decision is that corporations can use their treasuries to finance campaigns.

I can't think of anything more corrosive or destructive to our democracy than that. The system was already bad before the Citizens United decision, but this thing made it much worse. Unfortunately, the Citizens United decision is just one of a series of decisions that allows more and more money into politics, and I truly believe that this is a threat to our cherished democratic and republican institutions.

This trend is not confined to the Supreme Court. Earlier this year, the Republican-controlled Senate, in concurrence with the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, passed legislation that increased the total individuals could contribute to political parties by a factor of 10—going from $35,000 to over $300,000.

What can we do about it?

The good news is that there are really a number of very good ideas that have been proposed, and I think it is important for us to go over some of those ideas. My friend WALTER JONES has mentioned JOHN SARBANES' idea, and I will go into that in a little bit of detail. But there are others, and I think it is important that the American people be aware of some of these proposals out there and what they might offer and to let them decide, let the American people decide.

Do they want to see a legislative approach like JOHN SARBANES' great approach?—I support it—or a constitutional amendment like mine and others that I will bring up as we go forward tonight? These proposals all have merit. They are all worth studying and thinking about, and I would be happy to support any of the ones that I am going to talk about this evening and to consider other ones that may not have been brought forward yet. The proposals, again, fall into two categories—legislative proposals and constitutional amendments.

Legislative proposals are a little bit easier to enact, but they are subject to Supreme Court and lower court overturning. So you can work hard, and you can get it passed and then have the Supreme Court or some other court overturn it. The constitutional amendment has a very high bar. It is very difficult to get a constitutional amendment passed, and it should be. You don't want people just willy-nilly passing an amendment to change the Constitution. It requires a two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives, a two-thirds vote in the Senate, and three-quarters of the State legislatures throughout the country to pass that amendment for it to become part of the Constitution; but once it becomes part of the Constitution, the courts can't touch it. They can interpret it, but they can't overturn it.

There is legislation that I would like to talk about, but some of my colleagues who were going to be here tonight couldn't be because of a change in schedule. I think one of the important approaches, mostly championed by CHRIS VAN HOLLEN from Maryland, is the disclosure and transparency approach, which is that people who donate ought to be disclosed quickly and broadly so that people know where money is coming from. That is a very important idea.

□ 2000

Also, Government By the People, JOHN SARBANES' approach, which I will talk about in a little while; and there is also legislation that would create public finance, and I think that is a very good approach, too.

There are two constitutional amendments, one by DONNA EDWARDS, a colleague of mine from Maryland, that overturns Citizens United, and there is one by TED DEUTCH, a colleague of mine from Florida. TED DEUTCH from Florida would basically allow Congress to enact laws on campaign financing that could not be overturned by the Supreme Court. I think that is a good approach. I support that. In theory, it has got a beauty to it.

Then there is my approach, which basically would eliminate PACs and do other things. I would like to talk in some detail about my resolution now, and we will get the board up to talk about it. This is called H.J. Res. 31, and again, it is a proposed constitutional amendment. As you can see, it has four parts.

The first part, I think, is probably the most important, and it says basically that money that comes in to political election campaigns to support or oppose a candidate for office can only come from individual citizens and only go to the campaign controlled by the candidate or the principal campaign controlled by the candidate or from a system of public election financing.

So what does that mean? That means that when money comes in, it can only come from individual citizens. It can't come from corporations; it can't come from any other sources. It just comes from individual citizens, and it can only go to the campaign controlled by the candidate. That means that it can't go to political action committees, PACs; it can't go to super-PACs; it can't be dark money. The only money that can influence elections directly or indirectly to support or oppose a candidate has to come from individual

citizens. It has to go only to the candidate, to the campaign controlled by the candidate. That is a very strong requirement. It is probably the strongest requirement out there right now, but I think it is important.

By the way, the first requirement applies to elections for individual candidates at all levels of government, from the President on down to the Congress, the Senate, State governments, city governments, and so on.

The second measure is similar to the first. This requirement, money to support or oppose a State ballot initiative to change a State constitution or for other purposes can only come from individuals who are able to vote for the measure or from a system of public election financing. I think that is important because you have ballot initiatives in my home State of California, for example, and you see millions of dollars coming in from out of State. Why would somebody from out of State have an opportunity to influence a State ballot initiative in California? I think it is wrong, and I think that this would take care of that problem.

The third requirement is that Congress, the States, and the local jurisdictions must establish limits that an individual can contribute to any one election campaign, including limits on the amount a candidate may contribute to his or her own campaign. Now, for that particular requirement, we already have that in the U.S. House and U.S. Senate. The limit at this point in time is $2,700 per election. So every time your voters can go to the booth for you, people can contribute, individuals can contribute $2,700, so the primary election and the general election. In the House of Representatives elections are every 2 years, so you can collect an amount of $5,400 over the election cycle for your campaign.

Now, if you collect $5,400 before the primary and you lose the primary, then you are going to have to give back the money that was donated for the general election. So that would be you would have to give $2,700 back to the donors that gave that to you.

Also, it is important that it requires governments to limit the amount a candidate can spend on their own campaign. Some of our candidates are extremely wealthy. They have millions or hundreds of millions or more. They can buy their seat in Congress easily, and this would limit that. I think, again, this is very, very important.

The last is probably one of the more controversial of the four, but it says that the total of contributions to a candidate's campaign from individuals who are not able to vote for the candidate cannot be greater than the total of contributions from individuals who can vote for the candidate. Now, geographically what that would mean is that money coming from outside of your congressional district, or from your State if you are a Senator, can't exceed money that comes from inside your district if you are a congressional candidate or State if you are a Senator. It wouldn't affect the Presidential race as much because everybody in the United States is in the President's district, but it would also affect local districts as well. With that, that wraps up the discussion of my proposed constitutional amendment.

I want to talk a little bit about JOHN SARBANES' bill, and I think it is a fine bill. It is not a constitutional amendment. What it does is it gives you a tax credit for money that you can contribute to a campaign. So if you can contribute $50 to a campaign, then you get a tax credit of $50, which means money back on your income tax return; the same amount that you contribute, you get back. But also it matches that contribution by 6 to 1. So you will end up giving the candidate quite a bit more than you are actually contributing. It is a good measure. It is a good proposal. It would sort of even out the effect of PACs. I find myself supporting that.

Again, my colleague, TED DEUTCH, has a couple of constitutional amendments in the 114th Congress. One of them is called Democracies for All, H.J. Res. 119, and also H.J. Res. 22 that creates funding limits and creates a distinction between individuals and corporations, but what it really does is allows Congress to limit, to enact laws that will be enforceable and not overturned by the Supreme Court.

We have VAN HOLLEN in the 114th Congress, H.R. 430, and what this does is it requires disclosure so that when campaign contributions are made, we can determine who made those contributions—very important. I think it would make a big difference.

Then we have a number of proposals to create public financing. My colleague from Kentucky, JOHN YARMUTH, had one in the 113th Congress, Fair Elections Now Act. In the 114th Congress, which is this Congress, DAVID PRICE has H.R. 424, which establishes a system of public financing.

These are all good. I think I would be supportive of any of these kinds of approaches. I think the American public needs to be protected. I think our cherished Democratic and Republican institutions are a threat here, whether it is because candidates are bombarded by negative ads, whether it is because candidates are influenced by big donors, whether it is because more and more money is coming in to these elections every single cycle. There is a lot of reasons why we need to look at campaign financing and select one of these approaches and go with it and change the system that we have to a system that really does respond to the American public.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHAFFETZ (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of an unscheduled medical procedure.

Mr. DONOVAN (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of the birth of his first child.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2252. An act to clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 20, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1517. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement, pursuant to Sec. 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, on a transaction involving Gunes Ekspres Havacilik A.S. of Antalya, Turkey; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1518. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce, transmitting the second quarterly report from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration regarding the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority transition, pursuant to the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, Pub. L. 113-235; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1519. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final order — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Extension of Temporary Placement of UR-144, XLR11, and AKB48 in Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act [Docket No.: DEA-414] received May 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1520. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to Israel, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, as amended, Transmittal No.: 15-36; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1521. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a list of international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States, to be transmitted to Congress within sixty days in accordance with the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1522. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting pursuant

to Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1523. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1524. A letter from the Director, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting seventeen reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1525. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Chairman's Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period of October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1526. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report providing a FY 2016 Estimate for the Free Clinic Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 233(o); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1527. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the ''2014 Biennial Report to Congress on the Effectiveness of Grant Programs Under the Violence Against Women Act'', as required by Sec. 1003(b) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1528. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Depreciation of Precious Metals (Rev. Rul. 2015-11) received May 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1119. A bill to improve the efficiency of Federal research and development, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 874. A bill to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1156. A bill to authorize the establishment of a body under the National Science and Technology Council to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation opportunities (Rept. 114–123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1158. A bill to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1162. A bill to make technical changes to provisions authorizing prize competitions under the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980; with an amendment (Rept. 114–125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1561. A bill to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STIVERS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 273. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2262) to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 880) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 22, 2015, through May 29, 2015 (Rept. 114–127). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 274. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–128). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 6. A bill to accelerate the discovery, development, and delivery of 21st century cures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 2405. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the special expensing rules for certain film and television productions and to provide for special expensing for live theatrical productions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2406. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and 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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 2407. A bill to reverse declining milk consumption in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LEE, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 2408. A bill to establish in the Administration for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services the Federal Interagency Working Group on Reducing Child Poverty to develop a national strategy to eliminate child poverty in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow small businesses to defer the payment of certain employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. TITUS, Ms. ESTY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California) (all by request):

H.R. 2410. A bill to authorize highway infrastructure and safety, transit, motor carrier, rail, and other surface transportation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Science, Space, and Technology, Natural Resources, Oversight and Government Reform, the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 2411. A bill to support early learning; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WELCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2412. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credit for residential energy efficient property and the energy credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr.

MESSER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 2413. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 South Main Street in Elkhart, Indiana, as the ''Staff Sergeant Jesse L. Williams Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. LONG, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2414. A bill to facilitate the responsible communication of scientific and medical developments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2415. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for establishment of a streamlined data review program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2416. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to evaluate the potential use of evidence from clinical experience to help support the approval of new indications for approved drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 2417. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fair and consistent eligibility requirements for graduate medical schools operating outside the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 2418. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reduce the fuel economy obligations of automobile manufacturers whose fleets contain at least 50 percent fuel choice enabling vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2419. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act to reauthorize funding for the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2420. A bill to reduce administrative burdens on researchers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2421. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase accountability at the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2422. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to third-party quality system assessment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2423. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to valid scientific evidence; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2424. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to training and oversight in least burdensome appropriate means concept; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2425. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the recognition of standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2426. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to easing regulatory burden with respect to certain class I and class II devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2427. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to advisory committee process; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2428. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to humanitarian device exemption applications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KIND, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any discharge of income contingent and income-based student loan indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2430. A bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for job training expenses of employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 2432. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a gender equality-focused investment option under the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2433. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to enhancing combination products review; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2435. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with regard to the Reagan-Udall Foundation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 2436. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to appropriate age groupings to be included in research studies involving human subjects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2437. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act regarding high cost durable medical equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2438. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to broader application of Bayesian statistics and adaptive trial designs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2439. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Silvio O. Conte Senior Biomedical Research Service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 2440. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve loan repayment programs of the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2441. A bill to award a Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the 1st American Volunteer Group of the Chinese Air Force, also known as the AVG Flying Tigers, in recognition of their service to the nation; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 2442. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2443. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to CLIA waiver study design guidance for in

vitro diagnostics; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2444. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Food and Drugs to award grants for studying the process of continuous drug manufacturing; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2445. A bill to express the sense of Congress with respect to enabling Food and Drug Administration scientific engagement; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2446. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the use of electronic visit verification for personal care services furnished under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2447. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for an NIH research strategic plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2448. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a program of high-risk, high-reward research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BASS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 2449. A bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 2450. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair and deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 2451. A bill to amend title 23 and title 49, United States Code, to strengthen domestic content standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 2452. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to facilitating dissemination of health care economic information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2453. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to authorize the National Capital Planning Commission to designate and modify the boundaries of the National Mall area in the District of Columbia reserved for the location of commemorative works of preeminent historical and lasting significance to the United States and other activities, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to make recommendations for the termination of the authority of a person to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 2454. A bill to provide for the public disclosure of information regarding surveillance activities under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. PITTS:

H.R. 2455. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to precision medicine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2456. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure the sharing of data generated from research with the public; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 2457. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit to small businesses which hire individuals who are members of the Ready Reserve or National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 2458. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5351 Lapalco Boulevard in Marrero, Louisiana, as the ''Lionel R. Collins, Sr. Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2459. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to enhance the reporting requirements pertaining to use of antimicrobial drugs in food animals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2460. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 272. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H. Res. 275. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Asian and Pacific Islander HIV/AIDS Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H. Res. 276. A resolution honoring the National Association of Women Business Owners on its 40th anniversary; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 277. A resolution honoring the Tunisian People for their democratic transition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H. Res. 278. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should initiate negotiations to enter into a free trade agreement with Tunisia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. UPTON:

H.R. 6.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 2405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause I, Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution which reads: ''The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 2406.

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

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

Amendment II—A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 2409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8; Sixteenth Amendment

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 2411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 2412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 2413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Per Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes. Per the Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Per Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes. Per the Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Per Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes. Per the Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 2418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution states that Congress has the authority to ''regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states.''

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution states that Congress has the authority to ''regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states.''

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution states that Congress has the authority to ''regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states.''

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 2429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause I of Section VIII of Article I.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 2430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution

''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state.''

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 2431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 and Clause 18 of Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 2432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 or Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 2440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

''. . . and provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States . . .''

''. . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . .''

This legislation seeks to award the Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the 1st American Volunteer Group of the Chinese Air Force.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

. . .

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

. . .

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. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

. . .

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

. . .

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. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

. . .

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

. . .

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. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 2446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

. . .

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

. . .

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. HARRIS:

H.R. 2447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 2449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 2450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which allows Congress to regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 2452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clauses 14 and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 2454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 2457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare Clause)

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 (Territories Clause)

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 9: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 21: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 67: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 167: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 169: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 224: Mr. JEFFRIES and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 226: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 232: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 244: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 303: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 343: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 353: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 382: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 402: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 427: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 429: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 483: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 532: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 539: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 540: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 542: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 555: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 556: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DENT, and Mr. MOOLENAAR

H.R. 564: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 572: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 578: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 581: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 628: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 672: Mr. BLUM and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 700: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 721: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 761: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 767: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 784: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 785: Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 793: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 815: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 816: Mr. BRAT and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 838: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 863: Mr. UPTON, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 879: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 913: Mr. KEATING and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 923: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 924: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 969: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 980: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 985: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 986: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 999: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1002: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1062: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 1087: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1089: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1141: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 1174: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1175: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1188: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1192: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1194: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1197: Mr. HONDA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1221: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1225: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1234: Mr. LAUDERMILK.
H.R. 1258: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1271: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1283: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 1284: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1299: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 1300: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1312: Mr. RUSH and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1320: Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 1338: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DENT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1343: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1350: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 1384: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1393: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1398: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1399: Mr. HONDA and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1401: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1404: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1413: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1421: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1450: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 1453: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 1462: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1475: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1492: Mr. BERA and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1496: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1516: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BOST, Mr. GIBBS, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1519: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1549: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 1550: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1552: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1555: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 1559: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1567: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1571: Mr. WALZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 1598: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SIRES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1604: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1618: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1622: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1635: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1644: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1671: Mr. BLUM and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1675: Mr. HURT of Virginia.
H.R. 1683: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LEE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1684: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1718: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 1736: Mr. ASHFORD and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1737: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1739: Mr. POSEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1745: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1752: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1769: Mr. KATKO and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1777: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1805: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1810: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1817: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MERCHANT, and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1833: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1843: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1853: Mr. MARINO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1861: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1876: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1877: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1886: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1899: Mr. MEEKS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1919: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1920: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1921: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1942: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. MENG, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1974: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1977: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1992: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1994: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 2008: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2014: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2017: Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. Mimi Walters of California, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. KIND, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2046: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2061: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 2072: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 2076: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2077: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2093: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2100: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HANNA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BASS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2156: Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. Judy Chu of California.
H.R. 2169: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2191: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2205: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2110: Mr. BERA and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 2227: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2243: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 2247: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2259: Mr. MESSER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 2267: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2268: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2270: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2272: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2276: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2300: Mr. MESSER, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 2302: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2304: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2306: Mr. MESSER and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2315: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2316: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 2330: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2331: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 2351: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2354: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2371: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2372: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2393: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2394: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2403: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 2404: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.J. Res. 9: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. BABIN.
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H. Res. 12: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. PETERSON.
H. Res. 16: Mr. BRAT.
H. Res. 17: Ms. STEFANIK.
H. Res. 28: Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BOST, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WELCH, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. PETERSON.
H. Res. 54: Mr. MARINO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. NADLER.
H. Res. 130: Ms. FUDGE.
H. Res. 194: Mr. NOLAN.
H. Res. 233: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. TROTT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MEEKS.
H. Res. 249: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H. Res. 256: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. YODER, and Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 259: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative DINGELL or a designee, to H.R. 1335, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative SMITH of Texas or a designee, to H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1909:

Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 19, 2015 *No. 77*

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.

Gracious God of all, we have heard glorious things about Your goodness. Let Your glory be over all the Earth. Our hearts make melodies to You because of Your exceeding greatness. Thank You for Your faithfulness that endures forever.

Today, give us steadfast hearts that we may honor You with our lives. Be near to our Senators, giving them a powerful awareness of Your presence. Lord, increase in them such knowledge, love, and obedience that they may grow daily in Your likeness. Grant us wisdom and courage for the living of these challenging days as You surround us with Your divine favor.

We pray in Your great 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.

TRADE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today we will continue our work on the trade legislation, which is before us. I know Senators on both sides are eager to offer amendments. Yesterday was a good start. We voted on a few amendments. We have a half dozen more pending, but we need to keep the ball moving. So let me again encourage Members of both parties to offer those amendments that they may have. Let me again encourage Members to work with the bill managers to get the amendments moving.

We want to process as many amendments as we can. We know we already lost a week to needless filibustering and delaying of this bill, which means one less week to have amendments considered. So we need cooperation from the leadership across the aisle to ensure we do not lose any more time.

Our friends on the other side seem quite eager to let everyone know how uninterested they are in obstruction these days. You will not find a happier guy than me if that turns out to be true. So we will see if they demonstrate the spirit of cooperation they keep telling us about as we continue to debate trade.

Either way, Members on both sides who recognize the benefits of trade to their constituents are determined to pass important export and jobs legislation this week. I hope to see it pass by the same kind of overwhelming, bipartisan margin we saw in the Finance Committee a few weeks ago, because voting to improve this bill is one way to prove you care about the middle class. It is one way to prove you care about American jobs and American workers.

One study tells us that knocking down unfair trade barriers in places such as Europe and the Pacific could boost our economy by as much as $173 billion and that it could support as many as 1.4 million additional American jobs.

In Kentucky, the study says it could bring almost $3 billion in new investment and support more than 18,000 additional jobs. That is in my State alone. We know a lot in the Commonwealth about the benefits of trade. More than half a million Kentucky jobs are already related to international trade. We know that those kinds of jobs typically pay more than other jobs.

Kentuckians also know that a lot of rhetoric on the other side of this issue does not always ''stand the test of fact and scrutiny,'' as President Obama put it.

The 7,000 workers at the Toyota plant in Georgetown, KY, might agree. Following a trade agreement we recently enacted with South Korea, they are now working hard to export Camrys—Camrys—made in Kentucky to Korean consumers. Given some of the overheated language surrounding that U.S.-Korea trade agreement, you may be surprised to hear about these automotive workers in my State who are building Camrys in Kentucky and sending them to Korea. But the truth is that just about every serious public official knows that eliminating the restrictions that hurt American workers and American goods is good for our country.

It is something Republicans have long believed. It is an area where President Obama now agrees, as well. It is an area where many serious Democrats also agree. So I hope we can join together to score a victory for American workers. To get there, let's work now to offer amendments, to get them pending, and to engage in substantive debate rather than more pointless delay for its own sake.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 2 years ago the American people first became aware that the National Security Agency was collecting private information about their phone calls. This is called the Snowden revelation.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Under the banner of national security, the National Security Agency was mining information about home phone calls and how long they lasted. They found out whom they were calling—and not only that. They found out whom the call was between. They also determined how long that call lasted.

NSA essentially was conducting a dragnet, without first attempting to determine whether that information was relevant to a national security problem. NSA ran this program under the authorities granted to them by section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, which expires on June 1 of this year. The American people were outraged by these revelations and Congress rightly acted.

Last year, the House passed a bill by a vote of 303 to 121 to end the NSA's so-called bulk metadata collection program and reform and extend the authority for this program.

I brought a similar bill to the floor authored by Senators LEAHY and LEE. There was a bipartisan group of Senators who joined them to call for its passage. But sadly, the majority leader—at that time the minority leader—stood in the way of bipartisan reform. Instead of passing meaningful reform, he led a Republican filibuster of this bill. That was one of a couple hundred that was led by my friend.

This year, Senators LEAHY and LEE worked again with the Chairman and ranking Member of the House Judiciary Committee on the USA FREEDOM Act, which ends the National Security Agency's bulk collection program and extends and reforms the authorities under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

There have been bipartisan and bicameral calls for the Senate to take up that legislation. Yet again, instead of committing to bringing up this bipartisan bill, last month the senior Senator from Kentucky introduced a bill that would extend the authorities for the National Security Agency's bulk collection program for 5½ years. Then the Second Circuit, almost simultaneously—within 24 hours of that decision by the majority leader—found the bulk collection illegal.

In reaction to the court's decision, the House last week passed the USA FREEDOM Act by a vote of 338 to 88. By a four-to-one margin, the House voted to end the National Security Agency's illegal bulk data collection program and reform its practices.

But even in the face of that court's decision, the majority leader stood once again against bipartisan reform. Instead of heeding the Republican-controlled House's calls for reform, the majority leader introduced a bill that would extend the authorities for the National Security Agency's illegal program for 2 more months.

Congressman GOODLATTE, the chair of the Judiciary Committee in the House, said they will not accept a short-term extension of the bill. This morning, Leader MCCARTHY, the second ranking Republican in the House, said they will not accept any extension. That is exactly what the Speaker, Congressman BOEHNER, said.

If we squander this opportunity to deliver sound reforms to this illegal program, we are handling our duties irresponsibly here in the Senate.

To stand in the way of reforming these practices is to ignore the voice of the American people. Just yesterday, a new poll commissioned by the American Civil Liberties Union showed that 82 percent of Americans are concerned that the Federal Government is collecting and storing the personal information of Americans, and they do not like it.

If we are unable to reform these practices, we are ignoring the ruling of the Second Circuit, which rejected the National Security Agency's bulk collection program, and we are not allowing the American people's voice to be heard.

I think, most importantly, if the senior Senator from Kentucky does not allow this commonsense reform simply with a vote on the Senate floor about what happened in the House, they are ignoring the rare bipartisan support that we have.

Just last week, 190 House Republicans voted to end the National Security Agency's illegal program. There is bipartisan consensus in favor of ending this program. Many of the Republican leader's own colleagues have called for it as well.

Last week, Attorney General Loretta Lynch and James Clapper, Director of National Intelligence, wrote a letter to Senator LEAHY, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. Both the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence voiced their support for the USA FREEDOM Act, saying:

> Overall, the significant reforms contained in this legislation will provide the public greater confidence in how our intelligence activities are carried out and in the oversight of those activities, while ensuring vital national security authorities remain in place.

I agree with that statement. But sadly, the majority leader continues to stand in the way of bipartisan reform to end these illegal practices. As we face the June 1 expiration of these authorities, the majority leader still offers no viable alternative.

We cannot allow this program to be extended. The majority leader should listen to the American people because we cannot extend an illegal act. That is what the majority leader is asking us to do.

The majority leader should listen to the American people, consider the action of his Republican colleagues, and respect the expertise of the intelligence community.

The Senate should act now on the USA FREEDOM Act before it leaves for the Memorial Day recess and restore the confidence of the American people.

NOMINATIONS AND HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have heard so much about how great the Republicans are doing here, about how well things are working now. We are doing no nominations—none. We are 5 months into this Congress, and we basically approved virtually no one. It is interesting to say there are not many names on the calendar to bring up. Why? Because they are not even holding hearings on all the nominations. We always hear about the need for jobs—but not from my Republican colleagues. We hear from us. One of the prime examples of that is the highway bill. It is about to expire. What are we going to do? Nothing. There is no program to extend this bill. It has already been extended short term 33 times. Think about that. We used to do bills here for 5 years, 6 years so that the directors of transportation and all of these States around the country could plan ahead.

We are being penny-wise and pound-foolish. We are having these short-term extensions, which are very expensive, creating no jobs. For every $1 billion we spend on these highway programs, we create 47,500 jobs. My Republican colleagues are ignoring this.

What is the business of the day, Mr. President?

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 for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided, and the Democrats controlling the first half and the majority controlling the second half.

The assistant Democratic leader.

DACA AND DAPA PROGRAMS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, 14 years ago, I introduced a bill known as the DREAM Act. My friend and colleague Senator LEAHY was the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and for the last 14 years we have tried to pass this basic law, and here is what it says: If you were brought to the United States as a child, and you were undocumented in America, but you have lived here without committing any serious crime and finished high school, we will give you a chance. If you will agree to at least complete 2 years of college or enlist in America's military, we will give you a path to citizenship.

I offered this legislation because so many young people—about 2½ million—living in this country were brought here when they were infants, small children. They didn't have any voice in the matter, their parents decided. They came to the United States. They have lived here as Americans.

They stood in their classroom every single day and put their hand on their heart and pledged allegiance to that flag. That was their flag. What they didn't know or didn't understand was that they were undocumented. They don't have a country. The laws of the United States are very clear. If you are one of those people, you have to leave. You have to leave for at least 10 years and then apply to come back in. I didn't think that was fair.

I introduced the DREAM Act. In fact, I had the support of the senior Senator from Utah as my cosponsor when I first introduced it. We could not pass it and make it the law of the land. So the day came when I appealed to the President of the United States, my former colleague from the Senate and the State of Illinois. He was a sponsor of the DREAM Act. I appealed to the President to give these young people a chance. He took his power as President and issued an Executive order, and that Executive order said that if these young people would come forward, pay a substantial fee for processing, show that they have no serious criminal record and can show they had come to the United States years before, they would be given a chance to stay without fear of deportation. It is called DACA.

Well, the President waited and challenged Congress to do something about it—pass the DREAM Act, pass comprehensive immigration reform. Even though it passed in the Senate, with 68 votes on a bipartisan rollcall vote, the Republican House of Representatives refused to even call the measure for a vote.

One year passed, 2 years have passed, and here we are—no action by the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives or, for that matter, in the Senate to move comprehensive immigration reform. The President said: I am going to step up with my power as President and do what I can to deal with this issue. He said: Let's have some standards. I will not allow anyone to step forward and ask for temporary status in this country unless they have been here at least 5 years. If they step forward, they have to pay a filing fee for us to process their application, and they have to submit themselves to a criminal and national security background check. We don't want anybody in this country who is a danger to America. If they flunk that part of the test, they are finished and deported. And then they have to put their names on the books to pay their taxes in the United States of America while they are working. Under those circumstances, we will give them the temporary renewable right to stay and work without fear of deportation, and then several years later repeat it, submit an application again. The President believes, and I share the belief, we will be a safer nation if we do that.

There could be as many as 11 million undocumented people in this country who would qualify for what we call DAPA. They would have to pay a fee, pay their taxes, go through this background check, and be subject to renewal on a regular basis.

Well, today, May 19, 2015, was supposed to be the first day people would be allowed to apply for this new program—this DAPA Program, but unfortunately it has been stopped cold. It has been stopped by the Republican Party in the House and Senate and stopped by their efforts in court to stop this President. Oh, they have an alternative. They stated their alternative. Their alternative is for these people to leave the United States. Their candidate for President, Governor Romney, said as much when he ran last time. They have no alternative plan. They want these people—millions of them—to leave the United States through voluntary deportation, as they call it.

Well, the sad reality is that is not going to happen, and obviously the Republicans are not going to do anything to deal with our broken immigration system. There are casualties with this decision. One of them is Naomi Florentino. This attractive young woman was brought to the United States from Mexico when she was 10 years old. She grew up in Smyrna, TN. She was an amazing student and active in her community.

In high school, she was a member of the National Honor Society, and she received the Student of the Year Awards for algebra and art. She served on the student council and played on the varsity soccer and track and field teams, where she was a shot-putter and discus thrower.

Naomi's dream is to become a robotics engineer. In high school, she was a member of the robotics team, participated in NASA's Science, Engineering, Mathematics and Aerospace Academy, and she performed so well she won the Next Generation Pioneer Award. Naomi graduated from high school with an honor's diploma, but Naomi's immigration status limited her options. The college counselor refused to help. The college counselor at her high school told her that since she was undocumented, she was on her own.

She didn't quit. She took mechanical engineering courses at Lipscomb University in Nashville. She then went on to community college. These undocumented kids cannot get help while they are going to school. They do not qualify for the Pell grant or government loans. She was determined. She was not going to quit.

At the community college, where she will be graduating this spring, she has an associate's degree in mechatronics technology, a field that combines mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, telecommunications engineering, control engineering, and computer engineering. This fall Naomi will begin to work on her bachelor's degree in engineering at Middle Tennessee State University. Remember what I said. She is on her own. She gets no help from the government to do this because she is undocumented.

In her spare time—if you can imagine she has any—she continues to be very involved in her community. For 6 years, she was judge and mentor in engineering and robotics competitions. Since 2008, she has volunteered as a college mentor with the YMCA Latino Achievers Program in Tennessee. Despite everything this young woman has achieved in her life, her future is totally uncertain.

In 2012, President Obama said that under the DACA Program we are going to protect Naomi, and people just like her, from deportation. We will not give her government assistance to go to school, but at least she knows she will not be deported as long as she passes the test I mentioned earlier.

She is now part of the work-study program at Nissan North America's Smyrna, TN, plant. They want her. Wouldn't you? This is the largest automotive manufacturing plant in the United States.

As a maintenance intern, she assists with troubleshooting on their most sophisticated equipment—this young lady with 2 years of community college.

She wrote me a letter, and here is what she said about the DACA Program:

> DACA has meant the opportunity of a lifetime for my academic and professional career. As a student at Smyrna High School, driving past the Nissan plant motivated me to be a better student—with hopes of, one day, being part of a company that is highly-regarded in my community. However, without proper work authorization, that goal seemed far-fetched. Today, it is a reality for me. I have learned that, given the opportunity, hard work, patience and perseverance can pay off.

Naomi and 600,000 DREAMers like her have stepped forward under President Obama's program. They are not going to be given any kind of award. They will just be given a chance.

I don't understand the Republican point of view. The Republicans would have us deport this young woman. Their attitude is: Send her back to Mexico. We don't need her.

She, unfortunately, came here because her parents decided to bring her here, and now she has to pay the price for her parents' decision. Is that what America is all about? Is that what our system of justice is all about?

Naomi will be an important part of our future, and thousands like her deserve that chance. That is why today is a sad day. The President's efforts to extend this program and help others—parents of young DREAMers like this have been stopped cold by the courts and stopped cold by the Republican leadership.

President Abraham Lincoln once said, ''We cannot escape history,'' and history is very clear, we are a nation of immigrants. My mother was an immigrant to this country, and I stand here today as a Senator from the great State of Illinois. I am very proud of

what she and her family did when she came to this country.

Let us reward those who are willing to come to America to work and make it better. Let us give these young people a chance. Let us, once and for all, say this Nation of immigrants is proud of our heritage and prouder still of what immigrants can mean to our future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I just wish to praise the senior Senator from Illinois. He has been consistent on this issue since he came here. He was one of the architects of a major overhaul of our immigration system a year and a half ago, which passed by a two-thirds majority, by Republicans and Democrats alike.

We have gone such a long way toward solving this problem. The Republican leadership in the House—even though the votes were there to pass it in the House—refused to bring it up.

I am proud to align myself as a follower of the leadership of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, on this issue.

With the way we apply the laws now, I wonder whether my grandparents would have been able to come to Vermont from Italy and see their grandson become a U.S. Senator or would have seen their highly decorated son serve in World War II. I wonder if my wife's parents would have been able to come from Canada so she could be born in Vermont.

Come on. We are a nation of immigrants. Let's welcome them. They can often make our country much stronger than it was before.

I applaud the Senator from Illinois.

USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. LEAHY. On another issue, in just 12 days, section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act, along with two other surveillance authorities, will expire. And once again, the Senate Republican leadership is scrambling at the last minute to avoid a crisis of its own making.

Last year, we had a chance to pass the USA FREEDOM Act of 2014, and I urged the Senate to pass it. A majority of Senators, but not 60, voted for it because we all knew the expiration date for these surveillance authorities was right around the corner. We knew May 31 would arrive quickly in the new Congress.

I did not want our intelligence community to face a period of uncertainty leading up to the sunset, and I also didn't want the American people to have billions of their phone records stocked away in a government database any longer—especially as we have seen, in the case of Edward Snowden, just how insecure that database can be.

That is why we spent months holding six public hearings in the Judiciary Committee and even more months negotiating a bipartisan bill, which got the support of the administration, the intelligence community, privacy groups, and the technology industry. I think that is the first time we have had all of them together.

Unfortunately, my attempts to avoid this last-minute chaos were blocked by the Republican leader last year. He said this was a matter that could wait for the new Congress. He said the new Republican majority would have a rigorous committee process for important issues.

Well, five months into the new Republican majority, and with the deadline looming, the Republican leader has just now turned his attention to this issue.

The Republican-led Senate committees have not taken steps toward reauthorization or reform. Instead, the majority leader now proposes a 60-day extension of a program that a Federal court of appeals just ruled is unlawful. The court ruled unanimously that it is unlawful, and they are saying, well, let's just extend the bulk collection program for another 60 days.

The majority leader apparently wants to do this to allow one of his committee chairmen to develop a last-minute ''back-up plan.'' This is why we tried to pass legislation a year ago.

The House of Representatives is not going to pass a 60-day extension, nor should it. We should not extend this illegal program for one more day, and we do not need to do so. After all, we have a solution in hand. Why try to ignore reality and go on with something else?

We have a responsible solution. In fact, it is the only responsible solution. Broad consensus has developed around the bipartisan USA FREEDOM Act of 2015.

The Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence wrote a letter in support of the bill. The FBI Director told me he supports it. This past weekend, the former chairman and ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee advocated for passage of this legislation in an article in the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these materials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, May 15, 2015]

INTELLIGENCE REFORM BILL IS IMPORTANT TO SAFEGUARDING OUR SECURITY AND PRIVACY

(By C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger and Mike Rogers)

The USA Freedom Act will protect our security and privacy.

A recent Baltimore Sun editorial described legislation to reform the government's collection of Americans' phone and email data as a sign that ''bipartisan cooperation in Congress is not completely dead'' (''Reining in the surveillance state,'' May 5). We'd like to remind The Sun that similar legislation to end the mass storage of this data passed the House by an overwhelming bipartisan majority—it garnered more than 300 votes, in fact—over a year ago.

In our role as leaders on the House Intelligence Committee, we drafted and introduced last year's bill together with our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, Reps. Bob Goodlatte and John Conyers. Our success provided the foundation for the legislation that passed the House by an even larger margin on Wednesday. The USA Freedom Act ends the bulk collection of what we now know as ''metadata''—that big database up at the National Security Agency that contains the phone numbers of millions of Americans will go away. The government will now have to seek court approval before petitioning private cell phone companies for records. The court will have to approve each application, except in emergencies, and major court decisions will be made public.

We need this reform to keep our country safe. Section 215 of the Patriot Act, which is the part that legalizes much of NSA's critical work to protect us from terrorists, expires in less than three weeks on June 1. If we do not reauthorize it with the reforms demanded by the public, essential capabilities to track legitimate terror suspects will expire, too.

That couldn't happen at a worse time—we live in a dangerous world. The threats posed by ISIS and other terror groups are just the tip of the iceberg. We also need strong defenses against increasingly aggressive cyber terrorists and the ''lone wolf'' terrorists who are often American citizens, for example.

This bill restores Americans' confidence that the government is not snooping on its own citizens by improving the necessary checks and balances essential to our Democracy. We helped write it last year, we support it this year and we hope Republicans and Democrats continue working together on common sense reforms to protect our national security and our civil liberties.

MAY 11, 2015.

Senator PATRICK J. LEAHY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Senator MIKE S. LEE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS LEAHY AND LEE: Thank you for your letter of May 11, 2015, asking for the views of the Department of Justice and the Intelligence Community on S. 1123, the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. We support this legislation.

This bill is the result of extensive discussion among the Congress, the Administration, privacy and civil liberties advocates, and industry representatives. We believe that it is a reasonable compromise that preserves vital national security authorities, enhances privacy and civil liberties and codifies requirements for increased transparency. The Intelligence Community believes that the bill preserves the essential operational capabilities of the telephone metadata program and enhances other intelligence capabilities needed to protect our nation and its partners. In the absence of legislation, important intelligence authorities will expire on June 1. This legislation would extend these authorities, as amended, until the end of 2019, providing our intelligence professionals the certainty they need to continue the critical work they undertake every day to protect the American people.

The USA FREEDOM Act bans bulk collection under Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act, FISA pen registers, and National Security Letters, while providing a new mechanism to obtain telephone metadata records to help identify potential contacts of suspected terrorists inside the United States. The Intelligence Community believes, based on the existing practices of communications providers in retaining metadata, that these provisions will retain the essential operational capabilities of the existing bulk telephone metadata program while eliminating bulk collection by the government.

The bill also codifies requirements for additional transparency by mandating certain public reporting by the government, authorizing additional reporting by providers, and establishing a statutory mechanism for declassification and release of FISA Court opinions consistent with national security. It establishes a process for appointment of an amicus curiae to assist the FISA Court and FISA Court of Review in appropriate matters. It provides reforms to national security letters, requiring review of the need for their secrecy. The bill also closes potential gaps in collection authorities and increases the maximum criminal penalty for materially supporting a foreign terrorist organization.

Overall, the significant reforms contained in this legislation will provide the public greater confidence in how our intelligence activities are carried out and in the oversight of those activities, while ensuring vital national security authorities remain in place. You have our commitment that we will notify Congress if we find that provisions of this law significantly impair the Intelligence Community's ability to protect national security. We urge the Congress to pass this bill promptly.

Sincerely,

LORETTA E. LYNCH,
Attorney General.
JAMES R. CLAPPER,
Director of National Intelligence.

Mr. LEAHY. But even more importantly, last week the House of Representatives passed the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 with an overwhelming vote of 338 to 88. At a time when the public says Congress is locked in partisan gridlock, look at this overwhelming vote of Republicans and Democrats for the USA FREEDOM Act. Well, the Senate ought to do the same thing the House did.

We can keep our country safe without a government database of billions of Americans' phone records. I think about Richard Clarke, who is a former counterterrorism official. He spent six months examining this program as a member of the President's Review Group. He concluded the program has ''no benefit.'' We do not need it, and, more importantly, Americans do not want it.

I fear that if Congress does not end this bulk collection program, it will only open the door to the next dragnet surveillance program. Next time it will not just be phone records. It might be location information or medical records or credit card records. That is why it is so important to stop it now.

Some will say Congress doesn't need to act because the Second Circuit has already ruled that this program is illegal. I have read the court's decision, I agree with it, and I hope this panel decision will ultimately be upheld by the Supreme Court. But there are other pending lawsuits and it could be months or even years before we know how the courts will ultimately rule on this issue.

In addition, the USA FREEDOM Act doesn't just end bulk collection under section 215 and the other national security authorities; it also contains other important reforms that cannot be won through legal challenges, such as new transparency measures and a panel of experts from which the FISA Court can draw on for amicus support. So the courts made it very clear Congress has to act.

Congress has spent years working on these issues, with numerous hearings. The Senate last year came up with basically the same bill the House has just overwhelmingly passed. We shouldn't be staying around here talking about whether we are going to go over the brink. We are going to put our intelligence community under pressure.

The USA FREEDOM Act is a responsible solution that can pass both Chambers today, including with a majority vote for it in this body today. Its enactment will ensure that these expiring provisions do not sunset. I urge Senators to support it.

Let us not play politics with the security of this country. Let us talk about what really can be done, what has been done in a responsible, bipartisan way in the other body, and let us step up and do the same in the Senate. That is what I would urge, not this brinkmanship which will actually bring about the end of all of these provisions. Maybe some would like that. I think we have a better balance here with the USA FREEDOM Act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the two parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ISAKSON. 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 SONNY DIXON

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, it is not often that anyone comes to the floor of the Senate to praise a journalist one way or another; but in Georgia, on the 31st of May of this year, Sonny Dixon of Savannah, GA, will retire after 18 years of being the anchor at WTOC in Savannah, GA.

Sonny Dixon is a rare breed indeed in terms of political reporters because he has actually been in elected office, serving for years in the Georgia Legislature, some of those years with me. I know him as a friend, I know him as a professional, and I know him as coastal Georgia's best anchorman, period.

He was awarded the Edward R. Murrow Award and the Associated Press award for best anchor in Georgia. He has been recognized by everyone who can do so for his professionalism, his knowledge, his skill, and his talent.

It is a privilege for me to acknowledge today on the floor of the Senate his 18 years of service as an anchor, his 10 years of service in the Georgia Legislature, and his lifetime of commitment to the greatest State of all, the State of Georgia, to the betterment of his community, to the betterment of Savannah, the first capital of the State.

So as we take this moment in time to pause, I want to congratulate Sonny Dixon on a great career and a great recognition that is well earned.

TRIBUTE TO ROY ROBERTS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I would like to talk about Roy Roberts from Walton County, GA. It is not often that a Senator from Georgia rises to pay tribute to a Kentucky basketball player, but Roy Roberts played for the famous Adolf Rupp in the 1960s and was an All-SEC basketball player for the University of Kentucky. He was a great player and made many all-star teams and received many awards, but he came back to Georgia to ranch and farm 1,000 acres, raise Hereford cows, and, with his two brothers, make Walton County, GA, the centerpiece of our State.

He has annually participated in many things that involve politics and public involvement in Walton County and has helped to lead Walton County to be one of the leading Republican counties in the State of Georgia.

Most notable is the Roy Roberts annual barbecue, which takes place next Tuesday in Walton County, GA, where over 1,000 Georgians and Presidential candidates from all over the country will come to meet at Roy Roberts' farm, enjoy a little barbecue, and enjoy the best of grassroots politics.

Were it not for people like Roy Roberts, we wouldn't have the body politic we have, we wouldn't have the democracy we have, and Georgia would not be the great State it is.

I am pleased to rise today and commend to everyone the work of citizen Roy Roberts, a great American, a great Georgian, and a pretty doggone good basketball player for the University of Kentucky.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it was just a few weeks ago that the Senate took up and passed S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. This bill took us a while to get through but ultimately garnered unanimous support from this Chamber with a vote of 99 to 0. I am happy to report that the House of Representatives will take up and pass this bill later on today, and this vital legislation will then head to the President for his signature.

I thank my colleague and friend and fellow Texan, Representative TED POE of Houston, for serving as the chief House sponsor for this legislation. I also express my gratitude to the House leadership team and Chairman GOODLATTE of the House Judiciary Committee for their important work on this issue.

This legislation, as we said before, will provide victims of sexual exploitation, slavery, and human trafficking in the United States with an avenue to find healing and restoration. Most importantly, the victims, who are often children, will have access to additional resources to ensure that they get the shelter and the services they need. I am thankful that Members from both Chambers and from both sides of the aisle were able to recognize the urgency of the matter and get the job done.

While this bill represents a step forward, there is more we need to do and more we will do to continue to fight the scourge of human trafficking. In the coming years, we will look back on this moment as a time when our country finally began to get serious about this problem and heard the voices of the thousands of American victims in our own backyard.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this Chamber has now turned its consideration to trade promotion authority, or TPA. I am a supporter of this legislation because my State is the largest exporting State in the country, and I think our economy and the number of jobs that are created in Texas are reflective of our strong commitment to international trade.

We simply find the point inarguable that to open new markets to the products that our agricultural sectors grow, our ranchers raise, and our manufacturers make seems to be such an obvious thing to do. That is why I am a big supporter of this legislation.

It is not something that just helps businesses; it helps consumers, too. Reducing the protections for domestically produced goods helps consumers most dramatically. It helps with their cost of living and helps make their daily or weekly or monthly paycheck go a little bit further.

Earlier this week, the Wall Street Journal reported that U.S. exports to trade-pact countries were growing at a far higher rate than exports to nontrade-pact countries. So if we get this TPA passed and the United States enters into one of these agreements under negotiation, such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership, we could see American exports to the region skyrocket. This region in particular involves 11 other countries and makes up about 40 percent of the world's economy, and, of course, it would be a ready-market for U.S. products, from beef to electronics.

The reason why trade promotion authority is so important is because it makes no sense—in fact, I think it is almost impossible—to negotiate a trade deal with 535 Members of Congress. Congress gives the President the authority within very firm and clear directives on how the President's U.S. trade administration should negotiate this. Frankly, I think this is one area where we have bipartisan agreement that this is good. So why wouldn't we work together in the best interests of the American people and our economy?

Trade doesn't just help businesses, as I have said; trade and TPA also help the consumer by driving down prices they pay every day at the drugstore, the grocery store, the hardware store—you name it. This legislation is good for American exporters and good for American consumers. Put simply, trade is good for America.

Let me reiterate that this bill is not filled with partisan rhetoric. It is actually a very simple trade tool that will give Congress the authority to examine any upcoming trade deal the President is trying to cut and make sure the American people get a fair shake.

I have heard several of our colleagues say they have gone down to a room to look at what has so far been negotiated on the Trans-Pacific Partnership. That is a good thing, but the fact is that negotiations aren't complete. That is not the whole deal; it is just a start.

Many of the provisions in the TPA are just commonsense proposals. For example, if passed, TPA would give Congress the authority to access the full text of the trade agreement. Of course, it is hard to get more straightforward than that. It would also make sure there is greater transparency and accountability in the negotiation process, with regular briefings by the administration to Congress and Members allowed to actually attend the negotiations.

In short, this trade legislation will provide Congress the needed oversight of the trade negotiations and will act as a safeguard for American interests to make sure our markets and our goods and services remain competitive in the global marketplace.

Finally, I would like to say that this is a reminder of how the Senate should function—as a deliberative body that votes regularly on a bipartisan basis to do something important to help hard-working American families. We vote.

I hope we will have a series of votes later this afternoon. I think having an open amendment process, as the majority leader has promised, is something that has been found to be a welcome development not just for the majority but also for the minority, which I know wants to participate in the process and thus represent their constituents to the best of their ability. Although some of my colleagues from across the aisle do not support this legislation, I hope they don't block it and prevent those of us who are interested in passing a good trade promotion authority piece of legislation from working productively.

I would encourage all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to offer their amendments so that the Senate can debate them and vote on them. That is our job as the elected representatives of the American people.

I see TPA as a real opportunity to help American workers earn higher wages and send more American-made products around the world. I encourage our colleagues to support this bill and in doing so to lend support to the hard-working Americans who increasingly rely on trade to support their families.

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.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLARIFYING THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE BORDER PATROL AGENT PAY REFORM ACT OF 2014

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2252, which has been received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2252) to clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2252) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of trade adjustment assistance, which is included in the bill we are now considering. I urge my colleagues to oppose any attempt to curtail this vital program.

Trade adjustment assistance—better known as TAA—plays an essential role in helping hard-working Americans who through no fault of their own lose their jobs as the result of what is often unfair foreign competition. TAA programs enable displaced workers to acquire the new skills, the new training necessary to prepare for jobs in other industries.

I am proud to have authored the bipartisan legislation with Senator RON

WYDEN to reauthorize TAA that is included in the bill before us. Our legislation forms the basis of the TAA provisions that are included in this bill.

Maine workers have been hit particularly hard by mill closures and shuttered factories. In the last 15 years, Maine has lost 38 percent of its manufacturing jobs, nearly 31,000 jobs in total. While not all of those job losses are due to increased and unfair foreign competition, there is no doubt that workers in the manufacturing sector in Maine have been harmed by the outsourcing of their good-paying jobs to countries with much lower wages and environmental standards.

This last year was particularly difficult for workers in Maine's pulp and paper industry. In just the past year alone, the communities of Lincoln, East Millinocket, and Bucksport have all experienced devastating job losses due to the closures of paper mills. Those mills have been the financial anchors of those small towns, providing good jobs for generations of families. The second- and third-order economic effects on other businesses and their employees in those small communities are also significant.

In times of such great upheaval, laid-off employees need the time, the support, and the resources to learn the skills that will enable them to seek and secure new employment opportunities. These are skilled Americans who are eager to get back to work and who, with the right training, support, and opportunity, can find new jobs in in-demand fields.

Just this spring, I visited the Eastern Maine Community College in Bangor. I had the opportunity to talk with a group of students who are former employees of the Verso paper mill in Bucksport, which closed down last year completely unexpectedly. It was a huge and terrible surprise to the workers and to the community and surrounding area. But because of trade adjustment assistance, these former workers with whom I talked are now enrolled in a fine-furniture making program and are learning new skills for new jobs.

I was so impressed with their determination and their attitude. It is very difficult, if you have not been in school for decades, to enroll in a whole new field of study, but that is exactly what these laid-off workers were doing. Their determination to start new careers after years of working at the mill in Bucksport was inspiring. Each of them was enrolled thanks to the support provided by the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. Without that program, they would not have had the funding, the support, and the resources necessary to enable them to do a mid-life career change.

Similarly, last year in Lincoln, ME, I met a woman who had spent many years working at the local tissue mill. This mill had a cycle of ups and downs over the years. When it was closed for a time years ago, this woman was thrown out of work, but her story had a happy ending. Through TAA, she was able to learn new skills and find employment as a nursing home administrator, where she has been happily employed for a decade. It took a lot of courage for this woman who had been employed as a mill worker for many years to go into an entirely new career field, but she did so. She encouraged her fellow workers to recognize that through the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, they too could find new skills, retrain in an area completely different from the work they had been doing, and have a happy ending.

Her story was inspiring. Because of TAA, for 10 years she has been providing for her family and contributing to her community. What a great return on investment. It would not have been possible without TAA. There are many more success stories like this one.

I thank Secretary Perez for expediting the TAA assistance these workers who are newly displaced have needed.

I would also note that since Maine is the State with the oldest median age in the Nation, this woman really picked a very good field in which to enroll. As a nursing home administrator, her skills are going to be in demand as we see the changing demographics not only of the State of Maine but of our Nation.

TAA programs have made a tremendous difference in the lives of those I have described, in the lives of those working in trade-affected industries in Maine, such as pulp and paper manufacturing, textile, and shoe production.

In fiscal year 2013 alone, more than 700 Mainers have benefited from the TAA programs, and more than 70 percent of the TAA participants in Maine have found employment within 3 months of completing their retraining programs made possible by TAA. Even more encouraging, of these participants who found employment, more than 90 percent were still employed in their new jobs 6 months later. Without TAA, it is very unlikely that would have happened.

Assisting American workers who are negatively affected by international trade—particularly when they are competing with workers with lower wages in countries with lower wages and lower environmental standards or none at all—is vitally important and the right thing to do.

In Maine, the effects of free-trade agreements have been decidedly mixed. While some past agreements have brought benefits to my State in the form of lowered tariffs on Maine products such as potatoes, lobster, and wild blueberries, jobs in many other industries have suffered terrible losses as a result of unfair foreign competition.

Our workers are the best in the world, and they can compete when there is a level playing field, but oftentimes they are competing against industries in developing countries that are paying lower wages, that don't have to comply with any kind of environmental standards, and that are often subsidized by those governments—and that is not fair.

The least we can do is to reauthorize the trade adjustment programs which are successfully helping to retrain and reemploy American workers. That is a commonsense way we can help workers recover from the blows inflicted by some unfair trade agreements, so these Americans can start new jobs and new lives with fresh skills.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of trade adjustment assistance and to oppose any amendments to end these vital programs.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1314, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Pending:

Hatch amendment No. 1221, in the nature of a substitute.

Hatch (for Flake) amendment No. 1243 (to amendment No. 1221), to strike the extension of the trade adjustment assistance program.

Hatch (for Inhofe/Coons) modified amendment No. 1312 (to amendment No. 1221), to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to require the development of a plan for each sub-Saharan African country for negotiating and entering into free trade agreements.

Hatch (for McCain) amendment No. 1226 (to amendment No. 1221), to repeal a duplicative inspection and grading program.

Stabenow (for Portman) amendment No. 1299 (to amendment No. 1221), to make it a principal negotiating objective of the United States to address currency manipulation in trade agreements.

Brown amendment No. 1251 (to amendment No. 1221), to require the approval of Congress before additional countries may join the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.

Wyden (for Shaheen) amendment No. 1227 (to amendment No. 1221), to make trade agreements work for small businesses.

Wyden (for Warren) amendment No. 1327 (to amendment No. 1221), to prohibit the application of the trade authorities procedures to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement that includes investor-state dispute settlement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as we resume consideration of our TPA bill, I want to delve a little deeper into the process of considering and approving trade agreements.

Throughout the debate surrounding this bill, I have heard the term ''fast-track'' used quite a few times. There was, in fact, a time when trade promotion authority was commonly referred to as ''fast-track.'' Now, only TPA opponents use that term.

They want the American people to believe that under TPA, trade agreements come to Congress and are passed in the blink of an eye. Sometimes they use the term ''rubberstamp'' as if under TPA Congress wielding ultimate authority over a trade agreement—the power to reject it entirely—is a mere administrative act.

There is a reason the term ''fast-track'' isn't used anymore. It is because those who are being truly honest know the process is anything but fast.

I think it would be helpful for me to walk through the entire process Congress must undertake before rendering a final judgment on a trade agreement, to show how thoroughly these agreements are vetted before they ever receive a vote.

Before I do, though, I will note for my colleagues that this bill adds more transparency, notice, and consultation requirements than any TPA bill before it. This bill guarantees that Congress has all the information we need to render an informed up-or-down verdict on any trade agreement negotiated using the procedures in this bill. Congress's oversight of any trade agreement starts even before the negotiations on that agreement begin.

Under this bill, the President must not only notify Congress that he is considering entering into negotiations with our trading partners but also what his objectives for those negotiations are. Specifically, this has to happen 3 months before the President can start negotiating. That is 3 months for Congress to consult on and shape the negotiations before they even begin.

Congress's oversight continues as negotiations advance.

This bill requires the U.S. Trade Representative to continuously consult with the Senate Finance Committee and any other Senate committee with jurisdiction over subject matter potentially affected by a trade agreement. Moreover, the USTR, the U.S. Trade Representative, must, upon request, meet with any Member of Congress to consult on the negotiations, including providing classified negotiating text.

The bill also establishes panels to oversee the trade negotiations. These panels, the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations and the designated congressional advisers, consult with and advise the USTR on the formulation of negotiating positions and strategies. Under the bill, members of these panels would be accredited advisers to trade negotiating sessions involving the United States.

Congressional oversight intensifies as the negotiations near conclusion. At least 6 months before the President signs a trade agreement, he must submit a report to Congress detailing any potential changes to U.S. trade remedy laws.

Then, 3 months before the President signs a trade agreement, he must notify Congress that he intends to do so. At the same time, the President is required to submit details of the agreement to the U.S. International Trade Commission. The ITC is tasked with preparing an extensive report for Congress on the potential costs and benefits the agreement will have on the U.S. economy, specific economic sectors, and American workers.

I want to focus on the next step required by this bill because it is a new requirement never before included in TPA. Sixty days before the President can sign any trade agreement, he must publish the full text of the agreement on the USTR Web site so that the public can see it. This ensures an unprecedented level of transparency for the American people and gives our constituents the material and time they need to inform us of their views.

Only after the President has met these notification and consultation requirements, only after he has provided the required trade reports, and only after he has made the agreement available to the American people, may he finally sign the agreement.

The process this bill requires before an agreement is even signed is obviously quite complex, full of checks and balances, and provides unprecedented transparency for the American public.

However, once the President does sign the agreement, his obligations continue. Sixty days after signing the agreement, the President must provide Congress a description of changes to U.S. law he considers necessary. This step gives Congress time to begin considering what will be included in the legislation to implement the trade agreement.

This is also the time when the Finance Committee holds open hearings on the trade agreement in order to gather the views of the administration and the public.

Following these hearings, one of the most important steps in this entire process occurs, the so-called informal markup. The informal markup is not always well understood, so I will take a minute to describe it.

The informal markup occurs before the President formally submits the trade agreement to Congress. As with any markup of legislation, the committee reviews and discusses the agreement and implementing legislation, has the opportunity to question witnesses about the agreement, and can amend the legislation.

In the event of amendments, the Senate can proceed to a mock conference with the House to unify the legislation. The practice of the informal markup produces or provides Congress an opportunity to craft the legislation implementing a trade agreement as it sees fit and to direct the President on the final package to be formally submitted to Congress.

While the informal markup is well established in practice, this bill, for the first time in the history of the TPA, specifies that Congress will receive the materials it needs in time to conduct an informal markup. It requires that 30 days before the President formally submits a trade agreement to Congress, he or she must submit the final legal text of the agreement and a statement specifying any administrative action he will take to implement the agreement.

The bill therefore ensures that Congress will have all the materials it needs in time to conduct a thorough markup. Only at this point may the President formally submit legislation implementing a trade agreement to Congress, and only at this point do the TPA procedures, first established in the Trade Act of 1974, kick in.

Once a bill implementing a trade agreement is formally submitted to Congress, a clock for consideration of that bill starts. This clock gives Congress 90 days in session to consider and roll out a bill. As everyone here knows, 90 legislative days takes a lot longer than 90 calendar days. When I hear my colleagues talk about ''fast-track,'' I think this is where they start the clock.

They are disregarding the years of oversight and consultations that occurred during trade negotiations. They are ignoring the many months of congressional consideration of trade legislation that occurs before the President ever formally submits that legislation to Congress. They are discounting that by this point in the process, Congress has held hearings on the agreement, received views from the public, and extensively reviewed the agreement and the implementing legislation through an informal markup. Calling this part of the process fast-track is like skipping to the end of a book and saying the author did not develop a plot.

As I said, even here at the end of the process, the bill provides more than 3 months for hearings, committee action, floor debate, and votes. Sometimes I think that only a United States Senator could argue that more than 3 months to formally consider legislation—legislation that has already been thoroughly debated, vetted, and reviewed—is making decisions too fast.

When Congress votes on an implementing bill, it is only after years of oversight and months of formal review. So I have to ask, does this process seem fast to you? If TPA is not fast, then what does TPA do? Put simply, TPA guarantees a vote. TPA says to the world that when they sign an agreement with the United States, Congress promises to say yes or no to that agreement. Most importantly,

TPA guarantees that Congress will have the information in the time we need to make that decision.

Without TPA, we are essentially telling the President to try to negotiate the price of a house, and then after buying that home, we are asking to renegotiate with the sellers. This would be absurd and rob Americans of financial opportunities, employment, and a fair world marketplace they can only get from free-trade agreements.

Once again, I urge all my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss two amendments that are pending to the trade bill. I want to begin by thanking Chairman HATCH and Ranking Member WYDEN, as well as Senators MCCONNELL and REID, for working with me to make these amendments pending.

I believe it is important that we have an amendment process as we consider granting trade promotion authority to the President. Enacting the bill before us will have major impacts on our Nation's economy for years to come, and Senators should have an opportunity to improve the product reported by the Committee on Finance.

The trade promotion authority bill by its very nature demands that Senators be able to debate and vote on key trade issues. That is because the trade promotion authority bill creates a process by which trade agreements are submitted to Congress for approval without the opportunity to change them on the House or Senate floor. So it is critical that we utilize the opportunity we have now to set the rules of the road for future trade agreements and to enact important trade reforms.

Today, I would like to discuss two amendments I believe will strengthen the trade package.

AMENDMENT NO. 1227

As ranking member of the small business committee, it is my responsibility to look at bills on the Senate floor and ask: How does this affect small businesses? How will they benefit or be harmed? How can we improve this bill so that small businesses have a seat at the table?

I think that is especially important as we talk about trade. Trade has become increasingly vital for small businesses that are looking to diversify and grow. Yet, even though 95 percent of the world's customers live outside of the United States, less than 1 percent of our small- and medium-sized businesses are exporting to global markets. By comparison, over 40 percent of large businesses sell their products overseas. As we consider this trade package, we must make sure small businesses have a seat at the table and the resources they need to sell overseas.

The amendment I filed incorporates bipartisan, commonsense measures that will help small businesses take advantage of trade opportunities. It reauthorizes the SBA's State Trade and Export Promotion Grant Program. This program, known as STEP, was created as a pilot program to help States work with small businesses to succeed in the international marketplace. In just a few years, STEP has been a great success. Since 2011, it has supported over $900 million in U.S. small business exports, producing a return on investment of 15 to 1 for taxpayers.

It has helped small businesses such as Corfin Industries, located in Salem, NH. Before STEP, Corfin's international sales were just 2 percent. Now they are up to 12 percent. As a result, the company has added 22 employees. That is the kind of job growth we will see in our small businesses when we make sure they are part of our trade agenda.

Reauthorizing the successful STEP Program is a commonsense way to make sure our small businesses can benefit from trade, and it builds on bipartisan legislation that was first introduced by Senator CANTWELL, who was just on the floor, Senator COLLINS, and me.

The amendment also takes a number of steps to make it easier for small businesses to access export services provided by the Federal Government. It encourages those Federal agencies, such as the Small Business Administration and the Department of Commerce, to work hand in hand with State trade agencies that have on-the-ground knowledge of local needs.

Finally, the amendment makes sure we understand how trade agreements negotiated under trade promotion authority will affect small businesses.

I urge my colleagues to support this small business amendment, and I hope we can reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank so that our small businesses can access that funding and get into those international markets.

AMENDMENT NO. 1226

The second amendment I would like to discuss is an amendment Senator MCCAIN, who is on the floor, and I have filed to repeal a harmful, job-killing program—the USDA Catfish Inspection Program. This is something Senator MCCAIN has been working on for years. I have joined him in recent years to try to address the concerns I have heard from companies in New Hampshire that are going to be affected by that new USDA Catfish Inspection Program.

Back in 2008, a provision was added to the farm bill that transferred the inspection of catfish—only catfish—from the FDA, which inspects all foreign and domestic fish products, to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It required USDA to set up a new, separate program to inspect catfish alone.

I think this is a wasteful, duplicative program that will hurt seafood-processing businesses across the country. There is no scientific or food safety benefit here. In fact, officials from FDA and USDA have explicitly stated that catfish is a low-risk food. In nine separate reports, the Government Accountability Office has recommended eliminating this program.

Even worse, this program is actually a thinly disguised trade barrier against foreign catfish. We are facing an immediate 5- to 7-year ban on imported catfish as soon as the USDA program is up and running. As a result, our trading partners are explicitly threatening retaliation. And since there is no scientific basis for this program, any WTO nation that currently exports catfish to the United States could challenge it and secure WTO-sanctioned trade retaliation against a wide range of U.S. export industries, including beef, soy, poultry, pork, grain, fruit, or cotton. The program is becoming a major issue of concern in Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations.

The only other time the Senate has voted on this issue was in 2012 when we voted to repeal it in a bipartisan voice vote. But since then, we have been denied the opportunity to address this issue on the floor. I think it is very important that we have an opportunity to vote on this amendment because the USDA is poised to begin its inspection of catfish very soon. This may be our last chance to solve this problem before the program's harmful effects begin.

Again, we need an opportunity to vote on this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it and to repeal the duplicative USDA Catfish Inspection Program.

I look forward to hearing what my colleague Senator MCCAIN has to say.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from New Hampshire for her support and continuing efforts to get rid of this wasteful, pork barrel, outrageous program that has cost the taxpayers tens of millions of dollars and with regard to the catfish office alone, about $20 million to date. As the Senator from New Hampshire pointed out, this could put the entire TPP—Trans-Pacific Partnership—Agreement in jeopardy. So this has a lot more to do with just catfish here; it has a lot to do with our international relations and the prospects of concluding or not concluding one of the most important trade agreements arguably of the 21st century, obviously.

I am pleased to join my colleagues, Senators SHAHEEN, AYOTTE, ISAKSON, KIRK, CRAPO, RISCH, CASEY, REED, PETERS, WYDEN, WARNER, CANTWELL, and MCCASKILL, in introducing this amendment, which has already been made pending to the trade promotion authority act, which would repeal a proposed Catfish Inspection Program at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The amendment would end the waste of taxpayer money pouring into the creation of a USDA catfish office, which is about $20 million to date. It would also save American farmers and livestock growers from potentially losing billions of dollars in lost market access to Asian nations.

As the Senator from New Hampshire pointed out, I have been fighting this catfish battle for a long time. I first tried to kill an old catfish-labeling program in the 2002 farm bill. Later, during the Senate's debate on the 2012 farm bill, I offered a similar amendment to repeal this new catfish program, which was adopted by voice vote. But when the Senate took up the 2014 farm bill after failing to pass it in 2012, I was blocked from having a vote by the Democratic manager despite her assurances that my amendment would receive a vote.

I note that my dear friend from Mississippi is here, and I know there may be others who will want to preserve this $14 to $20 million waste of taxpayer dollars. All I want is a vote. All I am asking for is an up-or-down vote on whether we should continue to squander millions of taxpayer dollars on a program that is not only duplicative but endangers the entire Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement we are discussing today.

American agriculture is the heart of our efforts to pass TPA, particularly as negotiators move closer to completing the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement. TPA can put wind in the sails of the 12-nation TPP, which will promote hundreds of billions of dollars of American exports, including beef, pork, poultry, soy, wheat, vegetables, and dairy products. The TPP covers an area of the world that accounts for about 40 percent of global GDP and one-third of all trade. The TPP will strengthen our security relationships with countries such as Japan, Malaysia, Vietnam, and Australia, and provide a strategic counterweight to Chinese protectionist influence. So it is our responsibility to pass a trade promotion authority that signals to Asian trading partners that we are serious about free trade.

Free trade is good for America. I am a representative of a State that has immeasurably benefited from the North American Free Trade Agreement.

By the way, many of the same interests and people who opposed that are opposing this now—i.e., primarily the labor unions.

Here, that means eliminating this catfish program, which is one of the most brazen and reckless protectionist programs that I have encountered in my time in the Senate. The purpose of the USDA catfish office is purportedly to make sure catfish is safe for human consumption. I am all in favor of ensuring that American consumers enjoy wholesome catfish. The problem is that the Food and Drug Administration already inspects all seafood, including catfish.

The true purpose of the catfish program is to create a trade barrier to protect a small handful of catfish farmers in two or three Southern States. Let's be clear about what this is all about—protecting catfish farmers in two or three Southern States. Yet, we are endangering the entire agreement here. That is not right, and it is not right for the American people.

In classic farm bill politics, southern catfish farmers worked up some specious talking points—which will probably be repeated here today—about how Americans need a whole new government agency to inspect catfish imports. As a result, USDA will soon hire and train roughly 95 catfish inspectors to work right alongside the FDA inspector doppelgangers in seafood-processing plants across the Nation. Experts say it could take as long as 5 to 7 years for foreign catfish exporters to duplicate USDA's new program, which would give southern catfish farmers a lock on the American seafood market.

Growing government is not cheap. To date, the USDA has spent $20 million to set up the catfish office without inspecting a single catfish. I am not making that up. Moving forward, the USDA estimates it will spend around $14 million a year once the program is operational.

GAO has investigated this catfish office and warned Congress in nine different reports—nine different reports to GAO, which is probably clearly the most trusted organization here—nine different reports. The catfish office should be repealed. It is wasteful and duplicative. The FDA already inspects seafood. It fragments our food inspection system. Nine different reports. One GAO report is simply titled ''Responsibility for Inspecting Catfish Should Not Be Assigned to USDA.'' The Government Accountability Office has repeatedly found that catfish inspectors are a phony issue and warned that implementing the USDA program might actually make food less safe for Americans by fragmenting seafood inspections across two Federal agencies.

Here are a few GAO excerpts.

GAO, May 2012:

USDA uses outdated and limited information as its scientific basis for catfish inspection. The cost effectiveness of the catfish inspection program is unclear because USDA would oversee a small fraction of all seafood imports while FDA, using its enhanced authorities, could undertake oversight of all imported seafood.

GAO, February 2013:

Congress should consider repealing provisions of the Farm Bill that assigned USDA responsibility for examining and inspecting catfish.

GAO, April 2014:

We suggested that Congress consider repealing these provisions of the 2008 Farm Bill. However, the 2014 Farm Bill instead modified these provisions to require the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Commissioner of FDA that would ensure that inspection of catfish conducted by the FSIS and FDA are not duplicative. We maintain that such an MOU does not address the fundamental problem, which is that FSIS's catfish program, if implemented, would result in duplication of activities and an inefficient use of taxpayer funds. Duplication would result if facilities that process both catfish and other seafood were inspected by both FSIS and FDA.

Even if my colleagues do not care about ballooning government spending and taxpayer waste, then consider the risk this catfish program presents to jobs and agriculture exports from their home States to an area of the world that accounts for 40 percent of the world's GDP and one-third of its trade.

Ten Asian-Pacific nations have sent letters to the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative warning that this USDA catfish office is hurting TPP negotiations. At least one nation—Vietnam—has threatened trade retaliation if the program comes online.

American trade experts are equally outraged. In a legal opinion written by the former chief judge at the World Trade Organization—the chief judge at the World Trade Organization said:

The United States would face a daunting challenge in defending the catfish rule . . . there was, and still is, no meaningful evidence that catfish—domestic or imported—posed a significant health hazard when Congress acted in 2008 . . . the complete lack of scientific evidence to justify the catfish rule combines with substantial evidence of protectionist intent.

He further notes that when it came to creating the USDA Catfish Inspection Program in the dead of night using a farm bill conference report—that is interesting, my colleagues; a farm bill conference report was how this whole thing came about—''Congress shot first and asked questions later.''

This is perhaps Mr. Bacchus's most poignant warning:

If Congress continues to mandate the transfer of jurisdiction over catfish, it will not only be inviting a WTO challenge to the rule; it will be giving other nations an opening to enact ''copycat legislation'' which will disadvantage our exports. Moreover, if the United States somehow prevails in defending the catfish measure in a WTO case, it will truly be ''open season'' in the rest of the world for new restrictions on U.S. agriculture exports of all kinds.

Mr. Bacchus is not alone in his assessment. The Wall Street Journal has covered this catfish debacle over the years. The Wall Street Journal has editorialized and reported on this many times.

This past weekend, the editorial board of the Wall Street Journal penned an editorial entitled ''Congress's Catfish Trade Scam.''

The Wall Street Journal, lead editorial, ''Congress's Catfish Trade Scam.''

''The U.S. slams a trade partner and raises prices for Americans.''

''Senate Democrats dealt a blow to economic growth Tuesday by refusing to advance . . . Japan, Vietnam,'' et cetera.

The problem dates to 2002, when Congress barred Vietnamese exporters from marketing as ''catfish'' an Asian cousin known as pangasius with similar taste, texture and whiskers. But that failed to curb American enthusiasm for the cheaper foreign creature, which is common in fish sticks and often called ''basa'' or ''swai'' on menus. So in 2003 Washington slapped tariffs on the Vietnamese fish, claiming they were ''dumped'' into the U.S. market at unfairly low prices.

That didn't work either, so Mississippi Republican Thad Cochran slipped a provision into the 2008 farm bill to transfer regulatory

responsibility over catfish, including pangasius, to the U.S. Department of Agriculture from the Food and Drug Administration. The pretext was public health, but pangasius posed no risk, and the USDA regulates meat and poultry, not fish. The real aim was to raise costs for Vietnamese exporters and drive them from the U.S. market.

Thus was born one of Washington's most wasteful programs, which the Government Accountability Office has criticized nine times and estimated to have cost $30 million to start, plus $14 million a year to operate—as opposed to the $700,000 annual cost of the original inspection regime. This is ''everything that's wrong about the food-safety system,'' said former FDA food-safety czar David Acheson recently. ''It's food politics. It's not public health.''

Pangasius imports continue for now as the USDA sets up its expensive new office, with the fish passing cod and crab last year to become America's sixth most-popular. (Shrimp is first.) Meanwhile, Vietnam has threatened to respond to a ban by demanding the right to retaliate against U.S. beef, soybeans and other products as part of TPP negotiations and suing the World Trade Organization, where it would probably win.

Most Members of Congress understand the damage, but Mr. COCHRAN has used his seniority to block repeal. The latest effort at repeal, sponsored by JOHN MCCAIN and nine other Republicans and Democrats, could get a vote when the Senate reconsiders the trade-promotion bill, then would have to go through the House. Ending catfish protectionism would be a sign that at least some in Washington are serious about free trade.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the aforementioned Wall Street Journal editorial.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 14, 2015]

CONGRESS'S CATFISH TRADE SCAM

Senate Democrats dealt a blow to economic growth Tuesday by refusing to advance the trade-promotion bill needed to complete the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade pact (TPP). Now Japan, Vietnam and other negotiating partners will look to see if Washington can salvage its trade agenda. They'll also be watching Congressional jockeying over catfish. Allow us to explain.

The problem dates to 2002, when Congress barred Vietnamese exporters from marketing as ''catfish'' an Asian cousin known as pangasius with similar taste, texture and whiskers. But that failed to curb American enthusiasm for the cheaper foreign creature, which is common in fish sticks and often called ''basa'' or ''swai'' on menus. So in 2003 Washington slapped tariffs on the Vietnamese fish, claiming they were ''dumped'' into the U.S. market at unfairly low prices.

That didn't work either, so Mississippi Republican Thad Cochran slipped a provision into the 2008 farm bill to transfer regulatory responsibility over catfish, including pangasius, to the U.S. Department of Agriculture from the Food and Drug Administration. The pretext was public health, but pangasius posed no risk, and the USDA regulates meat and poultry, not fish. The real aim was to raise costs for Vietnamese exporters and drive them from the U.S. market.

Thus was born one of Washington's most wasteful programs, which the Government Accountability Office has criticized nine times and estimated to have cost $30 million to start, plus $14 million a year to operate—as opposed to the $700,000 annual cost of the original inspection regime. This is ''everything that's wrong about the food-safety system,'' said former FDA food-safety czar David Acheson recently. ''It's food politics. It's not public health.''

Pangasius imports continue for now as the USDA sets up its expensive new office, with the fish passing cod and crab last year to become America's sixth most-popular. (Shrimp is first.) Meanwhile, Vietnam has threatened to respond to a ban by demanding the right to retaliate against U.S. beef, soybeans and other products as part of TPP negotiations and suing at the World Trade Organization, where it would probably win.

Most Members of Congress understand the damage, but Mr. Cochran has used his seniority to block repeal. The latest effort at repeal, sponsored by John McCain and nine other Republicans and Democrats, could get a vote when the Senate reconsiders the trade-promotion bill, then would have to go through the House. Ending catfish protectionism would be a sign that at least some in Washington are serious about free trade.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article dated June 27, 2014, entitled ''U.S. Catfish Program Could Stymie Pacific Trade Pact, 10 Nations Say''; a letter by Jim Bacchus dated May 14, 2015; a letter dated May 13, 2015, from the National Taxpayers Union, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Taxpayers Protection Alliance, and Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, all of them urging Congress to repeal the catfish program in TPA; a letter dated May 14, 2015, from the National Restaurant Association; and a letter dated April 22, 2015, from the Vietnamese Ambassador to the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 27, 2014]

U.S. CATFISH PROGRAM COULD STYMIE PACIFIC TRADE PACT, 10 NATIONS SAY

(By Ron Nixon)

WASHINGTON.—Ten Asian and Pacific nations have told the Office of the United States Trade Representative that the Agriculture Department's catfish inspection program violates international law, and their objections could hamper Obama administration efforts to reach a major Pacific trade agreement by the end of next year.

They say that the inspection program is a trade barrier erected under the guise of a food safety measure and that it violates the United States' obligations under World Trade Organization agreements. Among the countries protesting are Vietnam and Malaysia, which are taking part in talks for the trade agreement—known as the Trans-Pacific Partnership—and have the ability to derail or hold up those negotiations.

The complaints are outlined in a May 28 letter signed by diplomats from the 10 countries. The letter does not threaten retaliation, but it emphasizes that the American catfish program stood in the way of the trade talks.

Vietnam, a major catfish producer, has long complained about the program, but it has never before won international support for its fight. Several of the countries whose representatives signed the letter—including the Philippines, Myanmar, Thailand and Indonesia—do not have catfish industries to protect and are not involved in the trans-Pacific trade talks.

But the letter expresses the concern that the inspection program could lead the Agriculture Department to expand its ability to regulate seafood exports to the United States, catfish or not.

''Many of these countries are looking to see what happens to Vietnam on the catfish issues, and what precedents it might set for other trade deals in the region,'' said Jeffrey J. Schott, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics in Washington and the co-author of a book on the Trans-Pacific Partnership. The United States and 11 countries on both sides of the Pacific—as well as Australia, New Zealand and Brunei—are still negotiating the trade pact, which has been repeatedly delayed over various disputes.

The Vietnam Association of Seafood Exporters and Producers recently hired James Bacchus, a former chairman of the World Trade Organization's appeals panel, to prepare a possible legal challenge to the catfish inspection program.

Mr. Bacchus said in an interview that only governments have standing to bring a case before the trade organization, but that the export group was working closely with Vietnamese officials to monitor the catfish inspection program.

''I'm confident that Vietnam would have a case before the W.T.O. if they decided to bring one,'' said Mr. Bacchus, a former United States House member from Florida who is now a lawyer with Greenberg Traurig in Washington.

The inspection program was inserted into the 2008 farm bill at the urging of catfish farmers, who have been hurt by competition from both Vietnam and China and by the rising cost of catfish feed. The domestic catfish industry has shrunk by about 60 percent since its peak about a decade ago, and in the past few years about 20 percent of American catfish farming operations have closed.

The catfish industry and lawmakers led by Senator Thad Cochran, Republican of Mississippi, fought for the new office, saying it was needed to protect Americans from eating fish raised in unsanitary conditions or contaminated with drugs. The Food and Drug Administration has a similar program, but it inspects less than 2 percent of food imports, and advocates of the Agriculture Department program said that was not good enough.

The Agriculture Department has traditionally inspected meat and poultry, while the F.D.A. has been responsible for all other foods, including seafood.

Agriculture Department inspections are more stringent than those conducted by the F.D.A. The Agriculture Department also requires nations that export beef, pork and poultry to the United States to set up inspections that are equivalent to the agency's program—an expensive and burdensome regulation that Vietnam says is unnecessary for catfish. A Government Accountability Office report in May 2012 called imported catfish a low-risk food and said an Agriculture Department inspection program would ''not enhance the safety of catfish.''

The Agriculture Department said it had spent $20 million since 2009 to set up its office, which has a staff of four, although it has yet to inspect a single catfish. The department said it expected to spend about $14 million a year to run the program; the F.D.A., by comparison, spends about $700,000 annually on its existing seafood inspection office.

Senator John McCain, Republican of Arizona, and other critics say the Agriculture Department program is a waste of money, and Mr. McCain sponsored an amendment in the latest farm bill that would have killed the program. But the measure was never brought up for a vote. The Obama administration has also called for eliminating the Agriculture Department program.

MAY 14, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Senate Majority Leader.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Senate Minority Leader.

SENATORS MCCONNELL AND REID: As the Senate considers Trade Promotion Authority, Trade Adjustment Assistance, and related legislation, I wanted to make certain that you have the facts about the USDA Catfish Inspection Program and its implications for the United States in the world trading system. In particular, I want to make sure you are aware that the United States would face a daunting challenge in defending the catfish rule.

As background, I am a former Member of Congress, from Florida; a former international trade negotiator for the United States; and the former Chairman of the Appellate Body—the chief judge—for the World Trade Organization. In nearly a decade of service to the Members of the WTO as one of the seven founding judges on the highest global tribunal for world trade, from 1995 through 2003, I judged many of the most notable WTO trade disputes and wrote the legal opinions in many of the WTO trade judgments on issues relating to numerous aspects of both agricultural trade and food safety. Currently, I chair the global practice of the Greenberg Traurig law firm, for which I am writing in my capacity as counsel to the National Fisheries Institute.

As you will recall, the 2008 and 2014 Farm Bills contained language that would shift inspection of catfish from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to the United States Department of Agriculture's Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS). FDA currently regulates all seafood, and FSIS regulates beef, pork, and poultry. Supporters of the transfer of jurisdiction have reassured Senators that the USDA program would not create a problem for the United States under WTO rules because imported catfish would be subject to the same standards as American catfish.

This is not so. The legal test of whether a measure, as written or as applied, is consistent with WTO obligations is not whether it imposes the same standard on like domestic and imported products. The legal test in the WTO is whether such a measure, as written or as applied, denies an equal competitive opportunity to the like imported products in the domestic marketplace. The catfish measure promises to fail this fundamental legal test under international law.

It is not my intent here to list the entire catalogue of claims that would be likely to be brought against the United States in a ease in WTO dispute settlement by Vietnam and possibly by other affected Members of the WTO following implementation of the catfish measure by the USDA. There will be more than ample opportunity for doing so later in Geneva if the catfish measure is not repealed.

Suffice it to say that, if the catfish measure is not repealed, and if it is implemented by USDA as currently contemplated, quite a few strong claims could very likely be made in WTO dispute settlement by the affected trading partners of the United States under both the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (the GATT) and the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the SPS Agreement), which are both part of the overall WTO treaty.

Because WTO litigation is intensely fact-specific, and requires painstaking and extensive development and analysis of the measures being challenged, I am always reluctant to express a definitive opinion about a potential WTO case. Having judged so many WTO cases, I am less inclined than others to predict their outcome. This case, however, stands out for the egregiousness of its inconsistencies with WTO obligations. Quite rightly, the Congressional Research Service has quoted approvingly a Wall Street Journal opinion article that described the treatment of Vietnamese catfish in this measure as ''protectionism at its worst.''

Nothing good can result for the United States from applying the catfish measure.

Continuing with the implementation of the catfish measure would further complicate the efforts of US trade negotiators to secute significant concessions from Vietnam and others on other issues of considerable importance to US businesses and workers in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Losing a WTO case that challenged the catfish measure would, if the United States chose not to comply with the WTO ruling, give the complaining countries the right to retaliate against American agricultural and other products bound for their markets.

Perhaps worst of all for the United States would be winning a WTO case that challenged the catfish measure.

The United States has a long and contentious history of trying to overcome European and Asian trade barriers to our agricultural and food products that are justified as ''food safety'' measures but are in fact intended to block entirely safe American food exports. For this reason, the United States has long been the leading advocate for a strong SPS agreement that ensures that food safety measures will be based on real scientific evidence, including a serious risk assessment.

If Congress continues to mandate the transfer of jurisdiction over catfish, it will not only be inviting a WTO challenge to the rule; it will be giving other nations an opening to enact ''copycat legislation'' which will further disadvantage our exports. Moreover, if the United States somehow prevails in defending the catfish measure in a WTO case, it will truly be ''open season'' in the rest of the world for new restrictions on US agricultural exports of all kinds.

Sincerely,

JAMES BACCHUS,
Chair, Global Practice.

MAY 13, 2015.

DEAR SENATOR MCCAIN: The undersigned groups representing millions of taxpayers and allied educational bodies write in support of your efforts to repeal the duplicative catfish inspection program at the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) in S. 995, the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015. The undersigned groups have been vocal critics of the catfish inspection program that has spent $20 million over four years and not inspected a single fish. The Government Accountability Office has nine times listed the program as ''wasteful and duplicative;'' and it is one that the former Chief Judge of the highest court of international trade says will result in not just a trade war but also a lawsuit the U.S. will lose. Right now the program is on track to spend $15 million annually for the USDA to do a job the FDA is already doing.

Specifically on the issue of trade, according to an April 24, 2012 bipartisan letter to Senate Agriculture, Nutrition & Forestry Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow (D–Mich.), ''And beyond the fiscal implications, the catfish program has caused considerable concern among trade experts. According to them, the program would create a discriminatory de facto ban on exports from key trading partners and expose us to retaliation. . . . We are aware that no scientific data that catfish, imported or domestic, pose any greater food safety risk than other farmed seafood—all of which will remain under FDA regulation.''

Eliminating the duplicative USDA catfish inspection office was agreed to by voice vote in the 2013 Senate farm bill debate, yet inexplicably the Senate was never granted an opportunity to debate the merits of including this program in the 2014 farm bill. But now with Trade Promotion Authority, there is an opportunity to finally implement the will of the Senate and end the duplicative waste that the USDA catfish inspection program has continued to foster. We support your efforts to repeal the program restoring some measure of fiscal discipline and we urge your colleagues in the Senate to do the same.

Sincerely,

Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, National Taxpayers Union, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Taxpayers Protection Alliance.

NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2015.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the National Restaurant Association, I strongly urge you to support the bipartisan McCain-Shaheen catfish amendment to the Senate's pending trade related legislation. This amendment supports our nation's businesses, farmers, customers and taxpayers by removing funding for the duplicative U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) catfish inspection program.

During the 2008 Farm Bill Conference, language was added to transfer the responsibility for catfish inspections from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to the USDA.

The USDA has already spent $20 million drafting regulations and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) estimates that the USDA will spend $170 million over the next decade implementing the program. The GAO also found that implementation of the USDA catfish program will cost American taxpayers millions annually to provide a duplicative service because the FDA currently inspects all seafood, including catfish. Every U.S. facility that processes, handles, or distributes catfish would now be subject to duplicative regulation by both FDA and USDA.

As members of the foodservice industry, we are committed to food safety. However, this new program would provide no benefit. In fact, the USDA itself has stated that its Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS) would not provide additional food safety protection. The Agency's cost-benefit analysis also found no significant safety benefit in creating the program.

Finally, implementation of this program could strongly impact U.S. agricultural relations with key trading partners. This program would create a potential trade barrier to catfish imports and could violate the World Trade Organization Sanitary and Phyto-Sanitary agreement. It could also make U.S. agricultural exports susceptible to trade retaliation.

For these reasons, we encourage you to help our nation's businesses, farmers, customers and taxpayers by supporting the bipartisan McCain-Shaheen amendment.

Sincerely,

MATT WALKER,
Vice President, Government Affairs, National Restaurant Association.
LAURA ABSHIRE,
Director of Sustainability & Government Affairs, National Restaurant Association.

THE AMBASSADOR,
EMBASSY OF VIETNAM,
Washington, DC, April 22, 2015.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, Washington, DC.

YOUR HONORABLE: As ambassador of Vietnam to the United States, I am writing to bring to your attention to the concern of the Vietnamese Government related to the discussion on the TPA/TPP at the Senate Finance Committee under your leadership and seek your kind assistance on the matter.

The concern is related to the so-called ''catfish inspection program'' being transferred from the FDA to USDA, for the following reasons:

The USDA program is duplicative with the FDA and National Marine Fisheries Service.

It costs much more the U.S. tax payers and imposes unnecessary regulatory complexity for seafood processors, which in turn adds burden to the U.S. customers.

It adds nothing more to ensuring the safety of the products.

It creates an inappropriate trade barrier that violates the World Trade Organization (WTO) rules.

In particular, this provision is not in line with what is to be achieved for the TPP, which is based on high standards, including on trade liberalization.

The Government of Vietnam strongly urges that an amendment to be set up to repeal the above-mentioned provision in the process of consideration and approval of the TPA/TPP.

I count on your support in this regard. Please, accept, Your Honorable, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Yours sincerely,

PHAM QUANG VINH.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the National Restaurant Association sent a letter:

On behalf of the National Restaurant Association, I strongly urge you to support the bipartisan McCain-Shaheen catfish amendment to the Senate's pending trade related legislation. . . . As members of the foodservice industry, we are committed to food safety. However, this new program would provide no benefit. In fact, the USDA itself has stated that its Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS) would not provide additional food safety protection.

Finally, implementation of this program could strongly impact U.S. agricultural relations with key trading partners.

The Taxpayers Protection Alliance:

We support your efforts to repeal the program restoring some measure of fiscal discipline and we urge your colleagues in the Senate to do the same.

Mr. President, I understand that the parliamentary situation is that we have a number of pending amendments and that probably it is very likely that a cloture motion will be filed. That, of course, would then mean I would not be allowed to have this amendment.

If we do not allow this amendment, I have to say that we will be really showing a degree of contempt and arrogance for the taxpayers of America. I have watched this program and this incredible—I have seen $14 million wasted. I have seen an example of protectionism.

I was told in the last bill on agriculture that I would receive a vote on my amendment. All I am asking for is a straight up-or-down vote so we can save the taxpayers $14 million, $20 million, $30 million, $40 million on a program that is both wasteful and not needed.

I understand my colleagues from Mississippi and other Southern States want to protect their catfish industry, which I have enjoyed many samples of over the years. I do not understand the rationale for continuing—particularly under conditions of sequestration—any program that costs the taxpayers unending millions of dollars per year.

I urge my colleagues to demand a vote. All I am asking for is an up-or-down vote on an amendment that is clearly relevant to the consideration of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I want to add my support to the amendment Senator MCCAIN has just spoken to and my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN.

Absolutely we should have a vote on eliminating this duplicative inspection of catfish, what the Wall Street Journal is calling one of Washington's most wasteful programs, calling it the catfish scam.

In fact, we had testimony before the small business committee the other day, and I asked the representative of the FDA whether we need duplicative inspections of catfish because right now the FDA is inspecting catfish for $700,000 a year, and this duplicative inspection of it is estimated to cost over $14 million a year. In fact, there was already a study done by the National Fisheries Institute that the USDA had spent more than $20 million to have a duplicative inspection regime. As Senator MCCAIN mentioned, there are nine GAO reports about the fact that we are wasting taxpayer dollars on a duplicative inspection regime that we should eliminate.

The fact that we cannot get a vote on the Senate floor on such a wasteful use of taxpayer dollars—this is why people get frustrated with Washington when it is sitting right before us, and it is so obvious that we should not waste their money when we already have a perfectly good inspection regime that costs so much less versus this added inspection regime, which in the end is going to hurt jobs across this country, including jobs in New Hampshire, because it is going to create not only a duplicative program that wastes taxpayer dollars that common sense would tell us we should have a vote to eliminate, but it is also going to eliminate the opportunity for trade. The free-trade agreements that are currently being negotiated could mean over 8,200 jobs in my State.

James Bacchus, the former chief judge on the highest international tribunal of world trade and former Member of Congress, said this program will result not just in a trade war but also a lawsuit, and the United States will lose. Not only will we lose taxpayer dollars by not having a vote on this program and wasting money, but we will also create an unnecessary trade barrier that could impede future trade agreements and American jobs that can be created.

I offer my support for this amendment, and I do believe we should have a vote on this amendment. Why wouldn't we have a vote on a program that has demonstrated—by nine GAO reports—it has wasted millions of dollars which could otherwise be used to pay down our debt or put to good use in programs that are worthwhile. Yet here we are. We cannot even get a vote.

I share my colleague's concern. I thank Senator MCCAIN and Senator SHAHEEN for bringing this important amendment forward, and I hope we will have a vote to eliminate the wasteful money going into the USDA inspection regime of catfish.

How many times do we need our catfish inspected? It is absurd and time to end this waste and quit wasting taxpayer dollars.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I understand that Senator WYDEN has priority recognition at this time. I have been informed he does not object to me entering into the debate at this moment.

May I proceed on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. WICKER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, there are a couple of objectives this McCain amendment would accomplish. For one thing, it was in the 2008 farm bill. The current move to change the inspection from the FDA to the Department of Agriculture is in the current farm bill, and it is about to take place, so it would revisit the last two farm bills. I do not think we should be doing that in a trade promotion authority piece of legislation. Also, it is absolutely not duplicative. It can be said on the floor of the Senate 100 times, but the fact is that the USDA Catfish Inspection Program is not duplicative. It transfers inspection from the FDA to the USDA and the USDA has testified before Congress that when the program is operational, as it is about to be, the FDA program would be eliminated.

Why move it from the FDA to the USDA? Here is the reason: There are a few of us—under controlled situations—who grow most of the catfish that is produced in the United States on farms, including the State of Mississippi and the State of Arkansas.

My distinguished colleagues from Arkansas and Mississippi will speak on this issue in a few moments, I hope.

This is about food safety for Americans in 50 States who deserve to know that the fish they are eating—the product they are eating—is unadulterated.

Here are the facts: Under the current FDA program, only about 2 percent of the billions of pounds of imported catfish are inspected—only about 2 percent. The other 98 percent of this large

quantity come in uninspected. Now, that gives me pause as a consumer. It should give residents of all 50 States pause that 98 percent of the catfish which comes into our country is not inspected.

Here is what we do know about the 2 percent we look at under the FDA program: An alarming volume of the catfish inspected by the FDA already failed to meet standards. They failed to meet consumer safety standards. Many overseas productions are simply not operated under the sanitary conditions that we insist upon in the United States with our farm-raised catfish.

The FDA program does not ensure that trade partners have sufficient health standards nor does it inspect any overseas agriculture operations. They don't go over to Vietnam and look at the operations there and see the safety standards that cause the health risks.

What kind of health risks are we talking about? We are talking about cancer. I have in my hand a page from a draft rule by the Department of Agriculture, dated February 10, 2009. This is a draft rule from the Food Safety and Inspection Service. It turns out—and the GAO has been mentioned here—that the GAO got OMB to ask the FSIS to rework this statement and make it a little softer so we would not go so hard on imported Vietnamese catfish.

Here is what the Department of Agriculture report, which has now been buried, says as to whether or not the Agency used random or risk-based samplings: Applying the Food Safety Inspection Service program to imported catfish yielded a reduction of approximately 175,000 lifetime cancers for Americans—I want that kind of reduction from carcinogens coming into the United States—and 0.79 percent acute toxicities. Using random sampling in the Agency's program yielded a reduction of 91.8 million exposures to antimicrobials and 23.28 million heavy metal exposures. We are talking about carcinogens, we are talking about improper antimicrobials that the USDA program would catch, and over 23 million exposures to heavy metals that we don't need in the United States. Using risk-based sampling yielded a reduction of 95.1 million exposures to antimicrobials.

We are talking about a program that is not going to be duplicative because it is going to move—according to the last two farm bills—from the FDA to the USDA. This excessive government waste we have heard about will not exist, but we will have better safety for the consumers of the United States of America. That is why we do not need to revisit this issue, and that is why the McCain amendment should be rejected. That is why we should take every precaution we can to protect the American consumer, whether in their home kitchens or restaurants.

I yield the floor. Perhaps other of my colleagues would like to address this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the Senate has made clear the authority of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for imported catfish inspections. It has been debated and resolved in two previous farm bills; first, in 2008 and again in 2014. The USDA catfish inspection is about protecting the health and safety of American consumers. The 2008 and 2014 farm bills required catfish inspection responsibilities to be transferred from the Food and Drug Administration to the USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service upon publication of final regulations.

The need for this regulatory clarification is clear: American consumers could be exposed to dangerous chemicals and unapproved drugs in the imported catfish they eat. According to the Government Accountability Office, about half of the seafood imported into the United States comes from farm-raised fish. Fish grown in confined areas have been shown to contain bacterial infections. The FDA's oversight program to ensure the safety of imported seafood from residues of unapproved drugs is limited, especially as compared with the practices of other developed countries.

According to the Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, the Food and Drug Administration inspects only 1 percent of all imported seafood products. This is just not acceptable. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, on the other hand, inspects 100 percent of farm-raised meat products that enter the country, which illustrates why the Department of Agriculture is the appropriate Agency for farm-raised catfish inspections.

Following enactment of the catfish mandate in the 2008 farm bill, the Department of Agriculture conducted risk assessments on the dangers of exposure to foreign agriculture drugs and determined that moving catfish inspections under the USDA inspection system would result in a reduction of 175,000 lifetime cancers, 95 million exposures to antimicrobials, and 23 million heavy metal exposures.

The Catfish Inspection Program will enhance consumer safety but will not result in duplication activities by U.S. government agencies. Upon issuance of final regulations, catfish inspection responsibilities will be transferred to and not shared with the Department of Agriculture.

In order to address perceived concerns regarding duplication, a provision was included in the 2014 farm bill that required the FDA and USDA to enter into a memorandum of understanding to establish clear jurisdictional boundaries.

We consider that this is a time to resolve this issue and put this matter to rest. International equivalence is a concept that originated with the WTO and is regarded as a way to encourage the development of international food safety standards and will help this issue to be balanced fairly among all Members and facilitate our trade with other countries.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the Portman-Stabenow amendment.

First, I wish to say a word in support of the efforts by Senator COCHRAN and Senator WICKER. I was a partner with Senator COCHRAN in the 2014 farm bill. I support their position as it relates to the catfish provision. Hopefully, we will be able to retain that provision.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator HIRONO as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1299.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated September 23, 2013, signed by 60 U.S. Senators, that calls on the administration to include strong and enforceable currency provisions in all future trade agreements.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, September 23, 2013.

Secretary JACK LEW,
Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC.
Ambassador MICHAEL FROMAN,
Office of the United States Trade Representative, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY LEW AND AMBASSADOR FROMAN: We agree with the Administration's stated goal that the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) has ''high standards worthy of a 21st century trade agreement.'' To achieve this, however, we think it is necessary to address one of the 21st century's most serious trade problems: foreign currency manipulation.

Currency is the medium through which trade occurs and exchange rates determine its comparative value. It is as important to trade outcomes as is the quality of the goods or services traded. Currency manipulation can negate or greatly reduce the benefits of a free trade agreement and may have a devastating impact on American companies and workers.

A study by the Peterson Institute for International Economics found that foreign currency manipulation has already cost between one and five million American jobs. A free trade agreement purporting to increase trade, but failing to address foreign currency manipulation, could lead to a permanent unfair trade relationship that further harms the United States economy.

As the United States negotiates TPP and all future free trade agreements, we ask that you include strong and enforceable foreign currency manipulation disciplines to ensure these agreements meet the ''high standards'' our country, America's companies, and America's workers deserve.

Sincerely,

Lindsey Graham; Rob Portman; Debbie Stabenow; Ron Wyden; Jeff Merkley; Christopher Murphy; John Boozman; Elizabeth Warren; Al Franken; Jay Rockefeller; Barbara A. Mikulski; Benjamin L. Cardin; Tom Udall; Amy Klobuchar; Charles E. Schumer; Joe Manchin III; Robert Menendez; Heidi

Heitkamp; Claire McCaskill; Jeanne Shaheen; Mark Begich; Roy Blunt; Edward J. Markey; James M. Inhofe; Jeff Sessions; Kirsten E. Gillibrand; Saxby Chambliss; Robert P. Casey, Jr.; Christopher A. Coons; Carl Levin; Richard Burr; Jerry Moran; Patrick J. Leahy; Daniel Coats; James E. Risch; John Hoeven; Jack Reed; Tom Harkin; Tammy Baldwin; Joe Donnelly; Mark Pryor; Sheldon Whitehouse; Sherrod Brown; Susan M. Collins; Martin Heinrich; Bill Nelson; Richard Blumenthal; David Vitter; Bernard Sanders; Jon Tester; Angus S. King, Jr.; Richard Durbin; Brian Schatz; Mazie K. Hirono; Pat Roberts; Kay R. Hagan; Mary L. Landrieu; Chuck Grassley; Barbara Boxer; Tom Coburn.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, before speaking specifically to our amendment, I wish also to indicate that there are a number of very important amendments coming before us in this open debate process. I am pleased we have a number of amendments pending that, hopefully, will be offered and voted on that relate to other very important topics.

One of those topics is an amendment currently pending offered by Senator BROWN. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of that amendment. It will clarify the process for new countries to join the Trans-Pacific Partnership and to ensure that additional countries, including China, cannot join the agreement without congressional approval. So I hope we will get a vote on that amendment, which is certainly part of this whole discussion on currency manipulation when we look at Asia, when we look at Japan now, and when we look at China. This is an important amendment.

I also wish to indicate that I have terrific respect for the chairman of the Finance Committee. I wish to address an amendment that I believe will be offered as a side-by-side to the Portman-Stabenow amendment. I urge colleagues to reject what is essentially nothing more than a rewrite of pretty much the same weak language that exists in the underlying bill. It changes some words around. It basically would not put us on record as 60 Members of the Senate to make sure we have enforceable currency provisions in this trade agreement moving forward.

At this point in time, when we look at currency manipulation, it is the most significant 21st century trade barrier there is. To quote the vice president of international government affairs for Ford Motor Company in the Wall Street Journal:

> Currency manipulation is the mother of all trade barriers. We can compete with any car manufacturer in the world, but we can't compete with the Bank of Japan.

We want our businesses and we want our workers to have a level playing field in a global economy. When we are giving instructions—when we are giving up the right to amend the Trans-Pacific Partnership through this fast-track process involving 40 percent of the global economy—we have the right and obligation to make sure we have a negotiating principle in there. We are not mandating exactly what it looks like. We are just applying a negotiating principle that addresses the No. 1 trade barrier right now to American businesses, which is currency manipulation. By some estimates, it has cost the United States 5 million jobs. If we don't address it in this reasonable way, it will cost us millions more.

Our people, our workers, and our businesses are the best in the world. We know that, but they have to have a level playing field. Currency manipulation is cheating—plain and simple. A strong U.S. dollar against a weak foreign currency, particularly one that is artificially weak due to government manipulation, means that foreign products are cheaper here and U.S. products are more expensive there.

One U.S. automaker estimates the weak yen gives Japanese competitors an advantage of anywhere from $6,000 to $11,000 in the price of a car, not because of anything they are doing other than cheating by manipulating their currency. It is hard to compete with those kinds of numbers: $6,000 to $11,000 difference in the price of an automobile. At one point it was calculated that one of the Japanese company's entire profit on a vehicle was coming from currency manipulation.

Frankly, this is not about competing between—the U.S. going into Japan—that has also been a red herring. It is about the United States and Japan competing against each other in a global economy for the business of the developing countries. For instance, we are talking about Brazil having 200 million people. We are competing for that business. India has a population of 1.2 billion people. We are competing—Japan and the United States—for everything in between, everything else. That is what this is about, and it is about whether they are going to continue to be able to cheat.

Also, it is not just the auto industry. It is other manufacturers, as well. This is also about companies that are making washing machines or all kinds of equipment or refrigerators and all of the other products that we make and create using good middle-class jobs here in America.

It also affects agriculture. Anything that impacts the distortions in the economy affects agriculture and every other part of the economy.

So what we are asking for is something very simple and straightforward—very simple—which is that just as we have negotiating objectives in the TPA fast-track for the environment, for labor standards, and for intellectual property rights, we should have a negotiating objective that is enforceable regarding currency manipulation. We are not suggesting what that would look like in a trade agreement, any more than we are specifying exactly what the other provisions would look like. We are saying it is important enough that if we are giving up our right to amend a trade agreement—we are giving fast-track authority—currency manipulation is the No. 1 trade distortion, trade barrier right now in terms of the global marketplace, so we should make sure there is a negotiating principle there. We also say that it is consistent with existing International Monetary Fund commitments and it does not affect domestic monetary policy.

I have heard over and over that somehow what we do through the Fed is impacted. That is not accurate. We are looking, in fact, at over 180 countries that signed up under the International Monetary Fund, saying: We won't manipulate our currency. Yet, even though that has happened—we have seen, in fact, in the case of Japan, for the last 25 years, they have manipulated their currency 376 times. We should say enough is enough.

Now, I also understand we are hearing from the administration. By the way, I am very supportive of their efforts, this current administration's time on trade enforcement efforts. They have won a lot of excellent cases. I wish to commend them for that. I disagree with them on this one position, because they are saying, first of all, that Japan is no longer manipulating their currency—the Bank of Japan. OK, fine. The administration says if we put a negotiating objective into fast-track authority, Japan will walk away. Why would they walk away if they are not doing it anymore? Maybe they want to do it again right after we sign the TPP. Maybe they will do it again, and it will be 377 times. If they aren't doing it anymore, why should they care? It makes no sense.

Either we can trust them and they are no longer manipulating their currency or we can't trust them and we need this provision. It can't be both. Right now, what they are talking about makes no sense. Again, we are not talking about domestic policy; we are talking about direct intervention in foreign currency markets, and that if there is direct intervention in foreign currency markets, we would like to see meaningful consequences that fit with the IMF definitions that countries have all signed up for saying they will not manipulate their currency and that it should comply with WTO enforcement, as we do for every other trade distorting policy, every other trade barrier.

This is actually very straightforward. I am very surprised that it has not been accepted. Frankly, I would have gone further. In the Finance Committee I had an amendment I would love to do which says that TPP doesn't get fast-track authority unless it is clear that there are strong, enforceable provisions on currency in the agreement. This doesn't say that. This is a reasonable middle ground to say, for the first time, that currency manipulation is important, it is a negotiating principle, and we leave flexibility in terms of how that is designed, just as we do with other provisions.

We have strong bipartisan support for this amendment. I wish to thank

Senators BROWN and WARREN, Senators BURR and CASEY and SCHUMER, Senators GRAHAM, SHAHEEN, MANCHIN, KLOBUCHAR, COLLINS, BALDWIN, HIRONO, FRANKEN, MENENDEZ, and HEITKAMP for understanding and supporting this amendment. We have other support as well. I wish to thank Senator GRAHAM. He made a comment, because we care deeply—we were so pleased to get the Schumer-Graham-Brown-Stabenow and others' efforts in the Customs bill related to China and currency, which is so important and which we also need to get all the way to the President's desk. But we know that if we don't put language in the negotiating document we give to the White House, then we are not really serious. Senator GRAHAM said: This amendment is the real deal. That is firing with real bullets.

So if we are serious, if the 60 people who signed the letter are serious—and I hope and believe we are—then we need to make sure the negotiating position we take is to ask—and to direct—the administration to put this in the final negotiations on TPP.

We have, as I mentioned before, enforceable standards language on labor and environment and intellectual property rights. This is not complicated. We need to make sure we are clear on currency manipulation. The IMF has rules about what is and what is not direct currency manipulation. They are clear rules. There are 187 countries, in addition to Japan, that have already signed up saying they will abide by that definition. We just don't enforce it, and we have lost millions of jobs. Again, Japan, after signing, has intervened—the Bank of Japan has intervened 376 times in the last 25 years. We are being asked to rely on a handshake and good-faith assurances that there won't be 377 times. But we are being told if we even put language requiring a negotiating principle into this document, that somehow Japan will walk away. This makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. We have a responsibility, if we are giving up our rights to amend a document, to amend a trade agreement. If we are giving up our rights to require a supermajority vote in Congress, if we are doing that, we have a responsibility to the people we represent to make sure we have given the clearest possible negotiating objectives to the administration as to what we can expect to be in a trade agreement. That is what TPA is all about. If, in fact, currency manipulation is the mother of all trade barriers, why in the world would we not make it clear that currency manipulation should be a clear negotiating objective for the United States of America?

Let me just say again that we can compete with anybody and win. Our workers, our businesses, our innovation can compete with anybody and win. But it is up to us in Congress, working with the White House, to make sure the rules are fair. I hope colleagues will join us in passing the Portman-Stabenow amendment to make it clear we understand in a global economy what is at stake and that we are going to vote on the side of American businesses and American workers.

Thank you, Mr. President.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the Presiding Officer being my colleague from my State of Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 1251

Mr. President, with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, we are considering the largest trade deal in our Nation's history. Forty percent of GDP is affected by the Trans-Pacific Partnership. We have a responsibility to ensure this deal does not get any bigger without congressional approval. That is why I am offering this amendment, the so-called docking amendment, along with many of my colleagues, to prevent the Trans-Pacific Partnership from being a backdoor trade agreement with China. What does that mean? Right now, there is nothing in this trade legislation—nothing—that we are considering to prevent the People's Republic of China from joining the TPP at a later date. Without a formal process requiring congressional input and approval for countries like China to join the TPP, we might as well be talking about the China free-trade agreement.

This amendment spells out in law a detailed, important process, step by step, for future TPP partners to join the agreement. It does not say they cannot join; it just says here is how they join—because TPP and TPA seem to be silent on that.

Here is how it works. The President would be required to notify Congress of his or her intent to enter into negotiations with a country that wants to join the TPP. The notice period would be 90 days. During that time, the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee would have to vote to certify that the country considering joining the TPP is capable of meeting the standards of the agreement. It would stop sort of backdoor Presidential authority, whether it is President Obama or the next President making that decision. After that, both the Senate and the House would have to pass a resolution within the 90-day window approving that country joining the negotiations.

So if the President decides that he or she wants China to join these 12 Trans-Pacific Partnership countries, the President cannot do that unilaterally. The President needs to go through this process and ultimately bring it to a vote by Congress. Then the American people can have their say. If it is just done unilaterally and quickly and maybe even kind of quietly by the President, the public would have no input. But if it goes through the congressional process, the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee—I do not think we speak to the order of that—the notice period would be 90 days, so the country would then have 90 days to speak its mind about what we all think, we 300-some million people in this country think about this new country—not just China. That is obviously the most important, the most salient, the one we pay the most attention to—the second largest economy in the world. The implementing bill for that country to join the TPP would be subject to fast-track authority only if TPA were still in effect at that time. This process is vital to ensuring a public debate on what would be one of the most consequential economic decisions in a decade.

TPP, as we all know, already affects 40 percent of the world's GDP. If China piggybacks on this agreement, we will be looking at a sweeping agreement that will encompass the two largest economies on Earth. In fact, it would then perhaps be three; it would be the United States, then China, then Japan. A deal of that scale demands public scrutiny. A deal of that scale demands congressional input. A deal of that scale demands that the American public weigh in.

We know China already expressed interest in joining the agreement at the end of last year. News reports indicate they are monitoring these talks closely. Of course they are. We also know China manipulates its currency, even though Presidents Obama and Bush would not say that. We know they manipulate their currency. We know China floods our market with subsidized and dumped steel imports. We know China pursues an industrial policy designed to undercut American manufacturing.

Sitting in front of me is the junior Senator from the State of Washington, who has worked so hard and is on this floor to make sure it happens, that we reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. We know what China has done there to sort of end run the United States and what the failure of our doing that here would mean to even give greater advantages to China.

Mr. President, 2016 will mark China's 15-year anniversary in the World Trade Organization. We saw what happened after Congress, in 1999, 2000—that period—normalized trade relations with China. China became a member of the World Trade Organization. Fifteen years ago, our trade deficit with China was not much more than $15 billion a year. Today, our trade deficit with China is $25 billion a month. So it went

from $15 billion to a factor of $300 billion—all in the space of 15 years. Think about that.

We know what Presidents over time have said about trade deficits—that when we have a trade deficit of $1 billion, what that means for lost jobs. It means we are buying $1 billion worth of goods more than we are selling to that country. Every day with China, we buy $1 billion more of goods—every day almost $1 billion—$900 million, roughly, more than we sell to China every day. We know what that means on job loss. We are not making it in the United States. They will make it in China. The workers in China are making it, not the workers in the United States. So that trade gap with China represents a huge percentage of our total U.S. trade deficit. Meanwhile, China continues to thwart the rules with impunity.

We have focused on integrating China into the international system—something we want to do—but we only hope it will comply with the rules we should follow. We give China chance after chance, pushing for increased engagement. China continues to play by its own rules. Currency manipulation is a good example.

I appreciate the Presiding Officer's work on that issue, on currency manipulation. That should be voted on in this body in the next, I assume, 48 years.

Year after year, the U.S. Treasury says China's currency is significantly undervalued. Year after year, we give China a chance—another chance, another chance—to change its monetary policy, but we will not call China a currency manipulator. President Bush would not do it. President Obama would not do it. Up to 5 million American workers have lost their jobs. Our trade deficit has grown by hundreds of billions of dollars due to currency manipulation.

We have clear evidence that China disregards international trade laws. Why would we think it would be any different if they get a backdoor entry into the Trans-Pacific Partnership? That is why we cannot allow TPP to become a backdoor way to pass a free-trade agreement with China without a vote in Congress.

I know Senator MENENDEZ has raised these concerns for a while. I appreciate that support and the support of our other cosponsors on this issue.

This amendment is not a poison pill. All this amendment does is clarify the process for new countries to join the TPP, should it pass. It does not say we cannot bring in new countries. It does say that Congress has to vote on it. Congressional approval is not required for additional non-Communist countries to join WTO agreements after the United States enters into them. We need this amendment to prevent that same so-called docking process from being used with the TPP. China and those countries like China that are not market economies are differently structured economies, different kinds of countries. We are not saying: No, never. You cannot enter into the TPP. We are simply saying Congress should have a say in it and, most importantly, the public should be able to speak out on this and have a period of time to talk to their Members of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to join me in adopting this critical amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following Senator WARREN's remarks, I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I want to start by saying thank you to Senator BROWN for his extraordinary leadership on this issue and his determination that voices be heard around this country on this trade debate, that the people who are actually affected be heard from. I say thank you very much to Senator BROWN for all he has done here.

AMENDMENT NO. 1327

Mr. President, I join with Senator HEITKAMP, Senator MANCHIN, and a number of other Senators to propose a simple change to the fast-track bill, a change that would prevent Congress from using this expedited process on any trade deal that includes so-called investor-state dispute settlement provisions. I come to the floor to urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

ISDS is an obscure process that allows big companies to go to corporate-friendly arbitration panels that sit outside any court system in order to challenge laws they don't like. These panels can force taxpayers to write huge checks to those big corporations, with no need to file a suit in court, no appeals, and no judicial review.

Most Americans don't think the minimum wage or antismoking regulations are trade barriers, but a foreign corporation used ISDS to sue Egypt after Egypt raised its minimum wage. Tobacco giant Philip Morris went after Australia and Uruguay to stop their rules to cut smoking rates. Under the TPP, corporations can use these corporate-friendly panels to challenge rules right here in America.

It wasn't always this way. ISDS has been around for a while, and from 1959 to 2002 there were fewer than 100 claims in the whole world. But, boy, has that changed. In 2012 alone, there were 58 cases. Corporate lawyers have started figuring out just how powerful a tool these panels can be for corporate clients. The huge financial penalties that these cases can impose on taxpayers have already caused New Zealand to give up on some tough antismoking rules. It has already caused Germany to pull back from clean water protections, and it has caused Canada to stand down on environmental protections.

If that worries you, you are not alone. Experts from all over the political spectrum—conservatives and liberals, economists and legal scholars on the left and the right, opponents of trade deals and supporters of trade deals—have all argued that these corporate-friendly panels should be dropped from our future trade deals.

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said that we should not give ''investors the power to sue foreign governments to weaken their environmental and public health rules.''

Nobel Prize-winning economist Joe Stiglitz, Harvard law professor Laurence Tribe, and other top American legal experts noted that ''the threat and expense of ISDS proceedings have forced nations to abandon important public policies'' and that ''laws and regulations enacted by democratically elected officials are put at risk in a process insulated from democratic input.''

The head of the trade policy program at the conservative CATO Institute has said that ISDS ''raises serious questions about democratic accountability, sovereignty, checks and balances, and the separation of powers''—concerns that ''libertarians and other free market advocates should share.''

ISDS is a major part of the reason why, no matter what promises are made, huge trade deals often just tilt the playing field further in favor of big multinational corporations. If a country wants to adopt strong new protections for workers, such as an increase in the minimum wage, a corporation can use these corporate-friendly panels to seek millions—or billions—in taxpayer compensation because the new rules might eat into the company's profits.

But, boy, it doesn't work in the other direction. If a country wants to undermine worker rights by allowing child labor or slave labor or paying workers pennies an hour, there is no special worker-friendly process for challenging that. Instead, advocates for workers are stuck begging their governments to bring enforcement actions and protect their rights. That process can take years, if the government responds at all. In fact, just yesterday my office released a 15-page report detailing how for decades both Republican and Democratic Presidents made the same promises over and over and over again about how good these deals would be for workers, and both Republican and Democratic Presidents failed to enforce the labor standards promises in those trade agreements.

Giving corporations special rights to challenge our laws outside our legal system is a terrible idea. Experts from every place on the political spectrum have concluded that it is unfair, it undermines the rule of law, it threatens American sovereignty, and it creates an end-run around the democratic process. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so we can keep

these corporate-friendly panels out of future trade agreements.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 1312

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, last week the Senate voted 97 to 1 to reauthorize the African Growth and Opportunity Act—AGOA—for 10 years. It was first enacted in 2000, so the 10 years were up and we had to get it reinstated. It provides the African countries with duty-free access on most of their exports to the United States.

I have long been a supporter of AGOA. The program has done a lot to improve our trade relationship with the continent of Africa, primarily sub-Saharan Africa. Since 2002, annual trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa has increased by almost 50 percent. So it is very successful. It has also been estimated by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that it has had the effect of increasing 300,000 jobs in sub-Saharan Africa and 100,000 jobs here in the United States.

Trade with Africa is important because many of the world's fastest growing economies are in Africa. According to an analysis that was done for The Economist magazine, six of the world's fastest growing economies were in sub-Saharan Africa in the 10 years it has been in effect.

This is going to continue. I have seen it firsthand. Every time I go to Ethiopia, Rwanda, Tanzania or many of the other countries in Africa, I see more and more cranes going up and bigger and better buildings. It is really a live spot in the world. The infrastructure in places like Rwanda and Tanzania is high quality. People who go to Rwanda come back with memories of something that is a modern city, not a Third World country, as it has been in the past.

So we have really good things going on there, and we need to continue to build on their trade, infrastructure, roads, highways, seaports, railways, and airports to help their economies grow.

For too long sub-Saharan Africa has been ignored as a trading partner by the United States. I have been to Africa probably more than any other Members have. In fact, there was something very critical of me just last weekend in the press—if I can find it here I will state what it was—anyway, they were critical of the attention I have been paying to Africa.

I can remember when the United States had the same problem. We ignored Africa. Back when we were going into Bosnia, I was kind of leading the effort to keep Americans from going into Bosnia. This was during the Clinton administration. The excuse they were using was that we had to get into Bosnia because of ethnic cleansing. I said on the Senate floor, for every person who has been ethnically cleansed in Bosnia, there are 100 in West Africa.

Just last weekend, ''Vice,'' a satirical show on HBO, tried to connect me to a law drafted by the Parliament in Uganda that was antigay. I have always opposed this law and had nothing to do with it. However, there are things that are going on in all these countries that need to be looked into.

My work in Uganda started many years ago to help bring an end to the Lord's Resistance Army. A lot of people are fully aware of the LRA now, but they weren't back then. There was one individual, Joseph Kony, who was going into the various areas of Northern Uganda and was kidnapping the little kids. They called them ''the children's army.'' The young people would be kidnapped out of their village and then be forced to learn to join their little army, to kidnap other people. If they refused, they were forced to go back to their villages and murder their parents. That is the LRA, and we finally are making progress there.

Other countries around the world are not ignoring Africa's potential as we have been. Brazil and China have secured preferential trade agreements with Africa. Every time you see something new and shiny in Africa, it comes from China. Economic Partnership Agreements of the European Union have also been signed. So we are kind of left out. This AGOA has been a worthwhile program.

We need to start looking ahead to the future. Nearly a billion people who live in sub-Saharan Africa and individual countries over the next decade or two will reach the point where they are competing head-to-head with many other countries around the world.

Our thinking about trade with Africa needs to be mature as their economies grow. That is why Senator COONS and I have offered the African Free Trade Initiative Act, amendment No. 1312 to the trade promotion authority act. We are doing it jointly. This amendment requires the President to establish a plan to negotiate and enter into free-trade agreements with our friends in sub-Saharan Africa. African nations want to enter into free-trade agreements with us. When I was in Tanzania earlier this year, I met with Richard Sezibera. Richard Sezibera is the Secretary General of the East African Community, which is made up of Rwanda, Uganda, Burundi, Tanzania, and Kenya. Richard Sezibera told me he wants their Eastern African Community to enter into a free-trade agreement with the United States—just those five countries. This makes sense because FTAs bind business communities together and can pay long-term national security and foreign policy dividends.

While some in our government may not deem sub-Saharan African countries ''ready'' for an FTA with us, our amendment requires the administration to articulate what each country needs to do to get ready. It is not enough for them just to say they are not ready to be associated with us in this type of a treaty. The amendment also requires the administration to determine what kind of resources might be needed to help the countries get ready for an FTA with us. Between the Millenium Challenge Corporation and USAID, we have had a lot of resources going into sub-Saharan African countries to help their economies develop, and many outside aid organizations and other countries do as well. It makes sense to identify which of these resources could be channeled for the purpose of developing a free-trade agreement with us.

We had a great guy. Unfortunately, he is leaving USAID. His name is Raj Shah. He has taken a personal interest in Africa, in developing relations with Africa.

USAID has a large trade focus, but much of its work is geared toward helping small businesses in places like Tanzania grow their exports. Now, this is good. It is a good thing to do, but they should also be working at higher levels to improve the trade activities of these economies as a whole. They can do this by working with our African friends, helping them prepare for a broader trade relationship with the United States, either by helping them identify how they can improve their agriculture safety regulations or general private property rights. To that end, our amendment authorizes USAID to use its appropriations to help implement the strategy that will be developed under this amendment.

The Senate just reauthorized AGOA for another 10 years. In the next 10 years, we should be considering one or more free-trade agreements with our partners in sub-Saharan Africa. Our amendment will help this desire become a reality.

As I said, our government and the media have to get beyond their opposition to Africa, and hopefully we will be able to be doing that before long. If we don't make free-trade agreements with Africa a priority, then I think we will find ourselves here in 10 years and see a much stronger, highly competitive African economy. We will be reauthorizing AGOA again and asking ourselves: Why didn't we push to enact free-trade agreements with these countries? We would rather not find ourselves there. If we don't do it, China will, and we should be the ones writing the rules for trade in Africa, just as we are trying to do in Asia.

So I appreciate the support of Senator COONS and others on this amendment, and hopefully it can be adopted to the free-trade promotion authority bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, as we continue to debate and file amendments to the trade promotion authority, the fast-track legislation, I ask unanimous consent to make two amendments pending and ask that the pending amendment be set aside and

call up my amendment No. 1233 and amendment No. 1234.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. CANTWELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I was under the impression that we would be able to have discussion and debate on the legislation before us. My two amendments would deal with two very serious issues. I am disappointed that we have an objection.

My first amendment, 1233, would ensure that any changes to U.S. law or policy are passed by Congress. Specifically, if implementing legislation allowed future changes to be made to a trade agreement that could affect or overrule existing U.S. law without Congressional approval, then that legislation could not be fast-tracked. The implementing legislation would have to guarantee that all future changes would have to be approved by Congress. I think that is perfectly appropriate, and it is an absolute responsibility of Congress to ensure its own authority in matters of these kind.

Indeed, the Constitution gives plenary authority to Congress over immigration law and trade. Under this amendment that I have offered, Congress cannot delegate the power to change U.S. law to the Executive—Congress cannot do that and must not do that—or to some international body that would be created if this trade agreement—the Trans-Pacific Partnership—enters into force. This is not made clear under the current bill.

Colleagues, we need to think about this commission—an international commission—that will be created with 11 trading partners in the TPP. This commission will be given power, and our trading partners will be given powers if Congress approves this, presumably. Under the TPP, that commission is given the authority to amend the trade agreement that is initially passed if they find that circumstances have changed and they desire to change it.

This is called the 'living agreement' provision. The 'living agreement' provision explicitly states these things in this trade agreement. The term 'living agreement' should make our hair stand up on the backs of our necks because this is a dangerous thing. What it means is that the commission can alter the agreement. We want to be sure that if this commission alters the agreement—assuming the TPP enters into force—that it is not given the power to change U.S. law, even if the President agrees.

There is another question. Senator BROWN, I think, has offered an amendment on this question, and my amendment would also fix it. It deals with the admission of new countries into the 11 party—12, counting the United States—TPP trade agreement. It is pretty clear. This commission has the power to admit new members. It says: With regard to the amendment process of the commission, that the process will look similar to that of the World Trade Organization. We have shared this with Senator HATCH and his fine staff. I think they understand what we are talking about here.

This suggests that TPP procedures are likely to mirror WTO procedures. Well, the United States has had a long-term problem with the World Trade Organization because we approved the World Trade Organization and passed legislation implementing that agreement, and we did not realize it allowed new members to be admitted without a vote of Congress. So under TPP, if it mirrors the WTO rules for amendments and accessions, the new members—it appears quite plain to me—could be admitted by just 8 of the 12 TPP members—not a unanimous vote as NATO requires or the European Union requires.

At one point, the TPP says there must be ''consensus,'' but then it talks about WTO. WTO does not require consensus on everything. So I have to say, colleagues, that, first and foremost, I do not know why we have to create a new commission—a transnational commission that has the ability to discipline the United States, to impose penalties on the United States by what might be a two-thirds vote under a number of circumstances, and create additional constraints on the ability of this great Nation to function.

I do not know why we would not be better off dealing—as we have done with other countries—with bilateral trade agreements between the two of us, not creating some international body such as the United Nations, the WTO, or as Europe has done with the European Union.

So I am disappointed that we are not going to be able to have my amendment to address this called up now, because if they can block this amendment from being called up, this amendment can be shut out altogether. That is the fact. The train would be advancing without real debate and without a real opportunity for this concept to be addressed and voted on by Members of Congress. I am sure people would rather not have it come up—would rather not have questions about this agreement be raised. I think it is a legitimate question. I would urge my colleagues to continue to evaluate the amendment and to see if we cannot get it up pending. Let's have a vote on it, and let's adopt it.

Now, I also have offered amendment No. 1234. First, my previous amendment was No. 1233. This would be 1234. It would hold the Obama administration and the United States Trade Representative to their assurances that no trade agreement will be used to change U.S. immigration law or policy. This has been done in the past to a significant degree. It resulted in Chairman SENSENBRENNER and ranking member CONYERS writing a letter saying: Never again should any trade agreement amend immigration law.

That is the province of the Congress, according to the Constitution. In 2003, I offered a resolution after a past trade agreement did just that—bypassed Congress' authority over immigration law. The resolution passed unanimously. Senator FEINSTEIN and other Democrats signed on. It said: Never again will immigration law be amended as part of a trade agreement. Trade agreements are not the way to change law of the United States, especially when you have a President who is rewriting immigration law, enforcing immigration law that Congress explicitly rejected through his Executive amnesty.

So my amendment is modeled after the Congressional Responsibility for Immigration Act of 2003, a bill sponsored by our Democratic colleagues, Senators LEAHY, FEINSTEIN, and Kennedy—former Senator Kennedy, our former colleague. It would prohibit the application of fast-track authority procedures to any implementing bill that affects U.S. immigration law or policy or the entry of aliens, if an implementing bill or trade agreement violates those terms.

Then, any Member could raise a point of order against the implementing bill, ensuring that the bill is considered under regular Senate procedures allowing amendment and debate. Look, now they tell us that we should not be concerned. Colleagues, we have heard it said that this will not happen—no future trade agreements will affect U.S. immigration law. All right, but I am a little nervous about that. I have been watching the language on this. Senator GRASSLEY, at the Finance Committee hearing a few weeks ago, asked the Trade Representative, Mr. Froman, this:

> My question: Could you assure the committee that the TPP agreement or any side agreement does not and will not contain any provision relating to immigration, visa processing or temporary entries of persons?

That is a good question—simple question. They have been indicating not. His answer sounds good at first blush.

> Thank you, Senator Grassley. And the answer is yes, I can assure you that we are not negotiating anything in TPP that would require any modifications of the U.S. immigration laws or system, any changes of our existing visa system, and in fact the TPP explicitly states that it will not require any changes in any party's immigration law or procedures. Now the 11 other TPP countries are making offers to each other in the area of temporary entry, but we have decided not to do so. So I appreciate the opportunity to clarify that.

So we have decided not to do so—now, at this moment, before the trade agreement is up for approval by Congress, knowing it would be controversial if the implementing bill included immigration changes. But that does not mean we are not party to any immigration provisions in the TPP that could be used to make changes later. One of the chapters in the agreement deals with immigration and temporary entry. I do not see anything that would prohibit the current administration or

a new administration from trying to use this trade agreement to advance an immigration agenda.

So if the Trade Representative really means it when he assures us there will be no changes in the future, then I would suggest my amendment would be something that Ambassador Froman would be delighted to support to keep us from having this problem and to remove this potential controversy from the legislation. I think it would also—for those who want to see it passed—enhance the opportunity to pass the legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, this week we are considering legislation that could have real importance for our country over the next several years on the economic front and also on the national security front. That legislation is trade promotion authority.

Trade promotion authority helps the United States negotiate strong trade deals that benefit American farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers and expand opportunities for American workers. Under TPA, Congress sets guidelines for trade negotiations and outlines the priorities the administration must follow. In return, Congress promises a simple up-or-down vote on the resulting trade agreement, instead of a long amendment process that could leave the final deal looking nothing like what was originally negotiated.

The promise of that up-or-down vote sends a powerful message to our negotiating partners that Congress and U.S. trade negotiators are on the same page, which gives other countries the confidence they need to put their best offers on the table.

That, in turn, allows the United States to secure trade deals that are favorable to U.S. workers and to businesses and to open new markets to products that are marked ''Made in the U.S.A.'' Almost every one of the 14 trade agreements to which the United States is a party was negotiated using trade promotion authority. Currently, the administration is negotiating two major trade agreements that have the potential to vastly expand the market for American goods and services in the EU and in the Pacific.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is being negotiated with a number of Asia-Pacific nations, including Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore, and Vietnam. If this agreement is done right, it will benefit a number of industries, including an industry that is very important to my State; that is, agriculture.

Currently, American agricultural products face heavy tariffs in many Trans-Pacific Partnership countries. Poultry tariffs, for example, in TPP countries go up to a staggering 240 percent. That is a tremendous obstacle for American producers. Reducing the barriers that American agricultural products face in these countries would have enormous benefits for American farmers and ranchers in my home State of South Dakota and across the country.

In fact, one pork producer in my State contacted me to tell me that a successful TPP deal could increase U.S. pork exports to just one of the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries by hundreds of millions of dollars. I know that is important in my State, important in the Presiding Officer's State, and important in every agricultural State across this Nation.

That is why former Agriculture Secretaries from both parties, representing every administration going back to President Carter, issued a joint letter in February emphasizing the importance of trade to farmers and ranchers and urging passage of trade promotion authority. They wrote in that letter:

> Access to export markets is vital for increasing sales and supporting farm income at home. Opening markets helps farm families and their communities prosper.

It is not every day that you see former members of both Democratic and Republican administrations coming together to advocate a particular policy.

I would say that this is the free and fair trade for a healthy economy that describes precisely what it is that we are talking about. We are talking about more exports for American agricultural products, manufactured goods, digital goods—you name it, across the board. What that means is more jobs and higher take-home pay for American workers.

The bipartisan agreement isn't limited to former Agriculture Secretaries who have come out in support of it. Ten former Treasury Secretaries—again, representing administrations of both political parties—came together to draft their own letter, stressing the importance of trade promotion authority and securing favorable agreements for our country. They said:

> Our support for open trade agreements is based on a simple premise. Expanding the size of the market where American goods and services can compete on a level playing field is good for American workers and their families. Expanded international trade means more American jobs and higher American incomes. It means greater access for American businesses to markets and consumers around the world, and it means lower prices for American families here at home.

That is from former Treasury Secretaries of this country representing both political parties.

Still another bipartisan group of former administration officials came together this month to urge support for trade promotion authority. This time it was seven former Secretaries of Defense, as well as a number of retired military leaders.

Their letter emphasizes another important aspect of trade that often gets overlooked in these discussions, and that is its national security implications. Discussions of the benefits of trade tend to focus on the economic benefits, of which there are many. So it is with good reason that we talk about the economy, jobs, and higher wages. But the new trade agreements have the potential to result not only in economic gains for American farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers but in national security gains for our country.

When we make trade deals with other countries, we are not just opening new markets for our goods. We are also developing and cementing alliances. Trade agreements build bonds. They build bonds of friendship with other nations that extend not only to cooperation on economic issues but to cooperation on security issues as well.

Two major trade agreements the United States is currently considering, the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, have the potential to provide significant strategic benefits for our country.

These agreements—these are the Defense Secretaries writing—''would reinforce important relationships with important allies and partners in critical regions of the world. By binding us closer together with Japan, Vietnam, Malaysia, and Australia, among others, TPP would strengthen existing and emerging security relationships in the Asia-Pacific. . . . In Europe, TTIP would reinvigorate the transatlantic partnership and send an equally strong signal about the commitment of the United States to our European allies.''

That is again from the letter coming from seven former Defense Secretaries representing administrations of both political parties.

The Secretaries go on to note:

> The successful conclusion of TPP and TTIP would also draw in other nations and encourage them to undertake political and economic reforms. The result will be deeper regional economic integration, increased political cooperation, and ultimately greater stability in the two regions of the world that will have the greatest long-term impact on U.S. prosperity and security.

In other words, these agreements will not only provide our Nation with significant economic benefits, they will also make a crucial contribution to our national security. The Defense Secretaries and military leaders also highlight another key point. Just because the United States isn't negotiating trade agreements doesn't mean other countries won't be.

The fact that the United States hasn't signed a single trade agreement over the past 5 years hasn't prevented other countries from signing numerous trade agreements over the same period. In fact, there are more than 260 trade agreements in effect around the globe today, but the United States is only a party to 14 of those.

If America fails to lead on trade, other nations, such as China, are going to step in to fill the void. And these nations will not have the best interests of American workers and American families in mind.

Free and fair trade agreements are essential for growing our economy and

ensuring that products marked ''Made in the U.S.A.'' can compete on a level playing field around the globe. They are also an essential tool for strengthening our relationship with our allies, which is of particular concern now with so many areas of instability around the globe. Trade promotion authority provides the best way of securing these agreements.

The bipartisan legislation that we are considering this week reauthorizes trade promotion authority and includes a number of valuable updates, such as provisions to strengthen the transparency of the negotiating process and to ensure that the American people stay informed. It also contains provisions that I have pushed forward to require negotiators to ensure that trade agreements promote digital trade as well as trade in physical goods and services.

Given the increasing importance of digitally enabled commerce in the 21st century economy, it is essential that our trade agreements include new rules that keep digital trade free from unnecessary government interference. I have previously introduced legislation to help ensure that the free flow of digital goods and services is protected, and I am pleased that the bipartisan deal that was reached includes many of the very measures I have advocated.

Democrats and Republicans in the Senate have repeatedly come together this year to pass legislation to address challenges that are facing our country. I hope we will see the same type of bipartisanship on this bill. This legislation will benefit American farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers. It will help to open new markets for American workers, and it will benefit American families. And it will help make our country more secure.

The President supports this legislation. A number of Senate Democrats are working with Republicans to get this done.

I hope that the rest of the Democrats in the Senate will join us to pass this important bill for American workers and businesses and make trade promotion authority legislation our next bipartisan achievement for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT MATTHEW RYAN AMMERMAN AND CORPORAL JORDAN SPEARS

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, Memorial Day is next week, so I wish to take a moment to remember and recognize the courageous men and women of the Armed Forces who lost their lives serving in the line of duty this past year.

Indiana lost two of its own, Army SSG Matthew Ryan Ammerman and Marine Cpl Jordan Spears, two young men who selflessly chose service to their country and gave the ultimate sacrifice.

SSG Matthew Ryan Ammerman of Noblesville served three tours of duty, two in Afghanistan and one in Iraq. A decorated soldier who received multiple medals during his career, Staff Sergeant Ammerman joined the Army in July of 2004. He deployed to Iraq in 2006 and then to Afghanistan in 2009. He went on to graduate as a Special Forces communications sergeant in 2013 before deploying to Afghanistan the following year as part of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Staff Sergeant Ammerman was killed on December 3, 2014, when his unit came under fire while conducting operations in Zabul Province. He was 29 years old. He is survived by his wife and two brothers.

Cpl Jordan Spears' childhood dream was to become a marine. His dad said he was so proud to wear the Marine uniform. He was a native of Memphis, IN. Corporal Spears met with a recruiter when he was 17 and wanted to be deployed, his dad said.

He was deployed in July of 2014 to the USS *Makin Island* for U.S. military operations against ISIS. Corporal Spears was lost at sea on October 1, 2014, while conducting flight operations in the North Arabian Gulf. He was 21 years old. He is survived by his parents and five siblings who loved him very much.

Indiana grieves for the loss of these two, extraordinary Hoosiers, as our country aches at the loss of many more husbands, wives, dads, moms, sons, and daughters. The loss of these heroes will not just be felt this Memorial Day. They will be missed at the dinner table, at birthday celebrations, at holidays, and beyond. This is a reality many military families must cope with.

Let us take a moment to stand beside every military family for the tremendous weight they often carry for their service to this great Nation.

And to the families and friends of Staff Sergeant Ammerman and Corporal Spears, we all send our continued thoughts and prayers. Hoosiers will never forget your loved one's sacrifice to this country.

Memorial Day provides us an additional opportunity to reflect on the bravery of the few who ensure the freedom, the safety, and the way of life for all of us. We will always be grateful to America's heroes, the service men and women in the Armed Forces, and their loved ones.

As a Senator for Indiana and on behalf of all Hoosiers, let us thank all the men and women in uniform for standing the watch and honor the memory of all who are no longer with us for their bravery, their courage, and their patriotism.

God bless Indiana and God bless America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to talk about the trade debate we are having in the Senate. I know we have heard a lot of debate on both sides.

I wish first to talk about some of the background before I get to what is in front of us in terms of the process in voting, amendments, and things like that.

I represent the State of Pennsylvania, which, like many States, suffered through the devastation of not just the 1980s—when it comes to job loss in, for example, the steel industry, we know that, for example, in a very short timeframe, about 5 years, for example, the steelworkers lost half of their jobs in southwestern Pennsylvania—in just those 5 years. They went from around 90,000 steelworkers down to below 45,000 in just 5 years. That is only one example of job loss that families in southwestern Pennsylvania have lived through, as well as other examples from around the State that we don't have time to recite today.

So that is kind of the backdrop. And, thank goodness, the steel industry and the steelworkers came together and were able to recover somewhat—obviously, not fully, but they were able to recover over time. And in that time period—we are getting into the 1990s and then into the 2000s—we have had a lot of assertions made that if a trade agreement is brought into effect, we would have job growth and it would help those who had been displaced.

But, unfortunately, what has happened over time is that folks in parts of Pennsylvania have seen some of the history. Just to give some examples—and this is a Department of Labor number—525,094 workers were certified as displaced from the period 1993 to 2002 in the aftermath of the so-called NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Over a period of time between 1993 and 2010, the trade deficit with Mexico was up by some $66 billion, and that is as of 2010, over those 17 or so years.

That is the backdrop when we debate trade itself. Now, I know there have been assertions made that this agreement, the Trans-Pacific Partnership with 11 other countries, will be different and that there will be protections in there that weren't in earlier agreements.

I have real concerns about those assertions, and I have doubts that they will play out in that manner because, in the end, this debate is about wages and jobs. It is really, kind of, in one sense, one major issue.

Will this agreement and will the trade promotion authority that undergirds this agreement advance or hinder job growth and the growth of wages? I have real concerns about arguments that say it will, that it will advance job creation.

One of the assertions often made, as well, is that job loss over time, over several decades—it has been more than one generation now in affected States such as Pennsylvania—job loss or wage

diminution is attributable to a number of factors. And there is no question about it; that is right.

But even when you are able to—or I should say especially when you are able to isolate the issue of trade, there are some data that support that as well, that you can attribute job loss or wage diminution simply to trade and not to other overarching issues. For example, the Review of Economic Statistics in October 2014, in a significant and substantial report, analyzed a number of issues that relate to trade. Here is the seminal conclusion from that report: ''Occupation switching due to trade led to real wage losses of 12 to 17 percent.'' And occupation switching is, of course, job displacement.

That covers the period from 1984 to 2002, so it covers a period prior to the North American Free Trade Agreement and, of course, about 8 years or so after the agreement was in effect. So my concern over the long term is about wages and Pennsylvania jobs.

We have a more recent example, and it isn't grounded in the arguments that relate for or against NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement. Just since the South Korea trade agreement—a more recent trade agreement—has been in effect, the trade imbalance or deficit with South Korea has increased substantially. By one estimate, it is about 12 to 1—$12 billion of imports on our side to just $1 billion on their side. That is the kind of ratio we don't want. We want the ratio to be something in our favor, not 12 to 1 against it.

So what do we do? We have an opportunity over the next couple of days to continue to debate trade promotion authority. In essence, this is the last chance for Congress to have a real impact—or any impact, really—on what happens in terms of the ultimate consideration of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the trade agreement itself.

Many of us have amendments, and I would make two arguments before I relinquish the floor. One is that we should have a reasonable number of amendments and have a debate about these issues. We have had some debate already but very few votes and very few amendments. I believe we should make sure that folks for trade promotion authority or against and folks for the Trans-Pacific Partnership or against should have a chance to vote.

I will have a couple of amendments. I have filed them. I will just talk about two, and then I will conclude.

No. 1 is a ''Buy American'' amendment. It would deny trade promotion authority privileges to free-trade agreements that weaken or undermine ''Buy American'' provisions—very simple but I think very substantial in terms of the potential adverse impacts or positive protections it can provide.

We should make sure that ''Buy American'' is maintained, that trade promotion authority doesn't undermine it, and we should not allow the trade agreement itself to undermine the ''Buy American'' provision. That is one of the least things we can do in the context of this debate.

The second amendment I will highlight, among several, is congressional certification. This amendment would require certification by the two relevant committees—the Committee on Finance in the Senate and the House Ways and Means Committee—that negotiating objectives have been met, so that prior to a trade agreement going into effect and once there is a final review that those objectives the administration and every administration asserts are part of the trade agreement—that has a review and then a subsequent certification by the two relevant committees.

I know there is a lot more to debate, but I would hope that on something as substantial and seismic in its impact on our economy and the economy of the world—40 percent of the world's GDP is contained in this agreement, TPP, and we know trade promotion authority is kind of the rule book in a sense for the Trans-Pacific Partnership—that debate we are having on trade promotion authority should allow States such as Pennsylvania or Ohio or any other State to have its voice heard, to allow the people of our States, especially folks who have concerns about these agreements, to have their voices heard. The only way their voices can be heard ultimately, in addition to their own advocacy and their own efforts to make statements to us, is here on the floor of the Senate, to have debates and then have votes on amendments, and we will see where we stand at the end of the week.

To shut off debate and to stop at this moment in time, as some seem to want to do, is contrary to what the Senate should do on something as substantial as the trade promotion authority, which will affect the trade agreement impacting 40 percent of the world's GDP, and I don't think it is asking too much to have a few more hours or even a day or two more of votes on the floor of the Senate.

Madam 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. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2048

Mr. LEE. Madam President, free trade is of absolute importance in this country. We need free trade. I like free trade. I want trade to be as free as it possibly can be. It is not, however, as pressing as another matter that we should be considering now.

Certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act will expire a week from Sunday at midnight. This is an important issue, and it is one that deserves debate and full consideration within the Senate.

I want to point out that we have had months and months to plan for this deadline—years, in fact. During these last several months, we have worked with House Members, members of the law enforcement community, and members of the intelligence community to create a compromise bill that now enjoys the support of the Attorney General of the United States, of the Director of National Intelligence, the telecom industry, the NRA, the tech community privacy groups, and 338 Members of the House of Representatives. This is a supermajority—a superduper majority.

We have had a week since the House passed this bill, and it is time that we take it up in earnest and give it the full attention and consideration of the Senate that it deserves. Then we can return to TPA and finish it without facing expiration of a key national security tool without anything to put in its place.

This is a bill—the USA FREEDOM Act, as enacted by the House of Representatives—that represents an important compromise, represents a very careful and effective balancing between privacy and security interests, recognizing the fact that our privacy and our security are not in conflict. They are part of the same thing. We are secure in part because our privacy is respected. This bill respects both of those.

We know that it is not easy to get to 218 votes for a lot of things on this issue in the House of Representative. In fact, we know it is impossible to get to 218 votes in the House of Representatives for a clean reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act provisions in question.

We know that a lot of other things would be difficult to impossible to pass in the House. We know that one bill does enjoy a supermajority in the House of Representatives, and that is the USA FREEDOM Act. We should be taking that up now.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate set aside consideration of H.R. 1314, the TPA legislation, and move to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2048, the USA FREEDOM Act, that the motion to proceed be agreed to, and that the bill be open for amendments; further, that upon disposition of H.R. 2048, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 1314.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PATRIOT Act is a critical tool for our national security. The junior Senator from Utah is correct that three provisions do expire at the end of this month: the so-called roving wiretap provision that will allow intelligence professionals and law enforcement officials to track terrorists no matter what device they might use, the so-called ''lone wolf'' provision that would allow our intelligence authorities to identify and stop terrorists who

are not necessarily clearly linked to an overseas terrorist organization, and, finally, section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, which has enabled our intelligence professionals at the National Security Agency to help keep our country safe in the so-called telephony metadata program, which was unlawfully disclosed by Edward Snowden 2 years ago, which is why we are able to discuss such a highly classified program.

The junior Senator from Utah and I disagree about the program and the legislation. There will be a time for that debate because it is the most important issue we could debating in the United States, our national security and the tools we need to keep our country safe.

For the time being, we are on the trade promotion authority bill. That was a decision made last week. This is maybe not the decision that the junior Senator from Utah would have made, and it is not the decision I would have made, but that is where we are. Perhaps we could have been done with the TPA bill if the other side of the aisle had allowed amendments to be processed last week and if there had not been a needless filibuster of the motion to proceed to the bill, but that is water under the bridge. We should move forward in an orderly fashion and process the amendments that are pending on the trade promotion authority bill. We should have a final vote on that bill and then we should move on to the PATRIOT Act reauthorization bill. There will be time for robust debate in public, which is exactly what so many of our Members have been doing in private, given the classified nature of these programs. If we have to work beyond Thursday, I am more than happy to do that. I will even work on Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and into next week, if that is what is necessary to first process the trade bill and then finally to reauthorize the important provisions of the PATRIOT Act.

Madam President, I object to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I also—no matter how we vote on trade—understand the importance of it.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Utah for his statements. The fact is, a great deal of work has gone into the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. The Senator from Utah's bill and my bill is the same version as the one passed by the House. I hope people will not lose sight of the fact that the House of Representatives really did what the American public wants, by an overwhelming bipartisan majority they passed the USA FREEDOM Act. Some had been saying that the other body could not have gotten that kind of a vote, until say, the Sun rises in the East. But the House came together from across the political spectrum in both parties to pass the bill. I think we ought to respect that.

We also—as the Senator from Utah and others have said—have a unanimous decision from a three-judge panel of the Second Circuit, which declared the current program illegal. We can pass the bill, the USA FREEDOM Act, which passed in the House. It means that both sides have given a lot to get there. We ought to pass it in this body at some point—maybe when the trade legislation and the highway bill are completed, we should just take the USA FREEDOM Act up and pass it. If there are questions once it has gone into effect, we can always come back and make other changes to the law, but we ought to pass this legislation and at least give some stability to our intelligence community. The Director of National Intelligence and the Attorney General have said they support it, and we ought to accept it and go forward. The USA FREEDOM Act takes care of the questions of the courts and we should pass it.

I concur with the Senator from Utah, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask the Chair what business is pending before the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 1327

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 1314 is currently the pending bill, and amendment No. 1327 is pending.

Mr. DURBIN. Relating to the trade promotion authority bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to speak on that issue.

Madam President, we cannot ignore that more than 95 percent of the potential customers for goods and services and agricultural produce live outside the United States of America. This means that to grow our economy and to maintain our influence in the world, we clearly have to embrace trade; however, this doesn't mean we would embrace every proposed trade agreement.

I have voted for about half of the trade agreements that have come before me in the House and Senate during my congressional service. I think some of those were good, on reflection, and some of them were not. There have been proposals made for free trade which I thought speak to the basic issue: Is America competitive in the 21st century? Can we outproduce other countries in the world? I never had any doubt about that, except for some given circumstances where another country has a specialty or some particular skill. I trust the United States. I trust our economy, our workers, and our business leaders.

When it comes to a trade agreement, I think we have to answer some hard questions about the specific trade agreement, not the principle of trade. Here is something most people do not know. They have proposed this trade promotion authority so we can vote on the Trans-Pacific Partnership. This is a document that has been negotiated over many months and is available for Members of Congress to see in a secluded setting. We cannot bring in as many staff as we would like, we cannot take the document out of the room, but it is accessible to us. Here is the point that is not often made: We have been told by the administration that this is not the final draft of the trade agreement. We have been told that after we pass the trade promotion authority bill, if we do, then there will be some more amendments and changes. So what we would view today is not necessarily what will be voted on at some later date. It is incomplete. It is a work in progress.

There are some things we should know and should reflect on. First, I will look at it from a very personal perspective. I am honored to represent the State of Illinois. It is one of the largest exporting States in the Midwest, and it is the fifth largest exporting State in our Nation. Illinois exports totaled over $65 billion in 2013 and about 10 percent of my State's gross State product.

Since 2009, Illinois exports increased by 58 percent, more than the national average of 50 percent. Fifty-six percent of exported Illinois goods in 2014—about $38 billion worth of exports—went to countries currently negotiating this Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement with the United States. Is this important to my State? Is this part of the world important to my State? Of course it is. However, Illinois' success in exporting its products depends on good trade agreements that level the playing field, not just for Illinois companies but for American companies. This means we need to have strong antidumping rules that prevent companies overseas from dumping cheap, for example, steel products and other goods to undercut domestic prices and put our companies out of business. Did that happen? It sure did.

A little over 10 years ago, three countries that we trade with—Brazil, Japan, and Russia—had an idea. They figured out a way to drive American steel companies out of business. How did they do it? Were they better or more competitive? No. They dumped their steel. What does it mean to dump a product? It means to sell it in another country at lower than the cost of production in your own country. They took a loss on every ton of steel until they ran that American steel company out of business.

We saw it coming. We saw this dumping taking place. We had trade agreements, and we took them to the enforcement authorities. We said: They are killing us. They are killing these steel companies in America and the people who work there and that is not fair and it violates the trade agreement. The organizations responsible for policing these trade agreements said: We are going to put that on the docket and we will get to that in just a few months.

Well, a few months turned into a few years. We won the case. They had

dumped steel in the United States, but the net result of it was not what we were looking for. The American steel companies went out of business. They could not compete against this dumped steel coming in from foreign countries.

When it comes to these agreements, we need to ask some basic questions. Is it enforceable on a timely basis? Can we stop unfair trade practices before they kill American jobs? That is pretty basic.

This steel issue continues to haunt us. Steel dumping is one of the reasons that the U.S. Steel plant in Granite City, IL, an area I grew up in, will stop production at the end of the month and put 2,080 Illinois jobs in jeopardy.

Fair trade agreements should include enforcement and they should also include enforceable currency manipulation provisions. When a country devalues its currency, the U.S.-made products, in comparison, become more expensive, and that adds to our trade deficit. It makes it difficult for U.S. companies to compete. There are a lot of ways to work on these trade agreements to the advantage of the exporting country if you break the rules.

Trade agreements should allow the United States to enact and implement consumer protection laws meant to protect the public. We don't want to go to the lowest common denominator when it comes to the basics, such as protecting consumers, protecting the environment, and protecting the workers. So whether it is food safety, environmental, public health, consumer financial protection, an investor's future products should not take priority over a country's right to protect its own people.

There is something known as the investor-state dispute settlement. It is a procedure which I want to describe to you because I think it gets to the heart of this trade agreement we are being asked to vote on. Investor-state dispute settlement procedures—often included in trade agreements and is included in several trade agreements that the United States is party to—prioritize corporate investors above almost everything.

What is it? This is how it works: It allows a corporation to challenge a law in an international court if the law, in the eyes of that corporation, violates a trade agreement and infringes on the investment made by a business. That sounds kind of theoretical. I will be specific.

We want U.S. businesses to have protections when they operate in other countries, so it appears to make sense, but corporations have gone too far. Corporations are using this dispute settlement to challenge legitimate laws in countries that protect the public, such as public health laws, environmental rules, land use, and food safety policies. More than 500 of these cases have been brought by corporations challenging the laws in various countries, including U.S. laws.

A U.S. chemical company launched a case against Canada, as a nation, when Canada banned a toxic gasoline additive used to improve engine performance—an additive already banned in the United States. An oil company sued Ecuador after a domestic court there ruled that the company owed $9.5 billion to clean up and provide health care to the workers in Ecuador after the oil company had dumped billions of gallons of toxic water in open-air oil sludge pits in Ecuador's Amazon.

Do you get the picture? Your country passes a law to protect the people living in your country, and then a corporation that has trade business with your company sues the country where the law was passed and says that new law is going to cost them money.

Those are two examples. A toxic additive to gasoline—a corporation sues Canada and says you cannot ban that; that will cost us profits. Efforts by Ecuador to avoid toxic dumping in their own country are being sued by an oil company that says, if you do that, it will cost us money. They did not go through the court system. They went through this investor settlement dispute.

There are so many examples of corporations using investor settlement dispute to undermine, rollback or delay laws meant to protect the public. One of the most egregious examples is Philip Morris. I kind of take this personally. As long as I have been around Congress, in the House and Senate, I have had a battle with tobacco companies. It happens to be the only product which when used according to manufacturers' directions will kill you and can still be sold legally. So I don't happen to think tobacco companies are in the best interest of public health for America or any other country.

About 26 years ago, I passed a law banning smoking on airplanes. It was the first time tobacco companies ever lost. I passed it in the House, and my good friend the late Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey passed it over here. It is the law of the land. For over 25 years, nobody smokes on an airplane. Tobacco companies fought us every single step of the way.

Philip Morris, one of the largest tobacco producers in the world, is aggressively challenging domestic tobacco laws around the world using the same investor-state dispute settlement that is going to be included in this agreement.

In Australia, as an example, after the highest court ruled against Philip Morris and upheld an Australian law requiring warning labels to cover a large majority of cigarette packaging, Philip Morris did not give up. Instead, Philip Morris sued Australia in an international tribunal under investor-state dispute settlement provisions in the Australia-Hong Kong Bilateral Investment Treaty. If Philip Morris wins, Australia could be forced to pay Philip Morris for expected future losses because of a warning label on tobacco products. It could be billions of dollars.

Proponents of this settlement dispute that is baked into this agreement we are going to be asked to vote on rightly claim these procedures can't require countries to change their laws. In other words, Philip Morris can sue Australia and say: Your new law is going to cost us money. Keep it if you wish, but we lost profits because of this new law, and you have to pay us for our lost profits.

They can force countries like Australia to choose between changing the law or using their own taxpayer dollars to pay billions of dollars to a company like Philip Morris for their expected future losses. Think about that for a second. Philip Morris is selling a product that kills if it is used as intended. Some 6.3 million people each year across the world die because of tobacco-related disease. Australia's health care system loses millions of dollars in tobacco-related illnesses for people in their own country, as well as lost productivity at their workplaces. Yet, when Australia enacts a public health law requiring labels on tobacco products, Philip Morris can sue Australia? Yes, that is right. Tobacco products produced by Philip Morris are literally killing Australian citizens, and Philip Morris is suing Australia because the warning labels may cost them future profits.

The same thing is happening in Uruguay. Philip Morris again lost its case against Uruguay challenging its tobacco control laws which helped reduce tobacco use in that country by 4.3 percent. Now Philip Morris says: If we can't win in the courts, we are going to win through the trade agreement. We are going to win through the trade treaty, the dispute settlement in the trade treaty.

Sometimes even just the threat of a trade dispute challenging a law is enough to block, delay, or prevent enactment of a public health law because a country doesn't have the resources to engage in an expensive and lengthy lawsuit. This was the case in New Zealand and Nambia.

Corporations are using investor-state dispute settlements to undermine legitimate public laws, from financial protection, to public health, to environment and food safety. What are we thinking? If we would allow corporations under a new trade agreement to come in and attack public health laws in America, to come in and attack environmental protection in America—because they can argue: If I can't pollute in that river, it is going to cost my company a lot of money; therefore, you have to pay us if you want to keep that pollution law on the books.

That is why I am supporting Senator ELIZABETH WARREN's amendment that removes fast-track authority for any trade agreement that includes these investor-state dispute settlements. State-to-state dispute settlements would still be available if the corporation's rights have been violated or if a country passes a law that violates a trade agreement. But there is no need to go the extra step and give priority

to the rights of corporations over the rights of people when it comes to laws that protect health, food, clean water, and clean air.

As the Senate continues to debate on giving fast-track authority to these trade agreements currently being negotiated, we still don't know what is in the agreements—not entirely. Providing fast-track authority for these agreements would prevent this Senate from offering amendments that would provide only one up-or-down vote after the agreement is finalized.

I support fair trade. I support trade. I hope the final agreements will meet the standards we have spoken of. But I cannot support granting fast-track authority to agreements where we don't know their contents and we could give away the most basic responsibility we have as Senators in the United States—to protect the people of America.

Madam 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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the vitally important Export-Import Bank expires at the end of June. It will be gone. If this program expires—it is not like anything else—we will have to start all over again. We will have to have hearings. We will have to have markups in both Houses. If we can extend the authorization of this, it will solve so many problems for us.

The Export-Import Bank creates jobs in our country—in the United States—by providing loans and loan guarantees so customers in foreign countries can buy our exports. An example is airplanes. I have spoken to Mr. McNerney, the head of Boeing, and one of the vital parts of their business is being able to have other countries have businesses within those countries come and want to buy their airplanes or countries that want to buy their airplanes. They have difficulty doing that without the ability of the Export-Import Bank to help raise the financing.

I greatly appreciate Senator CANTWELL now bringing the attention of this body to this important program that is going to expire soon. I appreciate Senator HEITKAMP for working on legislation dealing with this important issue.

The Export-Import Bank just this year sustained 165,000 jobs. It will be a lot more if there is a long-term extension of this bill. So one might think, of course, that a program such as this which supports 165,000 jobs in just 1 year would cost taxpayers an arm and a leg, a fortune, but in this case, they would be wrong. It is just the opposite. We make money on the Export-Import Bank. Over the last 10 years, the Bank has returned more than $7 billion to the U.S. Treasury. That is $7 billion the U.S. taxpayer does not have to pay because the program is so important and so successful.

A program as effective as the Export-Import Bank should have no problem getting reauthorized, but it has had a lot of trouble. As recently as 2006, the Bank's charter was extended by unanimous consent. It didn't even have a vote. But today the Export-Import Bank is in serious danger of being terminated, ended. The Senate banking committee has made no effort to bring up the Bank's reauthorization, and the majority leader doesn't have a path forward. The best, he said, is we will give you a vote on it. Giving a vote on it is meaningless.

So what has changed since just a few years ago when we extended this by unanimous consent? Why has this immensely successful program over the last few years been on the chopping block? I will tell my colleagues why. It is because the Koch brothers have decided that it needs to go. They want to get rid of it. It is part of their attack on government programs, and this is a government program. They don't care if a bank creates jobs or makes money; they simply want to get rid of it.

That is not the worst of it. Every other developed country supports their exports. China and Europe support their exports, and so do Brazil and India. They all do. But the Koch brothers don't care. They want the United States to be unilaterally disarmed. They are telling their Republican friends in Congress that the United States should just get rid of this program. They don't care that this will put U.S. companies at a competitive disadvantage, and that is an understatement. They don't care that this will cost U.S. jobs, and that is an understatement. They don't even care that this will put a larger burden on taxpayers to have to make up the lost revenue. All the Koch brothers care about is maintaining their warped, illogical view of taking down a government program and making more money for their massive business interests.

I encourage my colleagues to reject this misguided view. Let's stop shooting ourselves in the foot. Let's pass a long-term extension of the Export-Import Bank. On this bill, the trade bill—if it became part of the trade bill, it would be signed into law. The President loves the Export-Import Bank. He said so publicly. We have been trying to get this done, but now the Republicans have said no thanks because their guiding light, the Koch brothers, don't like it because it is a government program.

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. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1327

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as we continue to debate the future of America's trade policy, we have seen an onslaught of misleading claims and shocking tales of horror that have little or no connection to reality. Many of these ghost stories we have heard evolve around relatively obscure legal provisions relating to investor-state dispute settlement, or ISDS. Senator WARREN has called up an amendment that would give voice to those stories by stripping TPA protections from any trade agreement that includes ISDS provisions.

I call ISDS provisions obscure not because no one knows about them or they are unimportant but because in the real world where people actually live, they are not part of our day-to-day lives. It is only in the overly hyperbolic and borderline fictional world of political debate that ISDS provisions impact the lives of everyday people.

Simply defined, ISDS permits companies to challenge unfair or discriminatory treatment by foreign governments in binding arbitration rather than in ordinary courts. The purpose is to encourage the free flow of capital by protecting investors from uncompensated expropriation and other abuses that may not be adequately rectified in regular domestic courts that in many cases tend to disfavor foreign companies. That is it. That is all it is. This has nothing to do with secret tribunals that undermine U.S. sovereignty or provisions giving corporations the power to rewrite U.S. laws and regulations.

We are hearing a lot of these stories about ISDS these days because the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, which is currently under negotiation, includes such a provision. Of course, it would be a shock if it didn't. ISDS is a standard element of all U.S. trade agreements and international agreements in general. All told, there are 3,000 trade and investment agreements that include ISDS around the world. The United States has these types of agreements with 50 countries. They have been around for more than three decades.

Contrary to some of the claims made by opponents of free-trade agreements, ISDS is not a weapon foreign entities use against the United States. In fact, the United States demands the inclusion of these types of provisions in our trade agreements in order to protect American businesses from discrimination from foreign governments. You see, here in the United States, foreign companies and investors are assured fair and equal treatment under our laws and in our court system. While the same is true with regard to many of our trading partners, it is by no means guaranteed. ISDS is one mechanism we have to ensure a fair process

for our job creators who do business overseas. It is not widely used, but it provides an important backstop.

Of course, those who use ISDS as a bludgeon against free-trade agreements tend to use arguments that are short on actual, verifiable facts. For example, we hear claims that ISDS allows corporations to overturn laws and regulations both here in the United States and abroad. The truth is that ISDS arbitrators have no power to overturn laws and regulations. The only recourse for a party that wins an ISDS arbitration happens to be financial compensation.

Others have claimed that ISDS can be used to undermine our health care or welfare system or to undo our environmental protections. Once again, the facts tell a far different story. Most ISDS cases involve very narrow issues affecting individual investors, such as contract disputes, licensing, and permitting. There has never been a successful claim in ISDS that a nondiscriminatory public health, welfare, or environmental rule or legislation violated fairness or antidiscrimination requirements.

We have also heard people say that ISDS provisions put U.S. taxpayers on the line for losses. In truth, the U.S. Government has never lost an ISDS case. In fact, only 17 cases have been brought against the United States in the entire history of ISDS. By contrast, 15,000 cases get filed against the U.S. Government in claims court every year. In short, ISDS poses no threats to the American taxpayer.

In the end, virtually all of the tall tales we hear about ISDS come in the form of ridiculous hypotheticals that have very little basis in reality. But the facts are what they are. While it is only used sparingly, ISDS remains an important tool to protect U.S. investors and businesses. It is a fixture in international agreements, and if our negotiators did not demand its inclusion in our trade agreements, they would be doing our country a disservice.

In March, the Washington Post editorial board—not really known for having an unabashedly probusiness bias—published an editorial outlining the shortcomings of the anti-ISDS crusade.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Once again, I am all for a fair and open debate on trade policy. I am glad we are on the floor having this discussion. I hope we can stick to the facts and not spend our time debating unsubstantiated scare tactics.

I urge my colleagues to let common sense prevail and to vote against the Warren ISDS amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, March 11, 2015]

DON'T BUY THE TRADE DEAL ALARMISM

(By Editorial Board)

President Obama's proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement is in trouble on Capitol Hill. Senate Finance Committee Chairman Orrin Hatch (R–Utah) says a bill to enable expedited consideration of the pact will be delayed until April because of opposition from liberal Democrats and a few tea party Republicans. The latest rallying cry for TPP foes is that it would allegedly threaten environmental and labor regulations, as well as U.S. sovereignty, for the benefit, as Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D–Mass.) noted recently, of ''the biggest multinational corporations in the world.''

The supposed menace is the TPP's Investor-State Dispute Settlement mechanism, similar to language in more than 3,000 agreements among 180 countries, including 50 agreements to which the United States is a party. It would permit companies to challenge unfair or discriminatory treatment by TPP governments in binding arbitration rather than an ordinary court. The useful purpose of the settlement provision is to encourage the free flow of capital by protecting foreign investors from uncompensated expropriation and other abuses in countries where they are, as outsiders, disfavored in court—or in countries that may lack well-developed court systems at all.

Contrary to predictions that these processes are stacked in favor of multinationals, the United Nations reports that governments won 37 percent of cases and business only 25 percent; 28 percent were settled before the arbitrators ruled. In the history of ISDS, 356 cases have been litigated all the way to conclusion. Only 17 complaints were lodged against the United States. The number of such cases has increased in recent years but mainly because foreign investment itself has increased.

Critics trumpet ISDS horror stories, but upon closer inspection they generally turn out not to be so horrible. Take the oft-made accusation, repeated by Ms. Warren and others, that a French firm used the provision to sue Egypt ''because Egypt raised its minimum wage.'' Actually, Veolia of France, a waste management company, invoked ISDS to enforce a contract with the government of Alexandria, Egypt, that it says required compensation if costs increased; the company maintains that the wage increases triggered this provision. Incidentally, Veolia was working with Alexandria on a World Bank-supported project to reduce greenhouse gases, not some corporate plot to exploit the people. The case—which would result, at most, in a monetary award to Veolia, not the overthrow of the minimum wage—remains in litigation.

Obama administration negotiators have sought to minimize the misuse of this settlement provision under the TPP by recognizing each country's ''inherent right'' to regulate for health, safety and quality-of-life objectives. The vast majority of TPP countries are legally well-developed (Canada, Australia, New Zealand) or already free-trade partners with the United States (Mexico, Peru, Chile). So the TPP changes the status quo hardly at all.

It seems that the opponents' real beef is with the administration's view that the United States and its trading partners should encourage private investment in one another's economies. On balance, though, free-flowing capital creates more jobs and wealth than it destroys. The TPP would not only increase economic activity but also enhance geopolitical ties between the United States and its East Asian allies, especially Japan. No amount of alarmism should distract Congress from these benefits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of the thousands of men, women, and children around the world who are the victims of human trafficking. I rise in their defense, on their behalf, and in the interests of responsible trade policy that recognizes that there can be no reward to nations that ignore the problem and do nothing to end the scourge of what amounts to modern-day slavery—one of the greatest moral challenges of our time.

After negotiations with the White House, the USTR, and my colleagues on the Finance Committee, Senator WYDEN and I at the appropriate time will be offering an amendment to the trade bill to make sure that any tier 3-rated nation—those are the nations that have the worst record in our ''Trafficking in Persons Report''—that any tier 3-rated nation hoping to benefit from the Trans-Pacific Partnership will have to address the problem of human trafficking in their country. They will have to make concrete efforts to meet the standards stipulated in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act or they will not have the benefit of privileged fast-track access to our markets, period.

This modification to my original amendment allows for a narrow exception, not just a waiver, as we do with most of the restrictions on the executive branch. This exception may apply only to a country that has been certified by the State Department as having taken ''concrete actions . . . to implement the principal recommendations'' of the ''Trafficking in Persons Report.'' It will have to be made public so that all will be able to judge that the implementation of those concrete actions toward those recommendations has taken place. That has real meaning. Those recommendations are the roadmap we lay out for countries to move from tier 3.

This is a historic change in the nature of trade agreements now and in the future. For the first time, we will have on the Senate floor trade promotion authority that says we cannot provide fast-track for a trade deal with countries that have done nothing to stem the tide of human trafficking. For the first time, we have an amendment in a major bill that would impose real consequences and real repercussions for turning a blind eye to recruiting, harboring, transporting, providing, or obtaining a person for compelled labor or commercial sexual acts with the use of force, fraud, or coercion. For the first time, we have given teeth to the State Department's TIP report and will hold nations accountable for their inaction. While the report has provided us with important information, it has relied on moral authority but has had no real-world impact on real-world suffering.

Should this bill pass and be signed into law, at least we will not reward

nations with the worst record on reining in human traffickers with the benefits of a fast-track to American markets.

My mother was a seamstress in northern New Jersey. No one worked harder. She came home tired, but she came home to her family and was proud of her work. She wasn't held hostage by her employers, forced to hand over her salary, her passport, or worse.

Thanks to the hard work of the community of advocates against trafficking and the commitment of my colleagues on the committee, the ''no fast-track for human traffickers'' amendment is in the legislation we are debating presently on the floor. I understand there are those who would prefer to see this amendment just disappear, but, just like those it protects who are suffering around the world, it will be alive in every trade agreement now and into the future. This amendment says that we will not be silenced. We will not be bowed because some want free trade at any cost—at any human cost—even if it means letting in those nations that our own State Department has determined to be negligent at best in dealing with the scourge of human trafficking in their countries.

This amendment speaks volumes about how we approach trade, how we approach the concept of fast-track policy. We, Congress, set the terms that shape fast-track negotiations, not the other way around. Before any country gains access to U.S. markets, they must show they have taken concrete steps to eliminate human trafficking or there will be no fast-track—not for tier 3 nations at the bottom of the State Department's list.

Benjamin Franklin said, ''Justice will not be served until those who are unaffected are as outraged as those who are.'' Well, let's be outraged and make sure this amendment remains a key element of American trade policy.

I thank Senator WYDEN, the ranking member, for helping to develop compromise language that has preserved the full intent of the amendment, and I thank all the human rights and trafficking groups that have come forward, worked hard, and helped draw attention to this problem and provided a new public mechanism to hold this administration or any other administration accountable for their efforts to end human trafficking around the world and not reward the very worst human traffickers with access to our markets.

This is a victory for those fighting the scourge of human trafficking. Fast-track is no longer a given, no matter how bad a nation's record is on how it deals with those who would traffic in human beings for profit. This amendment is for all those who have been subjected to sexual exploitation, forced labor, forced marriage, debt bondage, and the sale and exploitation of children around the world.

It is for the world's 50 million refugees and displaced people, the largest number since World War II, many of whom are targets of traffickers. It is for the 36 million women and 5 million children around the world subjected to involuntary labor and sexual exploitation. For the victims of these crimes, the term ''modern slavery'' more starkly describes what is happening around the world and, sadly, what is happening in our own backyard—too often in the nail salons in our Nation.

I will continue to fight against human trafficking in all of its forms. All of us remain vigilant, constantly aware that the cost of human trafficking is not just far away across the ocean in a distant country. It is a moral crisis of international proportions that has reached our own shores, right here in our own backyard.

So again let me thank Senator WYDEN for his efforts and the 16 colleagues of the Senate Finance Committee—Democrats and Republicans alike—who voted for my amendment in the committee. Most importantly, let me thank all of the human rights groups who have worked closely with me to ensure that we do not reward nations with the worst record on addressing human trafficking with fast-track access to our markets.

Let all of those who are suffering around the world at the hands of human traffickers be the face of any future trade agreements. I have a list of groups that have worked every day to eradicate human slavery and that have supported my work on this important effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Coalition to Abolish Slavery and Trafficking (CAST), Coalition of Immokalee Workers CIW), ECPAT–USA, Free the Slaves, Futures Without Violence (FUTURES), International Justice Mission, National Domestic Workers Alliance (NDWA), National Network for Youth (NN4Y), Polaris, Safe Horizon, Solidarity Center, Verité, Vital Voices Global Partnership, World Vision.

American Jewish World Service, Bakhita Initiative, Bernardine Franciscan Sisters, Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good, Church of the Brethren, Office of Public Witness, Columban Center for Advocacy and Outreach, Daughters of Charity, USA, Franciscan Action Network, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns, Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Leadership Conference of Women Religious, NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Religious Sisters of Charity, Scalabrini International Migration Network, School Sisters of Notre Dame, U.S. Shalom Offices, Sisters of Charity of Nazareth Western Province Leadership, Sisters of Mercy of the Americas—Institute Leadership Team, Sisters of the Holy Cross, Trinity Health, Tri-State Coalition for Responsible Investment, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I appreciate greatly the kind remarks of my colleague from New Jersey about my role in all of this. I do not want to make this a bouquet-tossing contest, but I do want the Senate to know and I want the country to know how important it has been that Senator MENENDEZ has led this charge.

As my colleague noted, human rights advocates, those who have been in the trenches in the fight against trafficking, have come together to work with us. Senator MENENDEZ, since our debate in the committee, has led this fight. At that time, colleagues, the committee approved an important amendment to ensure that trade agreements with countries that drop the ball on trafficking get no special privileges here in the Congress.

The reason that my colleague has put all of this time and energy and passion into it is that he understands—everyone here, Democrats and Republicans—that human trafficking is a plague that must be fought at every opportunity. So what Senator MENENDEZ and I have done over the last few weeks is to work together to try to find a practical way to further improve the language in this original amendment.

What these alterations—really improvements—are going to do is to create a new process by which the President will report to the Congress on the concrete, specific steps other countries are taking to crack down on trafficking. I think—and we just got their statement—the Alliance to End Slavery and Trafficking, one of the leading groups that has been fighting this scourge the hardest, has just summed up—I just got this a few minutes ago—what the Menendez effort is all about. A test, the organization has called it, and I quote here, and describes it as a ''positive step forward'' in the fight to combat human trafficking.

When we take their statement with the fact that Senator MENENDEZ has brought the State Department on board, I think with what we are showing—and this has been a major theme, frankly, of what I have sought to do over these many months, negotiating with Chairman HATCH and colleagues, is to try to make sure that we come up with policies that demonstrate that there is a new era of trade policy afoot, a new era when trade is done right.

Because of the good work of my colleague from New Jersey, the amendment that we will be offering here, under my colleague's leadership, is a demonstration that we can do trade right, that we can do everything possible to eradicate this plague that so many around the world have mobilized to address. I congratulate my colleague for his efforts. Colleagues should note that this would not have happened had it not been for Senator MENENDEZ.

This was a matter that certainly colleagues felt very strongly about. People said: Oh, the whole debate is over. It cannot be resolved. Senator MENENDEZ said: There is a way to bring people together. I congratulate my colleague

for putting this together. I look forward to voting on it later tonight, I hope.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak a little bit today about the trade legislation that is before this body this afternoon. As we have talked about over the last week, as I have come to the floor, I do think we ought to be expanding exports in this country because it is good for jobs.

I think trade-opening agreements can be very good for the workers and farmers, people that provide services who I represent in the State of Ohio. We need those jobs. 60 percent of our soybean crop is exported in Ohio, our biggest agricultural product. One of every three acres is planted for export now. For our farmers, those overseas markets are really important. Of course we want to expand them.

For our industrial workers, about 25 percent of our factory jobs in Ohio are now trade jobs, export jobs. We want to expand them. For 7 years we have not had the ability to open up new markets, by knocking down barriers overseas. So that is a good thing. We should all be for that. Everyone should be for that. But the question is, as we knock down barriers overseas, are the other countries playing by the rules? If not, then it is not fair to our workers, our farmers, our service providers.

In Ohio, a lot of companies have become more productive. They have worked on productivity, and they have worked on efficiency. Workers have given concessions, including some of our major labor unions: the UAW, steel workers, and others, in an effort to join the global economy in a competitive way. What they are saying to me is this: You know, ROB, I would like to be able to be in this global marketplace and compete. But I want to be sure it is fair. If it is, I can do fine. I am confident. I am confident of them. So part of the discussion on the floor today is not just about expanding exports, as important as that is. But it is this: How do you have a more level playing field so that our workers are getting a fair shake, so that our farmers know, when they are competing in global markets around the world, that there is this more level playing field, so we have the ability to tell them—to look them straight in the eye and say: You know what; this is going to be good for you.

I will mention a couple of issues. Today, I saw Senator BROWN on the floor. This has to do with an amendment that we would like to offer in the trade promotion authority bill, which actually was part of the Customs bill which was voted on in committee and voted on here on the floor.

The idea is that instead of having it in the Customs bill, where it may or may not be successful, to have it in the trade promotion authority bill, where it is much more likely to go to the President, to his desk for signature. I will say that this amendment is language that Senator ORRIN HATCH, who is here on the floor with us today, the administration and others, supported putting into the Customs bill because they thought it was good policy.

Senator HATCH is very discriminating. He knows what is good trade policy in terms of being sure that we have this more level playing field for our workers in this area of subsidized imports and dumped imports into this country. So what we did was that we got this language into the Customs bill, and now we want to be sure it is part of the trade promotion authority bill.

Why is this so important?

Well, part of this level playing field is to ensure that when products are being sold into the United States of America, they aren't being sold at below their cost. If they are sold at below their cost, it is called dumping. It is an international standard. We have laws against it, but so do the other countries.

The World Trade Organization has enforcement measures against that. You are not supposed to dump product into another country in order to gain market share. It is kind of like a loss leader. What happens is, of course, our domestic companies can't compete with that because other countries are allowing their companies to sell at below cost. So when there is dumping, we want to be able to have a remedy for our workers and our companies.

The second one is called countervailing duties for subsidized product. That is when another country actually subsidizes their exports in order to get market share. That is not fair either.

Let's take the example of somebody who works in the steel industry in Ohio. They are trying to compete to sell steel to, say, the auto plant. Another country comes into the United States and sells their product that is subsidized that is well below the cost of our manufacturer. That is unfair. So you are able to put in place countervailing duties against that product.

All we are saying is that we would like to clarify the law so it is easier for a company, easier for those U.S. workers, to be able to show they are injured when you have dumping, when you have subsidized products coming into this country. Again, this is broadly supported. It is bipartisan. It is one that, again, was part of another bill called the Customs bill. It should be part of our legislation, in our view, and we hope it will be offered as an amendment. If it is able to be offered, I think it will pass because, again, I think this is an issue where there is a lot of consensus.

One of the problems right now is sometimes companies have such a hard time proving material injury that by the time they prove it, it is too late. In other words, they have lost market share, they have lost the ability to be competitive in the United States, and they end up having to lay people off—and sometimes, in some cases, in some companies in Ohio, including the steel business, they have gone out of business.

So this is, I think, a commonsense, logical approach that again has a lot of support. I hope that amendment will be able to be offered and that we will include that on the trade promotion authority.

The second amendment has to do with a third area of unfair trade. We talked about dumping. We talked about subsidizing. Another one is when a country says: You know what. I am actually going to intervene in currency markets globally in order to drive down the value of my currency explicitly to get an export advantage over other countries.

It is called currency manipulation. It is a standard that has been developed over the years by the International Monetary Fund. It is very specific, and it says that when you do that—because it does distort markets, it does affect trade—it is considered to be an unfair trade practice. The problem is there hasn't been enforcement of that.

What happens is, when countries do it, the value of their currency goes down. Therefore, their exports they sell, say, to the United States of America are relatively less expensive, and our exports to them are relatively more expensive.

Paul Volcker, who is the former Chairman of the Federal Reserve, made an interesting comment. He said, ''In five minutes, exchange rates can wipe out what it took trade negotiators ten years to accomplish.'' I think there is some truth to that. It can happen relatively quickly.

I have walked on a shop floor in my home State of Ohio, the company that makes steel pins—and these are very important steel pins because they hold up speakers at big concert halls. They have to be strong, and they have to be precisely drilled and made. They brought some that work back from China. God bless them.

I am walking the shop floor, and I am talking about how they have these new machines, they have taken their workers through new training, they have done everything to be more efficient and more productive, but they tell me: ROB, you know, unfortunately, we are going to lose some of this business now because of currency manipulation. We just can't compete.

So despite everything they were doing right and the concessions some of their workers were making in order to be more competitive, they couldn't if there was currency manipulation.

Everybody believes currency manipulation is a bad thing—the WTO does, the World Trade Organization. They have standards, and they deferred to the International Monetary Fund because it is a currency issue. The International Monetary Fund has standards. Those standards are such that if you look at our legislation, we pick up the standards from the International Monetary Fund.

So we say, ''With respect to unfair currency exchange practices [which] target protracted large-scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets by a party to a trade agreement to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties.''

So it is very specific. It is consistent with the IMF and WTO standards, but the amendment goes even further to ensure that is what we are talking about by saying that whatever we do has to be ''consistent with existing principles and agreements of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.'' So it is a targeted approach to currency manipulation.

By the way, someone said: Well, what about QE 1, 2, 3? What about monetary policy?

That is not governed, because the way we define this is, again, the IMF definition of ''protracted large-scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets by a party to a trade agreement to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade.''

That is not why we did QE 2. We did it to stimulate our economy. We can argue about the merits or demerits of that monetary policy, but it does not fit into that definition because concerns were raised about, well, maybe it could be.

As we filed this amendment this week, we added something else to the amendment. It is a very short amendment. I encourage you to read it, Senate amendment No. 1299. It says: ''Nothing in the previous sentence shall be construed to restrict the exercise of domestic monetary policy.''

So you may hear this debate on the floor: Well, gosh. I am worried this is going to come back against us.

It can't.

All this says is our negotiators, in doing a trade agreement, have to make currency manipulation one of the negotiating objectives. We already have labor issues, environmental issues, and other issues that are negotiating objectives. We have passed one here earlier this week with regard to human rights. Certainly, currency manipulation ought to be one of them. It does affect trade.

Now, I know the Secretary of the Treasury issued a veto threat today and said he would recommend the President veto. This has been in discussion for a number of weeks now, and up until now there has not been a veto threat. So that is new today. I find that surprising; first, because we have had a lot of discussion about this, and this is the first time there has been a recommended veto threat. It is not a recommendation that Presidents always agree with when a Cabinet member says that, but it has to be taken seriously.

I would be very surprised if the President of the United States were to say: You know what. I like this trade promotion authority. This is good. It expands exports—which is a good thing in my view, as I have said earlier—but somehow I am going to veto it because, boy, we just can't take on currency manipulation.

This is at a time when everybody—everybody—the administration, Members of the House and Senate, Democratic and Republican, all agree currency manipulation ought to be prohibited.

In fact, the side-by-side amendment that is being offered by my good friend and colleague Senator HATCH and my good friend Senator WYDEN also said we should not have currency manipulation. In fact, they pick up our exact language on how to define currency manipulation, but they don't have any enforcement. There are no teeth to it. It says you could do this or that, you could have reporting, you could have rules or you could have monitoring or you could do nothing.

What ours says is very simple: Let's just make currency manipulation the same as everything else that is a negotiating objective that is enforceable. Let's subject it to dispute resolution.

So you have opportunity; one, first, you have to start with consultation with the other party; and, second, if there are consultations that break down, if you can't resolve it, then it goes to a dispute resolution process.

Someone said: Well, the United States would be the judge and the jury.

Not at all. As a former U.S. Trade Representative, who has been involved in these negotiations, who has taken into account negotiating objectives, I can tell you these three-judge panels are objective. That is the whole idea, and they determine whether there has been manipulation under the agreement that the parties have reached. So what this says is: Let's raise this issue. Let's have a discussion about it. It is a negotiating objective, and let's see what we can agree with, with the parties, and let's make it subject to the same dispute resolution you would have with other issues, such as the environment, such as labor, so this is actually enforceable.

So the question on the floor is going to be: Do you support getting rid of currency manipulation because you know it affects people you present negatively? And the answer is going to be a resounding yes.

By the way, 60 Senators wrote a letter in the last Congress—60 of them—saying that in trade agreements there ought to be an enforceable currency manipulation provision. This amendment would require 51 because it is germane. So it is just interesting. If it doesn't succeed—because I know my leadership is against this, I know the White House has now said they are against it. We will see how people vote on this because everybody agrees we ought to deal with this. The question is whether we ought to have teeth in it, whether it ought to be enforceable or not.

By the way, what is trade promotion authority? Why are we doing all of this? We are doing it because this is the way Congress can express to an administration what our prerogatives are. Again, 60 Senators have signed that letter. It seems like everybody agrees currency manipulation is a bad thing.

The side-by-side—meaning the alternative—in an effort to defeat our amendment, the alternative acknowledges currency manipulation is a bad thing and sets up the exact definition that we use. Ours is a little better because it also exempts monetary policy explicitly, and theirs does not, by the way. But then at the end it says: And what are you going to do about it?

Well, you decide. You can do this or this or this or nothing.

Ours says: No, you have to subject it to the same enforcement you have with other provisions in a trade agreement.

So I am hopeful we can get this passed. People have said: Well, this is about the auto companies. You know, I am not ashamed to represent the auto companies. I am co-chair of the Auto Caucus. The automobile industry in this country is incredibly important. We are proud in Ohio to be the No. 2 auto State in the Nation. By the way, the UAW and the management have made a lot of concessions. They have made a lot of changes to the way they produce automobiles to be more efficient, to have the safest, best automobiles in the world produced in the United States of America. I think they do deserve a fair shot. Again, the agreement can reduce all sorts of tariff barriers and so on to give them a shot at going into some of these markets. But if at the end of the day there is currency manipulation, as Chairman Volcker said—former Fed Chair Paul Volcker—''In five minutes, exchange rates can wipe out what it took trade negotiators ten years to accomplish.'' So I am very proud to be on the floor saying: Yes, it is important to the autoworkers.

But it is much broader than that. The fact that the steel companies around the country have also supported this, the fact that other industries have supported this, it affects everybody. It affects farmers. If we are selling 60 percent of our soybean crops overseas, and they have currency manipulation making our product more expensive, that is bad for our farmers.

If you are selling these steel pins I talked about earlier overseas—I had the fastener industry come see me this week. They are from Ohio. These are the people who make screws, nuts, and bolts. They are concerned about it. So

it is not one narrow group. It is anybody who is involved in international trade and understands the need for us not to allow this to happen. Others have said. Well, this is a poison pill.

I view it more as a vitamin than a poison pill because I think it strengthens the underlying law. I think it makes it more likely we can get a consensus for trade going forward, including in the House of Representatives, where people want to vote for trade promotion authority, they want to expand exports, but they want to be sure it is fair. They want to be sure their workers and their farmers get a fair shake.

So I know the President has said he doesn't like it much, but the President, in the past, has spoken articulately and vociferously against currency manipulation. His statements have been very clear. He not only thinks it is wrong, he thinks it must be enforced. So I would find it surprising that he would be willing to move forward.

Is it poison pill because of the House? Again, I think it actually adds votes. Why wouldn't it? Is it a poison pill in terms of the administration? I hope not, and I can't believe it would be. This is a priority for the President to get trade promotion authority done, and I agree with him.

I think it is important for us to give our workers and our farmers the chance to export more of their products to the 95 percent of consumers who live outside of our borders, who are not Americans but who want to buy the best products in the world that are stamped ''Made in America.'' We want to do more than that.

Then, finally, is it a poison pill for the countries that are negotiating what is called the Trans-Pacific Partnership—called the TPP. Well, I have heard Japan doesn't like this amendment much. It concerns me if our friends in Japan—and they are allies and friends, and I have worked closely with them.

When I was the Trade Ambassador, we worked more closely with Japan than anybody had previously, I would say. I brought them into the close circle of countries that were trying to move forward, in this case, on international standards through the Doha agreement. I have great respect for them.

By the way, they are not manipulating their currency now and haven't been, in my view, since probably 2012, maybe the end of 2011, by the very definition in here. So why would they be worried? I don't know.

But it worries me that they wouldn't be willing to sign off on a provision like this, very sensible, saying: Let's all agree not to manipulate our currency so we can have a more level playing field between all of our countries.

They have manipulated their currency in the past. The IMF would say, I think, about 300 times before 2012. So I don't know if they really wouldn't negotiate with us. In fact, this is a very important agreement to them. It is a very important agreement to them because they, like us, want to expand our trade ties together in the fastest growing part of the world—in the Pacific region. And that is good.

So look, I appreciate the fact we are going to have a difference of opinion on this. I just hope people will actually look at the facts. Look at the language. Look at the fact that this is an issue we all agree on in terms of currency manipulation. The alternative amendments will have that. The only question is, Should it be enforceable? Should it have teeth? Should we be able to go home and look our workers in the eye and say: You know what? We have taken care of you on this one. You are not going to find yourself playing by the rules, making concessions, going through retraining, making these big investments in these companies with the most up-to-date equipment to be competitive and then find, oh my gosh, the rug is pulled out from under us by manipulation.

So here we have President Barack Obama. I mentioned his statement earlier. This is in June of 2007: ''I will work with my colleagues in the Senate to ensure that any trade agreement brought before the Congress is measured not against administration commitments but instead against the rights of Americans to protection from unfair trade practices, including currency manipulation.''

I know where the President stands on this. He, like me, like other Senators in this Chamber, wants to be sure we do deal with currency manipulation. In this case he is saying with regard specifically to trade agreements brought before this Congress. That is what TPA is all about—establishing our congressional prerogatives as to trade.

So I hope we will be able to move forward with expanding opportunities for everybody we represent, because that is what trade is about. It is about creating more and better jobs. If you are against exports, you are against creating better jobs. Trade jobs pay, they say, on average 13 to 18 percent more. Why? Because they tend to be jobs in the manufacturing sector, in the technology sector. They tend to be good jobs.

We want more of them in my State of Ohio. Our farmers want more exports. It is good for their prices. And they all deserve to have these markets overseas because they are working hard to create the best products in the world. All they want is a level playing field to ensure they have the opportunity to send those products overseas to the 95 percent of consumers outside our borders.

If we do that—if we do that and at the same time ensure it is fair—we will be able to look them in the eye and say that this is going to be good for you and your families.

Here is what Secretary Lew said earlier today: ''Holding our trading partners accountable for their currency practices has always been important to this administration.''

Let us hold them accountable. We can't hold them accountable if there is no enforcement. We can't hold them accountable if there are no teeth. That is all we are asking for today.

I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to look at this language and look at this issue. Earlier, one of my colleagues came to speak and he had a sign like this, and it talked about free trade and fair trade. That is what we are talking about. Let us be sure we have free trade and fair trade. If we do that, we can begin to rebuild a consensus around trade that used to be a bipartisan consensus, and we can begin to create a better future for our kids and grandkids—more engaged in global markets, getting better-paying jobs and more jobs, and ensuring America's promise is met.

At a time when we have a historically weak recovery, what better thing to do than to give this economy a shot in the arm by expanding exports and by doing so in the context of creating a more level playing field for the people we represent.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, this is an exceptional thing we are debating right now. We are talking about limiting our own constitutional power. We are talking about a trade promotion authority act that would restrict our ability to offer and debate amendments on free-trade agreements.

We have been told this is the only way we can move forward on things such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the soon-to-be-completed European free-trade agreement. There are great disagreements about whether that is necessary.

It is hard to understand why we hold trade to a fundamentally different standard than so many other things that are vitally necessary for our economy to move forward. Why not have a different process to pass immigration reform or energy reform or tax reform? Those are just as, if not more, necessary to economic growth than trade.

But in that we are talking about limiting our ability to offer amendments to a trade agreement, it would be the height of irony if we were to conduct that debate in a way that limited our ability to also offer amendments on the very act that takes away our power to amend the trade agreements.

So here is just a point on process. I am fairly new to this body. This is the first time I have been in the Senate debating a trade agreement. Certainly, it is the first time I have been in the Congress to debate a fast-track bill, a trade promotion authority. I think we can take our time to allow this body to work its will, to make sure we vote on more than a handful of amendments to a piece of legislation that takes away our power to offer amendments on the final trade bills.

We took 3 weeks to debate the last fast-track bill. Now, I don't think anybody is asking for 3 weeks, but we are

asking for more than a few days, given that many of us think we have amendments, such as the one Senator PORTMAN is offering, that can make this bill a lot better. So I am coming to the floor today to ask for that time to get to a better place on this bill and, specifically, to ask for this body to take up a series of amendments surrounding one vital issue, and that is the issue of protecting the American supply chain on products bought by the U.S. Government. It is commonly referred to as the ''Buy American'' law. It has been on the books for decades.

It is a pretty simple premise. When we are buying things for the U.S. Government, we should buy them from American companies, by and large. It is a pretty meager requirement. At the start, it just says that when you buy stuff for the American Government, primarily for the Defense Department, you should buy 50 percent of it from U.S. companies.

That makes a lot of sense to people in the United States. In my State of Connecticut, we believe that is just good economics, but it is also good national security policy, because if you are not making things for the Department of Defense here, you are making them abroad, and you become reliant on a supply chain that is increasingly internationalized and puts you at risk when one of those companies that is supplying parts for a jet engine, for a tank, for a weapon all of a sudden isn't your ally any longer.

The ''Buy American'' law has been riddled with loophole after loophole, exception after exception, such that the exception is now the rule. I won't go through the litany of ways you can get around the ''Buy American'' law, so that sometimes today items being bought by the Department of Defense are majority made outside the United States and frankly, often by countries that we may not be in total alignment with when it comes to our security policy.

I want to talk about one waiver, one way around the ''Buy American'' law, and that is a really big one. There is a waiver to the ''Buy American'' law for any country that we have entered into a free-trade agreement with. So if you have signed a free-trade agreement with the United States, you can supply content to goods made for the U.S. military and have it count as made in America.

Now, that is a pretty limited exception when you have only a small number of countries you have signed free-trade agreements with. But the two regions we are talking about adding to the ranks of those that have trade agreements with the United States would represent the bulk of the global economy. We are talking about a swath of countries in Asia with very low wages and then, ultimately, with the European trade agreement, the whole of Europe.

All of a sudden, we don't have a small exception to the ''Buy American'' rule, we have a truck-sized exception to the ''Buy American'' rule, rendering it almost obsolete and unenforceable at that point, because then almost any country that is producing a good can apply for the trade-agreement waiver.

So we have a series of amendments that would try to tighten up this particular waiver, this particular option built into trade agreements. The amendment I hope to offer simply says that if you want this waiver around the ''Buy American'' law, then you have to show that, No. 1, the result of moving the work overseas won't cause a U.S. company to go under—and I can give examples of when that has happened—and, No. 2, you have to prove it you can't find it in the United States—that your only option is to go overseas because you can't find it in the United States. If there is an American company making it for a reasonable price, then that company should be able to get that waiver.

Now, it doesn't take away all the other waivers. There is a waiver, for instance, that says if you can get it much cheaper overseas, then you can go overseas. We don't eliminate that waiver. We just say you have to prove you can't get it in the United States and you can't get it for a reasonable price in the United States, and then this waiver would apply.

I think all of our constituents would support trade agreements that make sure our taxpayer dollars being used to buy goods for the United States get used, preferentially, on American companies. And simply by tightening up this loophole in the ''Buy American'' law, we will protect a lot of jobs.

How do we know that? Because in 2013, the last year for which we have records, there were 1,200 of these waivers approved—1,200 waivers for existing countries with free-trade agreements—worth $500 million worth of goods. That is $500 million worth of work that would have gone to U.S. companies that went to foreign companies because of this waiver that said that any country that has a free-trade agreement just doesn't have to worry about the ''Buy American'' clause. That is 1,200 today. Imagine how many that will be in a year if we were to add all of the countries in TPP and all of the countries in TTIP. We are talking about factors of two and three and four added to that number.

So all I am asking for at this point is a debate. Let us just make sure on this seminal issue, the preference that we give American companies for work paid for by Federal taxpayers, that we have a discussion about that on the floor of the Senate at some point over the course of this week. Members can choose to vote up or down. They can choose to support American companies. They can choose to support the outsourcing of American taxpayer work. But let us have a discussion on it. We don't need 3 weeks, like we did last time, but be probably need a couple more days.

This is as big as you get for the Senate. We are debating giving away our power to amend a major trade obligation of the U.S. Government. Let us have a debate about the consequences of that with respect to American companies.

It would make a difference to one set of people in my district, and I will end on this—the former workers of Ansonia Copper & Brass. This is a company that made copper-nickel tubing for our submarines. They were the only American company that made this copper-nickel tubing, and they had a competitor in Europe that was trying to take their business away. Because of a waiver to the ''Buy American'' law, the contract was awarded by the Department of Defense to the European firm and taken away from Ansonia Copper & Brass. Because of that waiver to the ''Buy American'' law, Ansonia Copper & Brass went out of business. We now have no ability in the United States to produce copper-nickel tubing. Some of the most important components to the American sub fleet in the United States—gone. Our capacity has ended. And you can't just rebuild this, because this is a really specialized kind of material, a really specialized kind of product. Once that equipment, once that expertise is gone, you can't just start it back overnight. That has real security consequences for the United States.

I would argue that, even more importantly, it has serious economic consequences for the men and women who were laid off about a year ago from Ansonia Copper & Brass, because of an ill-thought-out waiver to the ''Buy American'' clause that compromises our economic security and our national security. Let us just pledge to have a debate about that on the floor of the Senate before we come to a final vote on trade promotion authority.

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.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I want to take a moment to add to what my partner on the Portman-Stabenow amendment has said on the floor. I appreciate working with Senator PORTMAN on this important issue. I find it very interesting, as we are debating—as other colleagues have said—a policy that allows the administration to go ahead and negotiate a trade agreement where we voluntarily give up our right to change, to amend, and that we voluntarily, as a Congress, say we are not going to allow anyone to object to make it a 60-vote threshold. So we are giving them the fast-track authority. The tradeoff, the way we are supposed to be doing that is by setting up a set of negotiating objectives and

expectations for what will be negotiated in the agreements. That is the deal here—fast-track authority, setting up the expectations. What we believe on behalf of our constituents, the people we represent, are the most important things that we want to make sure are covered: enforcement, strong labor and environmental standards, and the No. 1 trade distorting policy in the world today, which is currency manipulation.

We want to be able to say, if you are going to get this special ability to take away our right to change something, then we expect certain things. We expect that we are going to be negotiating from a position of strength so that we are racing up in the world economy, bringing other countries up in terms of wages, what is happening in terms of protecting our environment, protecting our intellectual property rights, stopping other countries from cheating on currency or other trade violations. We want to create a race up, not a race to the bottom, not a race to the bottom where the comments are this: Well, if you would only work for less, we can be competitive. If we only take away your pension, if we only take away your health care, if we only make sure that we do not enforce our trade laws, we can be competitive. Obviously, that makes no sense.

In the area of currency, what Senator PORTMAN and I are doing is putting forth the very straightforward case that there should be a negotiating objective that is enforceable, that is tied to IMF definitions. It makes it clear that we are not talking about our domestic policies. We are not talking about Fed policies. We are not talking about quantitative easing. We are talking about the foreign currency policies that under the International Monetary Fund, 188 countries, including the Asian countries we are negotiating with, have all signed up to agree to. All signed on the dotted line—the United States, Japan, all the countries that we are talking about—that they will not manipulate their currency.

The problem is they still do. The problem is that Japan, after signing on the dotted line under the International Monetary Fund, has over the last 25 years manipulated the currency 376 times. We are saying that if we are going to let you go into a negotiation and come out with a trade agreement of 40 percent of the global economy in Asia and where we are seeing the bulk of the currency manipulation, then we believe there ought to be an enforceable standard, that we ought to have an expectation of a currency manipulation provision that would be enforceable at least as a negotiating objective. That is what we are talking about.

You would think—it is unbelievable the reaction. I understand after working with many, many Secretaries of the Treasury—and I have incredible respect and admiration for our current Secretary—but every Secretary under every President I have had the opportunity to work with—Democrat or Republican—all believe the same: Do not get into this area of policy. I understand that. I do. I respect it. I disagree in this case, but I understand that reaction. But when we are talking about a 21st-century framework on trade and what we need to do in enforcement—and we passed a customs bill that has incredibly important enforcement provisions in it. I am pleased that a number of those are ones that I have been working on—that Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and I have been working on for years—provisions that are in that bill.

I am very pleased to see that the broader currency issue is addressed in there that Senator SCHUMER, Senator GRAHAM, Senator BROWN, and I and others have been working on for years, trying to not be in the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations, as we know. All of these things are good to be able to do. But if we are going to do that, we need to address—as has been quoted by one of our auto manufacturers—the mother of all trade barriers, which is currency manipulation. We know it is going on.

On the one hand, we hear from those on the other side that it is a poison pill to put this in the fast-track authority. The question is, Why? Why is it a poison pill? Why is it a poison pill?

Well, because Japan will not like it. Japan will walk away from TPP. Well, on the other side we hear that the Bank of Japan does not do currency manipulation anymore. They do not do it anymore. Why do we have to worry about it if they do not do it anymore?

If they do not do it anymore, then why in the world would they walk away from a negotiation if we have a negotiating objective on currency? It makes you wonder. Do they want to go from 376 times to 377 times? That is what I would assume, if that is that important that it would kill an entire agreement with 12 different countries to have a negotiating principle in there on currency. It is not just Japan, although, that is the major concern. We have seen this happen in Singapore, Malaysia, and other countries. If they do not intend to use that as a way to get an edge, to beat us on an unlevel playing field, then why in the world would they care? That is the question.

They cannot have it both ways. They cannot say they are not doing it anymore. But if we put this in there, somehow we are not going to be able to get this agreement. Our job in a global economy is to make sure the rules are fair for our businesses and our workers.

So far, it is estimated that we have lost some 5 million jobs and counting because of just one thing—currency manipulation. What is that? That means that Japan builds an automobile, and they sell it someplace else. When they are using the Bank of Japan to manipulate their currency, they are able to get a discount on the price artificially. We are told, on average anywhere from $6,000 to $11,000 on the price of an automobile. That is a lot when you are competing.

It is not a differential because they are more efficient at manufacturing or even paying their people less. It is because they cheat. It is because they cheat. It is not about selling into Japan, which is very difficult right now. But we also know that even if we took away the nontariff trade barriers, they have a culture of wanting to buy their own automobiles, which I wish we shared. It would be less of an issue if we in America were buying American. But the concern is that in a global economy, American companies are competing with Japanese companies to go into India—over a billion people—or Brazil or the Middle East or everyplace between America and Japan.

If we are creating this huge trade agreement and we do not address the fact that they can compete with us for those customers in other countries in an unfair way and we do not deal with that, we are forcing our manufacturers to try to compete with their hands tied behind their back. Why would we do that?

It is our job to make sure they have every opportunity to succeed—every opportunity—and that their playing field is level. How many times do we all say those words: ''level playing field,'' ''level playing field.''

We are hearing from manufacturers who want to trade. These are global companies that always support trade agreements. They are saying to us: Pay attention here. This is an issue that has gotten out of hand, that we need in the framework when we are negotiating a trade agreement with 40 percent of the global economy. For the places that manipulate the currency, we need to make sure they are not doing that.

That is what the Portman-Stabenow amendment takes a step to do. I would like to go even further and say that you do not get fast-track authority unless you have strong currency enforcement in the agreement. This is not that far. This is, in fact, the reasonable middle. It says we are going to have a strong negotiating objective that is tied to enforceable standards under the International Monetary Fund, the WTO, that it is a negotiating principle and we expect that to be in there. We expect it to be in there. But it does not have the hammer of saying you would not get fast-track authority because we want this to be something that has strong bipartisan support, that comes to the middle here in terms of what is viewed as reasonable and supporting the ability to have flexibility in negotiations and so on.

For the life of me, I do not understand the reaction on the other side in terms of the statements that this is a poison pill or that this is some outrageous thing to say that along with protecting intellectual property rights and focusing on labor standards and environmental protection, that we would have a negotiating objective on currency.

We do not dictate the outcome of it, which I would love to do. We do not do

that. We say, you have to put forward your best efforts here, and you have to put folks on notice that we are serious because this is one of our negotiating objectives. When it is time for the vote, I hope that it will be in this next group of amendments.

We appreciate very much that the amendment is pending, and we look forward to a vote. We would like very much to see that happen this evening. There is no reason not to have it. We are ready to have that vote. I think we have about 25 percent of the whole Senate now as cosponsors, and we would love to have more. This is a bipartisan amendment. It is reasonable, and it tackles the No. 1 trade distorting barrier right now in the global economy, which is currency manipulation. It does it in a responsible way.

I will close by saying this. Again, we hear that this is a poison pill because the main folks who have been currency manipulating, who would be part of the TPP, do not want this, do not want anything saying the word ''currency'' that would be possibly enforceable.

We are hearing that the Bank of Japan is not doing it anymore, so you do not need the language. But, by the way, they will walk away from the agreement if you have it in the language in there. You cannot have it both ways. Either they intend to do it again, and that is why they are objecting to an agreement with any kind of currency manipulation enforcement, or they are not going to do it again and it should not matter. They can't have it both ways on this debate. The fact that folks are trying to have it both ways makes me very concerned about what is really going on in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

I urge my colleagues to join me and Senator PORTMAN in passing this very reasonable amendment to make currency manipulation a priority in our negotiations.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I second the words of the senior Senator from Michigan. She is exactly right about the importance of currency. As she said, it is a negotiating objective. Frankly, I wish we could write even stronger language because we know that the U.S. Trade Representative—whether it is a Trade Representative serving a Democrat or a Republican—doesn't pay quite as much attention to the negotiating objectives as we want. But there is no reason we shouldn't write strong negotiating objectives. Senator STABENOW's amendment with my colleague from Ohio is exactly the right major step forward.

I wish to make one other comment. I believe Senator FRANKEN, Senator BOXER, and Senator WHITEHOUSE are coming to the floor, along with Senator MURPHY, Senator CASEY, Senator WARREN, and Senator STABENOW, to speak about amendments that really matter to TPA. There are literally almost two dozen Democratic Senators and I believe at least 8 or 10 Republican Senators—I am not sure of that number—who have good, solid, substantive amendments. That is why I want to see us do what Senator MCCONNELL has talked about, and that is have a full hearing and airing of amendments that are substantive. There are dozens of substantive amendments offered by at least a couple dozen Senators.

I wish to refer to one thing my colleague from Ohio said earlier, before Senator STABENOW's speech, and that is about the amendment that refers to leveling the playing field, which we have been working on and which is all about trade enforcement. I jotted down one thing he said, which I want to emphasize. He said that by the time our government is able to prove injury and prove an unfair trade practice, the injury is already so great to our workers and our companies. He expanded on that, and I wish to expand on that for a moment.

I have spent hours and hours over the years visiting plants in Ohio and seeing what happened to a number of our companies and the workers who work at those companies when countries such as South Korea engage in unfair trade practices, whether it is steel, coated paper, tires, or dumping oil country tubular steel—dumping means they may subsidize capital. In addition to lower wages, it may be water, energy, or land. Having lower wages is not an unfair trade practice, but the other examples are. We know what that means. It means that our workers can't compete when they don't play fair.

Whether it is Colorado, Ohio, or Michigan, we follow the rule of law, so it takes a period of time to prove these companies are engaging in unfair trade practices. We see a number of these countries and companies—it may be Korea, China, or somewhere else—not just gaming the currency system, but we see them so often not being forthcoming even though international laws require that they be forthcoming with information so we can process whether they, in fact, are subsidizing their production and dumping their product. They may give us inadequate or faulty information or they may give us purposely erroneous information. By the time we put together the trade case, small businesses, particularly in the supply chain, have gone out of business or have been damaged beyond their ability to survive long term, and so often, workers have been laid off.

I saw what happened in Lorain, OH, and I saw what has happened in Cleveland and Gallipolis and Chillicothe. I saw what happened in Trumbull County, OH, and Youngstown, OH, when China and Korea cheated on the oil country tubular steel issue.

Leveling the playing field will help us fight back. That is why so many corporations and labor unions support this legislation.

It matters to our communities because when a plant closes and workers are laid off, it is not just those workers and those families who are affected, it devastates the community. Firefighters, teachers, and police end up getting laid off, and the community is less safe. All of those things happen because we don't stand up and enforce trade law, we don't stand up for our international interests, and we don't stand up for our economic security and our community interests. That is why the Stabenow amendment on currency is so important, and that is why the Brown-Portman amendment is important—so we can level the playing field.

We have at least half a dozen Republican sponsors, and we have a number of Democratic sponsors as well. That language was so uncontroversial that it was adopted in the Finance Committee in the managers' package in the underlying bill that Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN negotiated at the beginning, about a month or so ago.

I applaud Senator STABENOW for her work on currency.

I urge my colleagues, first of all, to make the amendment on leveling the playing field pending, and second, to move on this legislation.

I also appreciate the leadership Senator WHITEHOUSE, who just joined us on the floor, has shown on these trade agreements.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I know Senator WHITEHOUSE is here and I have already spoken, but I wish to echo Senator BROWN's strong appeal that we vote on the leveling the playing field amendment. It is critical.

We have seen communities across Michigan as well as throughout the country that have been devastated. We not only lose good-paying jobs when a plant closes, but we lose small businesses from across the street, and it affects the whole community.

This is an incredibly important amendment. I hope we will get a vote on it. I believe the votes are here to support that amendment on a bipartisan basis, and I think it is critical that we vote and adopt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I wish to discuss.

About a year ago, we as a Senate, unanimously by a voice vote, ratified four treaties that helped protect American fisheries from illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing around the world. It is called pirate fishing. This was an effort by the Oceans Caucus. It was led by me and then-Senator Begich on our side and Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator WICKER on the other side of the aisle. It was hotlined on both sides and cleared.

It is a useful treaty to be in. It is important for our American fishing industry to make sure that they are not being punished or harmed by foreign competitors who are not fishing

sustainably, fishing illegally, or violating the laws of the jurisdiction in which they are fishing. Because of their misbehavior, they are able to bring catch to market less expensively than fishermen who play by the rules.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so I may call up my amendment No. 1387.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. CANTWELL. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I understand there are issues on the floor that need to be resolved and there are objections pending, but I did wish to speak to this amendment. It is an amendment I hope can either get a vote or, because of its noncontroversial, bipartisan status, perhaps can be added at a time when there is a managers' amendment or some means of dealing with noncontroversial additions to this legislation.

So the objection having been made to my request, I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly on the trade legislation before us and on the importance of considering and voting on amendments that would improve it. I have submitted amendments of my own. I am co-leading a pair of amendments with Senator BALDWIN, and there are a number of very important amendments that I support.

We are talking about how we will consider trade agreements that would cover a major portion of the entire global economy. That is a very important subject, and I believe we need to fully debate this bill. I also believe we need to have votes on a number of amendments to make this bill better than it currently is.

I believe that when trade is done right, it can benefit our workers, our communities, and our businesses. But I am concerned that the fast-track procedures set up by the trade promotion authority bill we are considering will not do enough to make sure we do trade right. So, at a minimum, I believe we should debate and have votes on a number of amendments that would considerably strengthen this bill.

I have submitted two amendments of my own. One of my amendments would strengthen the negotiating objective on labor and environmental standards in the trade promotion authority bill. Right now, the bill effectively says that partner countries violate those standards only when they fail to enforce labor or environmental laws on a sustained and recurring basis. The notion that violations of standards need to be sustained and recurring to really count as violations is not found elsewhere in the bill and doesn't hold with respect to, for example, intellectual property, digital trade, or regulatory practices. My very simple amendment would take out ''sustained and recurring'' so that a labor violation is a labor violation.

My other amendment is my Community College to Career Fund Act, which is designed to address the skills gap where there are jobs open in our country because there are not workers with the right skills to fill them. Just like Senator STABENOW's amendment on renewing the community college portion of trade adjustment assistance, or TAA, of which I am a cosponsor, my amendment will bolster workforce development and training.

The community college portion of TAA has been successful in helping to retrain workers and communities that have been harmed by trade, and that is a good thing. My amendment builds on this by helping community colleges partner with business sectors in order to improve our ability to get people into jobs in manufacturing that are high-skilled jobs or in IT or in health care by providing them the skills they need. This will make all of our communities more resilient and economically successful.

I am also proud to co-lead two amendments with Senator BALDWIN of Wisconsin on our trade remedy laws. One would prevent trade negotiations from weakening those laws, and the other would strengthen the language in the TPA bill on trade remedy laws—the laws that enforce our trade policies and protect our domestic industries from dumped and subsidized imports from other countries.

In Minnesota, I have seen firsthand the damage that happens when we don't have and, just as importantly, can't enforce strong trade protections. In the last few months alone, we have seen what happens when other countries unfairly dump their goods here. In this case, it was steel products. Nearly 1,000 Minnesotans are losing their jobs after a flood of dumped steel imports. Our provisions stand up for American manufacturers by putting in place and enforcing fair trade practices.

In addition to these amendments, there are many other important amendments my colleagues have offered on currency manipulation, investor-state dispute settlement, ''Buy American,'' and a number of other issues.

I believe that these issues are worth debating and that we should be voting on amendments on the important subjects which I have mentioned as well as on other important subjects.

In my view, this bill is in need of substantial improvement, and we should not cut off the process of trying to make those improvements. We need to be voting on amendments, and we need to be working to improve this bill.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have been listening to colleagues speak about the importance of having a very open process here where we can offer our amendments and make this fast-track a better deal for the middle class and for jobs in our Nation. It is rather shocking to recognize that this huge agreement, which is going to cover 40 percent of trade in this world, is being jammed down our throats in a couple of days. It is ridiculous. When we look at other agreements, they have had far more time. We have well over 100 amendments filed and we have been offered 6 amendments.

I know the Senator from Washington has laid down the gauntlet on the Ex-Im Bank. I support her. We have differing views on the underlying bill, but I think she is right because it is really hard to imagine passing this huge bill and then ignoring the fact that Ex-Im Bank is going to go away.

To me, as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, recognizing that the entire highway bill is ending—the entire highway program is ending on May 31—to take up this bill without taking care of that is absurd. To take up this bill before raising the minimum wage is ridiculous. To take up this bill before we make sure we have comprehensive immigration reform so workers can come out of the shadows is just the height of insanity. To take up this bill before we have taken up the Ex-Im Bank, as I know my friend from Washington has explained, is absurd. We have deals that are pending with our small businesses through the Ex-Im Bank. They are going to be entirely upended.

So I took the majority leader at his word. I thought we were going to have votes to put the enforcement inside this bill, and now that doesn't appear to be happening.

Let me just tell my colleagues about the amendment I wish to offer. I think it would pass here overwhelmingly. I have no illusions that we will be allowed to vote on it, but it simply says: If a country doesn't have a minimum wage of at least 2 bucks an hour, we can't fast-track a trade agreement with that country. Let me reiterate. The amendment simply says: You can't be fast-tracked if you don't pay at least $2 an hour.

Let's talk about it. Why is this important? I voted for fast-track for NAFTA. What a mistake that was. President Clinton promised us the world. Republicans and Democrats who were protrade promised us the world. Do we know what happened? We lost 700,000 jobs, mostly in manufacturing. What makes my colleagues think we are not going to see these 12 million manufacturing jobs leave when Chile pays $1.91 an hour—$1.91 an hour. Malaysia pays $1.21 an hour. Peru pays $1.15 an hour. Mexico pays 80 cents an hour. Vietnam pays 58 cents an hour. Brunei and Singapore, well, they have no minimum wage at all.

So we have a very simple amendment here which I don't believe I will ever get a chance to offer, but it is simple.

I know if I went outside and asked the average American how they felt and said: Do you think it is right for us to do a trade deal with countries that pay poverty wages, slave wages to their people—how are we going to compete with that? And people say: Oh, well, our workers are smarter.

That is right. But those workers, let me tell my colleagues, are very smart in Chile and Malaysia and Peru and Mexico and Vietnam and Brunei and Singapore. They are very good. It is tragic that they are in countries that pay them slave wages. That is this great deal we are going to make.

It is true that Australia has a very high minimum wage of $13.47; New Zealand, $10.87; Canada, $8.69. And I am embarrassed to say ours is still $7.25. Our States and cities are making up for it by raising their minimum wages. It is a tragedy. This is a race to the bottom. Japan has $6.51; and then we get to Chile at $1.91; Malaysia, $1.21; Peru at $1.15; Mexico at 80 cents; Vietnam at 58 cents; and Brunei and Singapore have no minimum wages whatsoever.

So I have this very good amendment, and I hope it makes it onto the list, I say to the majority leader. Then I have a series of amendments that deal with the environment.

If we are worried about an extrajudicial system to overturn our laws, all we have to do is look at what the World Trade Organization did yesterday when they said we cannot have country-of-origin labeling without getting tariffs put on our products. It had to do with beef. I am sure the Presiding Officer cares a lot about that. The fact is that country-of-origin labeling is critical. I want to know where the beef comes from because there have been all kinds of tragedies with diseases with beef, and I want to buy American. But the World Trade Organization said no. They said that is a trade barrier. Guess what it means? It means that if we don't cancel out that law, they are going to put tariffs not just on beef, they are going to put tariffs on wine, on our strawberries, our fruits, our vegetables, everything. They are going to put tariffs on it.

So here we are about to go into this massive trade deal with countries that pay slave wages, that have terrible environmental laws, with an extrajudicial process where companies can sue our States, sue our Nation if they say that the laws we have are barriers, and we are going to do all this on a Thursday so people can go on their trips. Uh-uh. No. I say no. That is wrong. We need to have votes on all of these things.

I will tell my colleagues, we could see polluters bringing cases in front of this new extrajudicial body and saying: Sorry, but the Clean Power Plan is making us spend too much money. Toxic laws here in America are making us spend too much money. Your laws against lead poisoning are making us spend too much money. Your laws controlling formaldehyde, California, are costing us too much money.

Then we are going to see lawsuits—and we have seen them in the past—and all we have to do is look at what happened with the WTO, the World Trade Organization, and we are in big trouble.

So on the one hand we are making a deal with seven nations that have slave wages or no minimum wage, so bye-bye, manufacturing; and secondly, we have this extrajudicial body that Senator ELIZABETH WARREN has been so eloquent about that can actually overrule America's laws and California's laws and Colorado's laws and Washington State's laws. And I have a number of amendments here that state that if we have laws that deal with toxic substances in toys—that is Boxer 1356—you can't mess with that. I have another one that says if we have laws that reduce exposure to known cancer-causing substances, you can't overrule those laws, but I can't get that on the list. My amendment is not on the list.

I have one that says that if we have laws that make sure pesticides are safe, sorry, we are not going to stand by and allow this extrajudicial process to work. That should be exempted, and toxic gas pollutants should be exempted, such as mercury and asbestos exposure. So all of my amendments make sure we do not enter into new trade agreements that have the effect of changing our longstanding environmental principle of ''polluters pay'' into ''polluters get paid.'' That is what this is about. A polluter can sue in this trade agreement.

I went downstairs. I had to give up all my electronics. I couldn't take notes with me, but I know enough to see what this is about. A polluter can go and make the case that Colorado or California has protective laws, and, by God, it made them pay more money to produce their products, and they ask for millions of dollars.

This is not a fiction. This has happened in past trade agreements. Believe me. Countries have paid through the nose and have had to repeal their laws. So we are rushing into a fast-track vote on something that is very dangerous. It is dangerous to the middle class. It is dangerous for jobs. And we are pushing it ahead of things that we ought to be doing, such as raising the minimum wage, passing the Ex-Im Bank, passing immigration laws, putting together the funding for a highway bill. We haven't raised the gas tax in 20 years. If we raise it a penny every quarter till we raise about 6 cents or 8 cents, it would cost the average driver 30 bucks. We can fix the 69 bridges that are collapsing. We can fix the 50 percent of roads that are out of compliance and not safe. And we can create 3 million jobs. But, oh, no, we are not doing that agenda for the middle class. We are doing things that threaten the middle class and that further threaten the health and safety of our people.

So I hope working with Senator MCCONNELL and Senator BROWN and Senator WYDEN, we can get a path forward here to hear our amendments.

We have a promise from the majority leader: This is a new day.

The press asked me: Is this a new day in the Senate with Senator MCCONNELL? I said no—not.

I can't get my amendments in. I have 10 amendments up. I can't get them on any list. Maybe it is because they don't want to vote on this—the protrade people. They don't want to vote to say that any deal with a country that doesn't pay at least two bucks an hour can't be fast-tracked. It is a hard vote. It is a hard vote, and I want that vote. So I am going to do everything in my power to solve this. I am going to use every tool at my disposal. I know the Senator from Washington is already doing it for me, in a way, but I stand as a backup here, because I don't like this being jammed down the throats of the people. This is wrong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, these trade agreements are big deals. Trade promotion authority used to mean setting tariffs. Now they can affect everything from the safety of our food to the working conditions of people around the world and environmental standards. Very frankly and simply, that means that Americans should know what the agreements say and what our government is saying about them, and they should be given that information while there is a meaningful chance to influence them.

I hope to influence them through this deliberative process. It is supposed to be open and transparent. I have two amendments—one that would promote greater transparency in trade agreements and the second to help ensure that foreign countries cannot use trade agreements to undermine the safety and security of America's food supply.

First, on the subject of transparency, nothing is more fundamental than for the American people to know what is in these trade agreements. Despite their significance, despite the far-reaching ramifications and implications they have for our American economy and, indeed, our way of life, they are being negotiated in secret. In fact, Members of Congress can view them only if they go to secure locations, and staff of Members of Congress can see them only if they are accompanied by the Members themselves. The real problem is not Members of Congress or their staff but the American public who are kept in the dark. They are the supposed beneficiaries of these deals, and yet they are kept from knowing what is in them. The TPA would allow the text of an agreement to be made public only after it is already finalized—a point that is way too late for the people most directly and urgently affected by the deals to do anything but try to get Congress to vote down

the whole thing in its entirety at once. That is not productive. That is not fair.

More transparency would allow issues over a particular provision to be resolved individually on their own. This kind of practice is not in accordance with our democratic condition, an open and transparent process to set policy—whether it is trade policy or any other issue of economic and political consequence.

So making the TPA more transparent is a relatively easy fix. My amendment would do it. This amendment would require the publication of ''formal proposals advanced by the United States in negotiations for a trade agreement.''

''Formal proposals advanced by the United States in negotiations for a trade agreement''—that means that the United States, when it takes an official position and offers it to another country, ought to tell the American people, its own people—not just the people who are rulers of another country but our own people. They have a right to know when this administration or any other offers something to people of another country, and my amendment would require that basic protection and transparency.

Very importantly, this amendment would not prohibit confidential negotiations or closed-door deliberations. Some off-the-record discussion, no question, is necessary for effective consideration of any multilateral agreement. And this amendment would not affect negotiations specifically relating to tariffs and similar market-access provisions that are the traditional subjects of trade negotiations.

Some negotiations have to be done in confidence—in private—but basic positions, official proposals, are outside of this realm—proposals that look more like traditional legislative policymaking, because they can involve give or take, sacrifices from the American people, and give and take by other countries. They can align standards for regulations across a number of areas, from drug development to finance.

Other countries can be encouraged. They can be empowered to adopt stronger protections for workers, for clean air and water and more. But harm can be done if trade agreements undermine American laws and American protections for health, safety, and security of our citizens.

There are a number of amendments that I have supported that will directly address labor issues, environmental issues, and security issues. This amendment would simply ensure that all of these issues are considered in an open, fair, and transparent way, so the American people—not just we in this Chamber, not just our negotiators, not just the President and his advisers—know what is happening.

Publication of formal proposals, which is a term of art in trade agreements, would bring American transparency practice in line with the general practices of our European allies. The European Union countries engaged in the TTIP negotiations announcing that they will post on the Internet all textual proposals that will be offered to the United States, as well as position papers, establishing their approach and analysis. And America should simply do the same. We are a nation that prides itself on leading the world in transparency, openness, and democracy. We should not be behind our European allies on that score.

I am very grateful for the support of Senator BROWN, a tremendous leader in this effort to ensure that American trade agreements work for the American people, as well as Senator BALDWIN and Senator UDALL. And I urge other colleagues to support this amendment and the other amendments that I am offering on food safety.

And I am grateful, again, to have the support of Senator BROWN on this one. It would establish as a principal negotiating objective of the United States the protection and promotion of strong food safety laws as well as regulations and inspections. Enforcement is key. Standards are vital. Ensuring that trade agreements do not weaken or diminish our food safety standards ought to be a given.

We take for granted all too often that our food is safe until we discover that it isn't, until we find there are food poisonings and tragedies that result from unsafe food. We saw it at the beginning of the last century. Unscrupulous corporations can cut corners by skimping on food safety or worse, by introducing dangerous additives or adulterations to foods, making them or processing them under unsafe or unacceptable conditions. They may save money, but they sacrifice lives and safety. The consequences in real lives and real time can be disastrous—not only in lives but in dollars.

The majority of food manufacturers and producers take their safety responsibilities seriously. The majority in this country certainly do. But what about abroad? What about in another country? What about in countries where the standards are nonexistent or not enforced? A campaign of dedicated advocacy and scientific research led to a system of food inspection in this country, which is far from perfect but way ahead of other countries, and it gives Americans the confidence they need and deserve to walk into any supermarket or restaurant in this country and feel trust—deserved because it is earned and because the laws are enforced.

Not all countries, unfortunately, follow these practices. Few countries have the standards that ours does. Food production is still under-inspected, spoiled or adulterated in those countries, and that is the product that we want excluded from this country if they fail to meet those standards. I am concerned that this trade agreement will affect our own food safety regulations by introducing those deficient products—unsafe food—into this country.

My amendment directs negotiators to ensure that imports of that food do not undermine the trust and confidence of our people in our own food supply as well as products from abroad. Countries with less stringent standards in protecting their citizens should not be permitted to use trade agreements to force this country to imitate them.

Trade is a crucial part of the American economy. It is an essential part of our Connecticut economy. Trade, when it is done right, is a great boon to many people and our entire economy. Defense and aerospace, small manufacturers, furniture and food companies in Connecticut all thrive because of trade. I want the world to see what Connecticut businesses have to offer, what our exports can do for them.

I know we can compete with anyone. I know how important exports are to my State, but I also know trade deals can have negative, unintended consequences, which is what we want to prevent; consequences in abuses by foreign governments seeking to subvert or circumvent American regulations or by giant multinational companies looking to move jobs and capital to where labor is cheapest and can be exploited easiest or where health or environmental protections are weakest.

My amendments would help ensure that the American people know what are in these trade agreements before they are approved, while they are negotiated, and when our food can be protected and transparency assured.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, during this trade debate, we have often heard a lot about the words ''enforcement'' or ''enforceable,'' particularly the phrase ''enforceable labor and environmental standards.'' But the fact is there are no enforceable labor and environmental standards. There is no new generation of treaty in the TPP that is going to create something we have not had before.

What we have had before has simply failed us. Why is that? Well, we had side agreements on labor and the environment in NAFTA. Much is made of the fact that, well, we are not going to have side agreements anymore; we are actually going to put these standards right in the treaty itself. So somehow folks are arguing in support of this treaty that moving the print from over here to here somehow makes is it more effective.

That is not the case. We had the same labor and environmental standards in the agreements we passed a few years ago, agreements I voted against—the agreement with Colombia, the agreement with Korea.

But what have we seen over time? Have we ever seen any of these labor objectives and these environmental standards enforced? Let me give you a sense of what we are talking about.

Under the International Labor Organization, ILO, they have a set of standards. They have lots of details. But there are things like freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining and elimination of forced labor or compulsory labor, as it is referred to, the abolition of child labor, the elimination of discrimination in the workplace.

Certainly, at the heart of this—back to the right of collective bargaining—is the right of unions to organize, the right of workers to talk to each other and to bargain for a fair return for their efforts. But have we ever enforced a single ILO provision? No, we have not. In fact, we have only challenged the terrible labor practices in another nation once; that is, Guatemala. That went through years before we officially challenged it, and now it is still not resolved some 8 years after it was first challenged.

Is there anything new that changes the process in the anticipated Trans-Pacific Partnership? No, it is the same process: put in the ILO standards and hope people will aspire to honor them—hope, the same hope that has failed us time and time again in treaty after treaty. So the next time someone comes to this floor and says there is an enforceable labor standard, no one should believe it because it is not there.

We have not enforced one labor standard, not one. Guatemala is the only one we have challenged, and that one, after 8 years, we still have not resolved it. How about environmental standards? Have we filed challenges on environmental standards? What are these environmental standards? Well, basically it is a requirement to honor international treaties.

No, these things are violated all over the place, but we have not challenged them a single time. Now, why is it that the United States does not challenge these violations? Well, first, it has to be a government-to-government action, when an issue is raised and folks are told: Hey, government, U.S. Government, you really should do something about trade unionists being murdered in Colombia.

Well, no, if we object, it will create ripples in the relationship. So the U.S. Government does not want to take action. It does not want to create ripples in the relationship. But if pressed, folks come and say: You know, it really matters that you said you would enforce this, U.S. Government, but you are not. You should really do something.

Well, you know, if we object to the way they are conducting themselves in regard to labor and environmental standards, there will be retaliatory actions against the United States. Then it will just be: We will challenge them, they will challenge us, and it will go on for years and years. It will disrupt the whole relationship. Why would we do that?

If that is not enough, then if the government, our government, is really serious about enforcing something, then the companies that have invested in that nation, then they come forward and say: Wait. The whole goal of this trade agreement was to create a stable environment for investing. If you challenge and try to have them honor the labor and environmental provisions, ultimately, not only will it produce retaliatory actions that will be potentially harmful, but if you should win somewhere down the line, that means there may be tariffs on the products that we produce in that country and they will not be able to enter the United States. Please do not mess up our investment in that nation.

So for these reasons, there has been no enforcement—none. Again, there was one effort in Guatemala never resolved. There is nothing new in this anticipated Trans-Pacific Partnership that would operate any differently.

How about if we had snapback provisions? We have been talking quite a lot on the situation with Iran, that if we reach an agreement with them in June, Congress is going to want to make sure that if there are violations of the agreement, that the controls on Iranian trade that have been effective in bringing them to the negotiating table will snap back into place to make sure folks really respond in Iran to honoring the agreement.

Is there any snapback provision anticipated, new strategy, this new tool to make sure the agreements are actually honored? No, there are not. So the old system has not worked. There is no new system. There has been no enforcement. Anyone who tells you there are enforceable labor and environmental standards is not telling you the truth because there are not. That is why we need to change the negotiations.

Now, the goal of fast-track was to lay out a series of objectives for the U.S. Government to pursue in writing an agreement on trade with other nations.

This is a little bit complicated now, because when you raise up an idea and say this should be addressed, the administration says, well, yes, but we have already negotiated this treaty. We cannot go back to the negotiating table and change it. We are 95 to 98 percent complete.

So, for example, we have been raising the issue of currency manipulation. This is a fundamental—fundamental—provision of what should be in a trade agreement, because when you get rid of a tariff, you can create an effective tariff on your trading partner's products and a subsidy on your own through intervention in the currency markets. It is known as currency manipulation. It should be covered, but it is not.

When you talk to the administration, the administration says we just cannot go back and talk about things that we have not already put on the table. So that would be unacceptable for us to take on this important provision now because we have already negotiated the agreement.

Well, then, what is really the point of fast-track, if it is not to lay out the standards that are expected for an agreement? In that case, it is nothing but a rubberstamp for an already negotiated treaty that does not meet the things that folks in this room are saying are important to have. In that case, it just simply becomes a greased track for approving the treaty or the agreement, as it is referred to. It is not referred to as a treaty. Why not? When it creates an international body that can assess fines on the United States, does that not qualify as a treaty? No. Because the folks who are negotiating this do not want it to be subject to the supermajority that the Constitution requires for a treaty. So they say we will call it an agreement. That will fix that. Now it is only a simple majority vote, and we will get this fast-track under the argument that Congress is getting a chance to say what needs to be in the treaty—but not really because we refuse to take any item we haven't already put in the agreement.

So that is really the state of affairs. That is why, instead of simply having negotiating objectives, we need to have negotiating standards that have to be met before an agreement is brought back to this body under the fast-track rule. Objectives are just wishful thinking, wishful thinking that you have some type of ''enforceable labor provisions,'' wishful thinking that there are some forms of enforceable environmental standards.

Is that really enough? Is that all we are asking for is a little bit of wishful thinking, when we already know it is not going to be honored? So let's put in mandatory negotiating objectives in these two categories. That is why I have submitted amendment No. 1369. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that my amendment be brought up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. CANTWELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

I am saddened to hear that there is an objection in a context in which the majority leader has argued that he is going to have a robust and open amendment process. So why is there an objection to bringing an amendment forward to debate a core issue, which speech after speech after speech in support of this agreement—this fast-track to accelerate consideration of TPP—has referred to enforceable labor standards? Why not debate an amendment that would actually require enforceable labor standards? Why not?

Well, because apparently that is not a serious goal. Let's turn to another piece of this. There is a part of this system referred to as ''dispute settlement,'' an international system of dispute settlement, ISDS. What this does is it sets up a tribunal not subject to American law. It is an international tribunal, has one person chosen by America and one chosen by a foreign

investor and one chosen by the combination.

This group, this ISDS, is empowered to apply a series of standards and say that an action by our country has damaged the interest of a foreign investor, and the foreign investor must be compensated or, if they are not compensated, that the law has to be changed. Well, really this whole concept was generated to protect American investments in countries that had weak judicial systems because that way, if you had an investment and the foreign country tried to expropriate it, change the law so you could not sell what you were making or something of that nature, there was a way to address that.

One can understand why American businesses would want that sort of stability. You can also understand why countries with poor judicial systems would want to sign on to such a system in order to encourage investment in their country. They want the jobs. They want that foreign investment.

But in the United States, we have a good judicial system. Why would we allow it to be displaced by an international tribunal—a tribunal that has not even been approved through the treaty process, mandated in the Constitution? Why would we give the power to three corporate lawyers who have conflicts of interest—there is no prohibition on conflicts of interest for the members who serve as judges—and allow them to rule on our consumer laws, allow them to rule on our public health laws, allow them to rule on our environmental laws? Quite frankly, that is giving away a significant piece of our sovereignty, carving a big hole out of our judicial system and handing it over to an international tribunal. If that doesn't constitute something that should qualify for treaty status—giving away a chunk of sovereignty out of our judicial system—I don't know what would qualify for a treaty. But this little slick game is underway of calling it an agreement in order to bypass our constitutional standard. And what does that mean? That means if a State says ''We no longer want to allow chemicals to be put into our carpets because those flame retardants are causing cancer in our children,'' a foreign investor who has set up a factory to make flame retardants can file suit against the United States and say they have been damaged as a foreign investor. The foreign investor gets rights that do not belong to in-country investors. Why should we give special rights to foreign investors that American investors do not have?

Why should we proceed and have a labeling law on e-cigarettes—a new challenge, if you will? Let's say, for example, that we require mandatory caps, childproof caps on the bottles. Let's say we banned the flavorings on e-cigarettes. Those flavorings are things such as double chocolate delight or any other number of candy flavors, bubble gum—you name it. If it sounds like candy, there is a container of liquid nicotine with that name on it. So you take away the flavorings, you greatly diminish the sales targeted at our youth.

Why would we control the flavorings? Well, we passed a law in 2009 that gave that power to the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration. The Food and Drug Administration has done an initial draft deeming regulation. Under this draft deeming regulation, they attempt to control or perhaps may control the flavorings. They would do so because cigarette companies—that is, tobacco companies—are targeting our children because they know that addiction occurs before the age of 21. You want to get our middle school and high school children puffing on e-cigarettes so that they will be addicted before they reach 21 because by then the brain has developed to the degree that people rarely get addicted.

So we, in protection of the health of our children, have seriously considered—created a framework for regulating this candy-flavored attack on the health of our youth. That is why we do it, for the protection of our youth. But along comes a foreign investor who set up a factory to create liquid nicotine and says: I can't sell my product now because I invested in all this equipment to do all these candy flavors and you are banning it. You either have to change your law or I get to be compensated.

So we should carve out of this ISDS settlement, if we have it at all—and I think it should be opt-in. A country that wants foreign investment because they know they have a shaky judicial system should opt into it. We would not opt in because we have a fair judicial system. But if it is going to exist, it should definitely carve out our public health, our consumer laws, and our environmental laws. And that is exactly why I have amendment No. 1401.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and amendment No. 1401 be called up.

Ms. CANTWELL. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Objection is heard.

Mr. MERKLEY. I will keep pushing for consideration of my amendments, which are being banned from consideration on this floor, because if we are going to have a ''robust and open amendment process,'' we should, in fact, have a robust and open amendment process and consider these serious issues before us.

So let's turn to a third area, which is the fact that the Trans-Pacific Partnership—you hear robust labor protections that level the playing field. Well, a level playing field would involve roughly similar standards between countries. So is there anything that levels in any way the vast difference between the minimum wage in some of the prospective TPP countries and other countries? The answer is no, not a thing. The single most important labor differential between the nations is not addressed in any shape or form.

So if we were to look at the minimum wages, we would find, as the Senator from California noted earlier, that Brunei and Singapore have no minimum wage at all. Mexico and Vietnam are under $1 in minimum wage. Malaysia, Peru, and Chile are under $2.50. So basically we have 7 countries out of this group of 12 that have a minimum wage that either doesn't exist or is under roughly $2.50. That is very different from the other five countries in this agreement. These are countries such as the United States, with a minimum wage at $7.25—it should be higher, but it is $7.25; Japan's is $8.17; Canada has a minimum wage of $9.75; New Zealand, $11.18; and Australia's is $16.87—more than double the United States, which was surprising to me.

Well, if you have this vast difference and you have manufacturers in the United States, Japan, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, these manufacturers would like to play off China against Malaysia and Malaysia against Vietnam and Vietnam against Mexico because that way they can drive the lowest possible wages between these countries.

Let me be quick to say that there are American companies—highly responsible American companies—that depend on overseas manufacturing that are very careful in monitoring their subcontractors and the conditions in which their subcontractors operate. These are often the brands that we know well, that are pillars in our community. But for every one of those, there are dozens of contractors and subcontractors that are seeking the lowest possible cost to make something, and that is why they want to play off these countries against each other. Oh, Malaysia, you are raising your minimum wage. Oh, you are enforcing your environmental standard. We are going to increase production in our Vietnamese factory. Oh, Vietnam, you now are saying you want to honor the ILO labor standard? Well, that is a problem. We are going to produce more in our Mexico factory. So this is opening a race to the bottom.

If we are going to come to the floor—as many have—to say that there are fundamentally even labor standards between the countries in this agreement, shouldn't we have even standards? Shouldn't we have an even minimum wage standard or at a minimum at least require there to be a base minimum wage and then have that raised over time for participants so as to reduce the differential between the highest paid and the lowest paid? Because not only does this system set up an ability and an effort to play off Malaysia against Mexico, against Vietnam, but it also sets up a situation where the conversation is like this: Oh, so here in America we are going to raise our minimum wage. Well, that means we are going to have to shift another 1,000 jobs somewhere else—maybe to

Malaysia, maybe to Vietnam. Maybe we will use the WTO and go to China.

It has a big impact on suppressing living wages in our country, and we have seen this impact. Since 1974, we have seen productivity soar in our country, but the actual return to workers, inflation adjusted, has been flat and then declining for the last 10 years. Families are having a terribly difficult time getting by.

So not only do we have a stake in fairness not to create a race to the bottom between Malaysia, Vietnam, Mexico, and Peru, but we also have an incentive not to create a situation where U.S. living wages are constantly eviscerated under the threat of shipping those jobs overseas. Well, maybe we will assemble it here, but we will do more of our subcomponents in those countries. And once you set up an effective, efficient factory overseas, it makes it easier and easier to ship those.

That is why I have an amendment that says: At a minimum, let's fill this gaping gap. Let's proceed to require there to be, as part of the negotiations, the negotiation of a minimum wage for entry and for that minimum wage to be gradually increased in order to diminish the disparities between the high-wage countries, of which there are five in this agreement, and the low-wage countries, of which there are seven. This would be good to end the play off of one low-wage country against another, and it would be good to diminish the comparative advantage of low-wage countries in terms of taking manufacturing out of the United States. That is why I drafted amendment No. 1409.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and for my amendment No. 1409 to be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection.

Ms. CANTWELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MERKLEY. I am zero for three now in terms of being able to get substantive amendments, serious amendments on this floor for debate, but I will try to on one more, and this one is anchored in recent news that we have seen the country-of-origin labeling—or COOL, as it is called—country-of-origin labeling standard knocked down just yesterday. What does this mean? This means it is going to be considered a trade violation for us to inform Americans on where their meat comes from. Isn't it a fundamental right in our country to know where our food comes from? Shouldn't we always have the right to know that? But we have engaged in a trade agreement—a previous trade agreement—and now the adjudicating body of that agreement says: No, no, no. That is unfair, to tell people where the meat comes from. Well, I think that is wrong, absolutely 100 percent wrong. Every American consumer should have the right to know where their meat comes from, and if I want to buy American-grown beef, I should have the right to do that, and I can't exercise that right unless I know—on the package—where it was grown.

If there are human rights violations or labor violations in Colombia and I don't want to buy Colombia meat until they fix their labor negotiations, I should have the right to use my dollar to buy my meat from the United States of America and not meat grown in Colombia. But that has been struck down because we gave away previously a chunk of our sovereignty. That is the danger of giving away the sovereignty of the United States of America to an international group that strikes down fundamental rights that every one of us should have. So let's fix that.

That is why I drafted amendment No. 1404 which would declare that the right to establish information for consumers about where their food comes from will not be violated by the agreement that is brought back to the Senate.

I hope everyone will join me in unanimous consent in saying that absolutely we are going to defend the rights of Americans to know where their food comes from.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that amendment No. 1404 be brought up in order that we should all be able to exercise our rights to not buy products from countries that we find in violation of fundamental human rights or other labor abuses or environmental errors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. CANTWELL. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MERKLEY. I see my colleagues on the floor who have their own amendments to address. I will conclude by saying that if I can't get up one of my four amendments to be debated—all substantive and all addressing key components of this agreement—then this is not a robust process, this is not an open process, and I ask the majority leader to keep his vision that he laid out on this floor that this would be an open process and a robust process.

Thank you.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the pending business, which is the trade promotion authority, also known as TPA, adding to the many initials we are throwing around these days.

I thought the Senate came to an agreement to move forward on this legislation, and as promised by the majority leader allowing amendments, but we are not getting to vote. I hope we can note that the objections are not coming from the Republican side of the aisle.

I believe the United States must engage in a global marketplace if they are going to survive economically. I also understand there are concerns about TPA. In particular, there is confusion about what exactly happens when Congress passes a TPA bill. History provides us an insight into why Congress created this particular authority.

Article I of the U.S. Constitution states, ''Congress shall have the Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign nations.'' For over 150 years, Congress established tariff rates directly. However, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement of 1934, RTAA—more initials—Congress delegated this authority to the President, who could reduce tariffs within preapproved levels in reciprocal trade agreements.

In response to Presidential overreach under the act, Congress enacted the first trade promotion authority bill in 1974. Since that time, Congress has regularly enacted TPA legislation which defines U.S. negotiating objectives and priorities for trade agreements.

As an added measure, Congress includes time limits on the use of TPA and retains the option to disapprove of an extension when the President requests one. Finally, each Chamber has the right to exercise its constitutional authority to change TPA in an implementing bill.

The underlying TPA bill builds on the tradition of Congress setting the terms for trade by expanding the transparency and consultation requirements for the administration. The procedure allows any Member of the House or Senate to unilaterally push to remove TPA authority if he or she believes the White House has not consulted fully with Congress. This is an important check to ensure that Congress is not turning over the fast-track keys to an administration that will disrespect the negotiating objectives Congress sets in its TPA bill.

I am confident in supporting TPA because it advances the ball on the Trans-Pacific Partnership—TPP. The TPP agreement is not just a trade agreement, it is an economic and strategic agreement. The TPA parties already include a number of nations the United States already has bilateral free-trade agreements with, including Australia, Chile, Singapore, and Peru. This starting point ensures that TPP includes the highest standards of trade favorable to an economically free and fair market.

Additionally, we know the United States needs to continue setting the tone in the Pacific region both economically and politically. The TPP achieves the goal by taking the first step in creating the leading trade agreement of the 21st century.

Let me give some examples of how TPP will benefit Wyoming. Despite having no direct access to the Pacific Ocean, in 2014, businesses from Wyoming exported $1 billion in goods to TPP partners, which would grow under the new agreement. For Wyoming, most of its trade is in the natural chemical industry. A key industrial

and chemical product I have spoken about on the Senate floor is soda ash. Wyoming also exports machinery and energy products to these Pacific markets.

I must also add that over two-thirds of the firms exporting goods from Wyoming are small- or medium-sized businesses. Exports are increasingly playing a role in job growth in my State. In 1992, just 12 percent of the jobs in the State of Wyoming were tied to international trade. As of 2013, one in six jobs in Wyoming is dependent on international trade. The TPP agreement is an opportunity for Wyoming's businesses, especially in mining, manufacturing, and agriculture, to expand their markets and grow. This is why on April 22 I voted to support TPA in the Senate Committee on Finance.

Trade promotion authority also plays a key role in advancing the interests of our Nation's most competitive businesses, including technology and medical innovation. I have long spoken about the importance of protecting American innovations overseas. The United States remains a leader in innovation and technology because of our strong protections for intellectual property. The TPP would include the highest standard to date for new innovations.

I look forward to advancing TPA and want to give credit to Chairman HATCH and Leader MCCONNELL for the open amendment process they are trying to get on this bill.

I will also mention, briefly, that I oppose expanding TAA—another good acronym—without a closer look at how it mimics and duplicates Federal workforce training programs. As the former chairman and ranking member of the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, I am extremely familiar with the existing Federal programs that Congress funds to improve workforce training. TAA is redundant, and now is not the time to increase spending. As chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget, I cannot ignore programs that add new spending. That is why I intend to vote against expanding it and adding it to the underlying bill.

I hope we will take a look at the TPA within the amendment process, and I hope people will pay attention to an article that appeared in the Casper Star Tribune, which is our State newspaper. I assume it appeared in many other newspapers. The title of this article is ''The left is so wrong on the Trans-Pacific Partnership.'' The article goes into some of the reasons Democrats might be trying to deny this from happening. If you look at the strategy, I think that probably is where a lot of the amendments are headed—to actually defeating it, not to help it along, not to improve it, and that is wrong.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article I just mentioned.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Casper Star Tribune, May 17, 2015]

THE LEFT IS SO WRONG ON THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

(By Froma Harrop)

The left's success in denying President Obama fast-track authority to negotiate the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) is ugly to behold. The case put forth by a showboating U.S. Sen. Elizabeth Warren, D-Mass.,—that Obama cannot be trusted to make a deal in the interests of American workers—is almost worse than wrong. It is irrelevant.

The Senate Democrats who turned on Obama are playing a 78 rpm record in the age of digital downloads.

Did you hear their ally, AFL–CIO head Richard Trumka, the day after the Senate vote? He denounced TPP for being ''patterned after CAFTA and NAFTA.'' That's not so, but never mind.

There's this skip on the vinyl record that the North American Free Trade Agreement destroyed American manufacturing. To see how wrong that is, simply walk through any Wal-Mart or Target and look for all those ''made in Mexico'' labels. You won't find many. But you'll see ''made in China'' everywhere.

Many of the jobs that did go to Mexico would have otherwise left for low-wage Asian countries. Even Mexico lost manufacturing work to China.

And what can you say about the close-to-insane obsession with CAFTA? The partners in the 2005 Central American Free Trade Agreement—five mostly impoverished Central American countries plus the Dominican Republic—had a combined economy equal to that of New Haven, Conn.

(By the way, less than 10 percent of the AFL–CIO's membership is now in manufacturing.)

It's undeniable that American manufacturing workers have suffered terrible job losses. We could never compete with pennies-an-hour wages. Those low-skilled jobs are not coming back. But we have other things to sell in the global marketplace.

In Washington state, for example, exports of everything from apples to airplanes have soared 40 percent over four years to total nearly $91 billion in 2014, according to The Seattle Times. About two in five jobs there are now tied to trade.

Small wonder that U.S. Sen. Ron Wyden, a liberal Democrat from neighboring Oregon, has strongly supported fast-track authority.

Some liberals oddly complain that American efforts to strengthen intellectual property laws in trade deals protect the profits of U.S. entertainment and tech companies. What's wrong with that? Should the fruits of America's creativity (that's labor, too) be open to plundering and piracy?

One of TPP's main goals is to help the higher-wage partners compete with China. (The 12 countries taking part include the likes of Japan, Australia, Canada, Chile, Mexico and New Zealand.) In any case, Congress would get to vote the finished product up or down, so it isn't as if the public wouldn't get a say.

But then we have Warren stating with a straight face that handing negotiating authority to Obama would ''give Republicans the very tool they need to dismantle Dodd-Frank.''

Huh? Obama swatted down the remark as wild, hypothetical speculation, noting he engaged in a ''massive'' fight with Wall Street to get the reforms passed. ''And then I sign a provision that would unravel it?'' he told political writer Matt Bai.

''This is not a partisan issue,'' Warren insisted. Yes, in a twisted way, the hard left's fixation over big corporations has joined the right's determination to undermine Obama at every pass.

Trade agreements have a thousand moving parts. The United States can't negotiate with the other countries if various domestic interests are pouncing on the details. That's why every president has been given fast-track authority over the past 80 years or so.

Except Obama.

It sure is hard to be an intelligent leader in this country.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 8 p.m. today be equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments listed: No. 1312, Inhofe-Coons, as further modified; No. 1227, Shaheen; No. 1327, Warren; No. 1251, Brown; I further ask that no second-degree amendments be in order to these amendments and that the Inhofe amendment be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold for adoption. I further ask that it be in order to offer the following first-degree amendments during today's session of the Senate: No. 1252, Brown-Portman, the level playing field amendment; No. 1385, Hatch-Wyden, the currency amendment; No. 1384, Cruz-Grassley, the immigration amendment; No. 1410, Menendez, the child labor amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BROWN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would like to speak first on the request. I thank Chairman HATCH for his work on this, especially on the level the playing field. He knows this amendment is a top priority for me. It is also a top priority for steelworkers and steel facilities throughout the country.

I would like to ask Chairman HATCH if he would take the same collaborative spirit he has shown toward me and ask him to modify his request, if I could. This is my request, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent that the following first-degree amendments be in order to be offered during today's session: Brown-Portman No. 1252; Hatch-Wyden No. 1385; Cruz-Grassley No. 1384; Menendez-Wyden No. 1410; Cantwell No. 1248; Casey No. 1334; Baldwin No. 1317; Murphy No. 1333; Cardin No. 1230; Blumenthal No. 1297; Sanders No. 1343; Markey No. 1308; Peters No. 1353; Whitehouse No. 1387; Boxer No. 1361; Franken No. 1390; Durbin No. 1244; Merkley No. 1401; that the time until 8 p.m. today be equally divided in the usual form and that at 8 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Inhofe-Coons No. 1312, as modified with the changes that are at the desk; Shaheen No. 1227; Warren No. 1327; McCain-Shaheen No. 1226; Brown No. 1251; Hatch-Wyden No. 1385; Portman-Stabenow No. 1299; Brown-Portman No. 1252; and Cantwell No. 1248. Further, I ask that no second-degree amendments be in order to these

amendments prior to the votes and that the following amendments be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold for adoption: Inhofe-Coons No. 1312; Brown-Portman No. 1252; McCain-Shaheen No. 1226; and Cantwell No. 1248; finally, I ask unanimous consent that it not be in order for cloture to be filed on the Hatch substitute or the underlying bill during today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah so modify his request?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, of course I haven't seen all that, so I will have to enter an objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection to the modification is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Ms. CANTWELL. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. 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. BROWN. Before Senator PETERS speaks, I again would like to thank Senator HATCH for the work he has done on this. I appreciate how he wants to move forward. There are many things here we agree with to move forward on.

The reason for the unanimous consent request I made was that we saw today a whole host of Senators come to the floor. We saw Senator BALDWIN come down, Senator MERKLEY has come down, Senator PETERS is here, Senator BLUMENTHAL came earlier, Senator WARREN, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator CASEY—and I am leaving some out—Senators BOXER and FRANKEN all came to the floor with amendments because they want, as Senator MCCONNELL promised, a full and open process. So my unanimous consent request was to take the generous offer of Senator HATCH and make it broader and wider so those Senators who have shown the interest to come to the floor today would be able to offer those amendments.

The reason I asked that cloture not be filed today is that it just simply doesn't seem right to me—and I know to a number of Members of my caucus—that literally 24 hours after we start this process we already are talking about cloture.

Thirteen years ago, the last time we did fast-track here, this debate went for 3 weeks. I am not asking for 3 weeks. I think that would be a bridge too far for most of us. But I am saying that 13 years ago there were 50 amendments that were considered. Today, we have considered 6 and there have been 149 filed. That is 4 percent of the amendments that were filed. Again, Senator HATCH's generous offer gets us not even to 10 percent of those offered amendments.

So invoking cloture this quickly really does stifle the process, and I think this is too big a deal for that. This fast-track debate encompasses the largest trade debate, the largest trade agreement in the history of the country—I guess in the history of the world, for that matter. It involves 40 percent of the world's GDP, these 12 TPP countries. Adding in the European countries in the next round, also under TPA, is another 20 percent of the world's GDP. So that would be 60 percent of the world's GDP. You don't file cloture within 24 hours and begin to shut down debate.

That was the reason for my unanimous consent request. Again, I thank Senator HATCH for his patience in working together on the level the playing field amendment, one of the major enforcement issues, but I have at least 15 Members of my caucus, as many as 20, who want to offer amendments. There have been 149 amendments filed on both sides, and to cut off debate with fewer than 10 percent of them in order or even a few more than that is simply not the way this Senate should operate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague, and I am trying to accommodate him. I always try to accommodate my colleagues. On the other hand, his side has stonewalled this since last Wednesday. Thursday was a full day we lost. We are going to be here Friday. We did not do very much yesterday; today, nothing. I am very concerned that we are not moving ahead. We are not doing what we should do. This is an important matter. It is an important bill.

I chatted with the President earlier today. He indicated how important it is to him personally, what this bill means to our country, how important it is to get it passed and to pass it in a form the House will accept, which is what I am trying to do.

I do not think it has been this side that has slowed this down, although I do not want to pick on either side. The Senators are certainly within their rights to slow-walk this all they want to. On the other hand, it is very difficult for me to sit here, having sat here all day and yesterday and would have been Thursday and Friday as well and Saturday if necessary. It strikes me as interesting that now they want all these amendments when they have had all this time to bring up their amendments and nobody was going to stop them.

All I can say is that I hope we come here tomorrow prepared to do amendments or do them tonight. I am prepared to stay if we have to. But the fact is that we are not going anywhere on this right now. This is an extremely important bill not only for the Congress but for the President of the United States and for the world at large when you stop and think about it, certainly the world over in Asia.

We are talking about having an agreement with Japan. It is the first time we have been able to do that. We have a new Prime Minister who is willing to work with us, and we are willing to work with him. That is a major achievement by this administration—not only that but 10 other countries. There is a high percentage of trade in this area, and what are we going to do—just leave it all to China to take over or are we going to take this more seriously and get this job done?

We have a number of poison pills that people have wanted to bring up that naturally would mean the end of this particular bill. I would like to prevent that if we can because we are talking about a bipartisan bill that has plenty of bipartisan support that really is crucial to this country at this time and crucial to that region. That could be a very difficult region for us if we do not do this.

If we do not do this and do it right, as we are trying to do and as the President is trying to do, then we will be just turning that whole area over to China. They are going to step right in and make the difference. Right now, these people want to deal with us, and there is a good reason they want to deal with us. But if we cannot even get our act in order to deal with them, then I can understand why they might go another route. They might be forced to go another route.

We all saw the new bank that has been established over there. At first, there were very few countries that went with it. The last time I heard—I may be wrong on this—there were up to 60 countries, including some of the European countries, some of the greatest countries in the world now.

What are we going to do—just cede the whole area to China or are we going to compete? This bill is for competitive purposes.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the distinguished chairman yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. WYDEN. I appreciate that, and I appreciate the chairman's work. I want to ask a question about where, in effect, we are. The two of us worked together on the list——

Mr. HATCH. That is right. Forgive me, I did not mean to indicate I was the only one doing this. I had an excellent partner.

Mr. WYDEN. Not at all. The question is, Mr. Chairman, we worked together to put together this list, and it was based on the proposition that we were going to be fair to both sides.

Mr. HATCH. Right.

Mr. WYDEN. On my side of the aisle, my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle felt strongly about the currency issue. Senator STABENOW, for example, and many others felt very strongly about the amendment Senator WARREN sought to offer. We were able, working together, to in effect get an equal number for each side.

My understanding is that we continue to be interested—and you just, I think, made another gracious offer. We are going to stay here tonight. You are still interested in putting together a list that gives all sides a fair chance at their major amendments. Is that a fair recitation of where we are now, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HATCH. Yes. I think both of us literally have tried to be fair to both sides. There are some amendments that I wish we did not have to put up with, to be perfectly frank with you, but that is always the case. Why should we not be fair to both sides?

There comes a limit to what you can do in these matters. As I said, this is probably the most important bill in many respects, outside of ObamaCare, in this President's 8 years. It is an extremely important bill for our country. It is an extremely important bill for our economy. It is an extremely important bill for our allies over in those areas. It is an extremely important bill that helps to set the stage for TTIP, the 28 countries in Europe.

All this bill does basically is provide a procedural mechanism whereby Congress has some control, if not total control, over what agreements are negotiated. This is not the TPP. It is not TTIP. It is not the final decisions on that. That will be made pursuant to this bill, which will be a very important bill for the purpose of saying that the White House and the administration follow certain protocols and recognize that the Congress of the United States is important in these trade matters, too.

I want to thank my colleague from Oregon for the hard work he has done on this bill. He has been a wonderful partner to work with today, and I really appreciate him. I hope we can resolve these problems, but as of right now, I had to object to the unanimous consent request by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, for whom I have a lot of respect. I do not agree with him, but I know he is sincere, and I know he is working very hard for what he believes is proper.

With that, I do not know what else to do other than just say I object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I, too, like the chairman of the Finance Committee, have been here all day, and I empathize with the dilemma that he faces, along with the ranking member, on how to move forward with this legislation.

This is a discussion which has been going on for months and months, if not years, which is, what are we going to do, as we deal with trade issues, about the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, which expires at the end of June?

While I appreciate my colleagues on the Finance Committee and the movement of trade legislation, I have had many discussions with them over the last several months about this very issue and the fact that this issue has to get resolved. I know no Member gets to have their way about what legislation gets an amendment. The list that was just given does nothing to guarantee that we would ever see a vote on the authorization of the Ex-Im Bank.

While the other side wants to protect what they think are the opportunities to pass this legislation in the House, which I respect, I do not think the House has to dictate to the U.S. Senate how we are going to proceed when the majority of people in both the House and Senate support the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. Right now, it has deals of $18 billion and more pending before it. If the Bank expires June 30, all of those trade deals, which are jobs for U.S. companies, disappear and go away. So, yes, in my opinion, there is no more important amendment than one that saves $18 billion of U.S. company sales to overseas markets.

So I and my colleagues who support the Ex-Im Bank reauthorization, which is the majority in both the House and Senate, have lost our patience with the ability to get this Bank before the Senate and before the House before that June 30 deadline. So I have no compulsion at this moment to say that I do not support moving forward on the cloture motion until we get an understanding of how this Bank is going to be reauthorized.

I know people are proud of the work that has been done on TPA, but it is silly to say to the American people that we are moving forward on opening up trade opportunities but we are going to let expire the tool that small businesses and individuals use to export their products—as a credit agency. It makes no sense to open up Cambodia if then you cannot get a bank in Cambodia to have the sales of a product from my colleague from South Carolina to that country. If somebody wants to tell me that one of these New York Wall Street banks will give us that kind of financing, then maybe we will come up with a different solution, but one does not exist.

Until our colleagues give us an answer about something we have been clear about for more than a year, we are going to continue to object because we are not going to let this Bank expire—the credit agency—without a fight.

I know my colleague from South Carolina is here on the floor. I appreciate his support of the Ex-Im Bank.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I want to echo what my colleague from Washington said. To those who negotiated this trade package, well done. I am going to vote for the Portman amendment because I think currency manipulation should be addressed more forcefully.

If trade deals in the future are going to be like trade deals in the past, we need to look at what we are doing because some of the trade deals in the past have not worked out so well.

On this currency issue, I want to vote. On the bank, I am telling my leadership the following: I have talked with you and talked with you. I have forgone taking votes on the Ex-Im Bank because I did not want to rock the boat on the budget and other things. I am tired of talking. You are not going to get my vote for cloture or anything else this year until I get a vote—we get a vote—on the Ex-Im Bank. There are over 60 votes in this body.

To the chairman, whom I admire greatly, you mentioned China. Let me mention China. China makes wide-body jets. They are getting into the wide-body jets business big time. China makes about everything we make. Boeing makes 787s in South Carolina and Washington. GE makes gas turbines in Greenville, SC, mostly sold through Ex-Im financing to the developing world.

If you are worried about China stepping in if we do not have this great trade deal, here is what I am worried about: If our Bank expires, then the market share we have today because we have competitive financing goes away, and the biggest beneficiary of closing down the Bank will be China.

I am not going to subject American manufacturers to trying to sell their products overseas without ex-im financing while all their competitors have an ex-im bank. As a matter of fact, China's bank is bigger than the banks of the United States, France, England, and Germany combined.

Airbus is a great airplane. France and Germany have an ex-im bank. An American manufacturer, when it comes to a wide-body aircraft or any other product trying to be sold overseas in the developing world—this Bank makes money for the taxpayers and makes them competitive.

To all of those who really do believe in trade, the fact that you would let the Bank expire because of some ideological jihad on our side makes absolutely no sense to me. I will not be a part of that anymore.

To the people who are trying to make this the scalp for conservatism, I think you lost your way. This Bank makes money for the taxpayers. This Bank doesn't lose money. This Bank allows American manufacturers who are doing business in the developing world to have a competitive foothold against their competitors in China and throughout Europe and have access to Ex-Im financing. All we are talking about is an American-made product sold in the developing world where they cannot get traditional financing.

The Ex-Im Bank has been around for decades. Ronald Reagan was for the Ex-Im Bank. The Ex-Im Bank is directly responsible for helping to sell Boeing aircraft made in South Carolina. Seventy percent of the production in South Carolina is eligible for Ex-Im financing. There are thousands of small businesses which benefit from manufactured products sold in the developing world through Ex-Im financing.

Would I like to live in a world where there were no ex-im banks? Sure, but the world I am not going to live in is where we shut our Ex-Im Bank down and China keeps theirs open. I am not doing that. That is not trade. That is just idiotic. That is unilateral surrender.

Come to South Carolina and tell the people at Boeing and all of their suppliers—and go to the Greenville GE plant that hires thousands of South Carolinians and all of their small business suppliers—why it is a good idea for America to shut down a bank that makes money for the taxpayers that allows us to be competitive. Tell them how you think that is a good way to grow our economy. Tell those people who have good jobs in South Carolina—and who will surely lose market share because we closed our Bank down—how proud they should be of your ideological purity.

I welcome this debate in South Carolina down the road. But I promised my leadership and friends on the other side that I am a reasonable guy. I vote for issues give-and-take, but the one thing I will not do is allow the Bank to expire without a vote. If my colleagues can beat me on the floor, that is fine. I am not asking anyone to vote for the Bank. I am asking them to allow me to vote for the Bank because it is critical to the economy in my State and I think the Nation as a whole.

The only reason we are having this debate is because some outside groups have made this the conservative cause celebre—in my view, without any rational reason.

I have no problem helping the chairman and ranking member move this bill because they talk about how it will make it harder on China to take market share in Asia. The only thing I ask of this body is to allow me and my colleagues who care about the Ex-Im Bank—it is a small piece of the puzzle that has a gigantic impact. It made over $3 billion for the American taxpayers.

This Bank is essential for American manufacturers to be competitive in the developing world, and I will not let this Bank expire without a vote. I will not give market share to China or the Europeans. I will not do that.

I am willing to work with my colleagues, but they have to be willing to work with me. And if they are not willing to honor their word that they have been giving me for the last 6 months, then they have nobody to blame but themselves.

To the Senator from Washington, all we are asking for is a vote on the Ex-Im Bank—that has been around for decades, that Ronald Reagan said was a good idea and that has overwhelming bipartisan support—before June 30 on a vehicle that must become law if we can pass that amendment. I ask the Senator from Washington, is that correct?

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina is correct. That is all we have been asking for, and we have talked to our colleagues about various vehicles and various opportunities for those votes. And, yes, that is exactly what has been promised.

We are here today because, as the Senator from South Carolina has described, the failure of us to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank will mean huge opportunities for foreign competitors at the very time when we are trying to open up markets for our U.S. companies. All we are asking is for the opportunity to have this vote. As the majority leader said, let the will of the Senate be done.

The Senator from South Carolina is right. People who have extreme views on this have decided that this is something they can hold up. Well, I don't think we are here today to try to ultimately say how individual people should vote. They should vote their conscience.

The fact that this Bank is about to expire and the fact that these jobs would be lost because we didn't do our job by reauthorizing the Bank is a failure. It is an imminent threat of $18 billion. These are proposed deals for export that will not get approved and will not get done because we won't have a bank. I think the Senate can do better than that.

I thank my colleague for being here tonight and going into detail about the Ex-Im Bank.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, reclaiming my time, and I will wrap it up.

To my colleagues who have been raising money off of this, you can raise all the money you want to, but you will have to debate your ideas against my ideas. You will not be able to shut this Bank down without a vote. If you feel that good about your position, let's have a vote on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House.

The one thing we will not do is let the Bank die without a debate and a vote, and that debate and vote must come before June 30 because the damage will have been done.

I will not sit on the sidelines and watch jobs in my State be lost because of some ideological crusade, the biggest beneficiaries of which would be China and our European competitors. If you really do care about China's effect in the world marketplace, shutting the Ex-Im Bank down in America and allowing China to keep theirs open is a deathblow to American manufacturers that sell in the developing world.

With that, I yield the floor and look forward to a positive outcome so my colleagues can have their bill passed and have votes on amendments they care about and get the bill up and passed if the votes are there, as long as I get a chance, along with the Senator from Washington, to vote on what I care about and what I think is essential to the economy—and not just to South Carolina but to the manufacturing community that sells in the developing world.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I think we are all aware that Chairman HATCH and Senator WYDEN have been working in good faith over the last several days to set up both debates and votes on amendments from both sides of the aisle. The bill managers have had some success in working together on the votes that we have had, and so far we have worked to get an additional seven amendments pending.

Sadly, there is an objection from the other side of the aisle on getting additional amendments pending regardless of which party offers the amendment.

Senator HATCH and his colleague have been down here for days trying to get amendments up, and obviously it is possible in the Senate to prevent others from getting amendments. Now we have the whole process stymied because we cannot seem to get agreements for any additional amendments.

I think we all know this is a body that requires at least some level of cooperation, and that just has not been happening here on this bipartisan bill.

I will point out that while I will file cloture on the bill this evening, that is not the end of the story. I will repeat that: That is not the end of the story. The bill managers will continue to work together to get more amendments available for votes before the cloture vote. And with a little cooperation from our friends on the other side of the aisle, I still think we can get that done.

It is my hope that we will be able to process a number of amendments, particularly those which are critical to Members on both sides, and then move forward, and we will have a couple of days to accomplish that.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a cloture motion to the Hatch amendment No. 1221 to H.R. 1314.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Hatch amendment No. 1221 to H.R. 1314, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, Daniel Coats, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, Jeff Flake, Tom Cotton, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Dan Sullivan.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a cloture motion to H.R. 1314.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.R. 1314, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, Daniel Coats, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, Jeff Flake, Tom Cotton, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Dan Sullivan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I call for regular order with respect to Portman amendment No. 1299.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 1411

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk to the text proposed to be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] proposes an amendment numbered 1411 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1299.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the text proposed to be stricken, insert the following:

(11) FOREIGN CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency practices is to seek to establish accountability through enforceable rules, transparency, reporting, monitoring, cooperative mechanisms, or other means to address exchange rate manipulation involving protracted large scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets and a persistently undervalued foreign exchange rate to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to a trade agreement, consistent, with existing obligations of the United States as a member of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, first off, I agree with Senator BROWN and Senator HATCH on how important this debate before us is. In fact, because it is so important, I certainly hope we have an opportunity to debate fully its ramifications, especially with issues such as the Ex-Im Bank, which I heard two of my colleagues discuss with some vigor just a few moments ago.

AMENDMENT NO. 1251

At this time I wish to talk about an amendment that I am offering with Senator BROWN to require approval of Congress before any additional countries may join the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

The 12 countries currently participating in TPP negotiations encompass about 40 percent of the global gross domestic Product. This would be the largest free-trade agreement since NAFTA, and Members should know that this agreement has the potential to expand to a number of additional countries without congressional approval.

The administration has said that they would welcome interest from other nations, including China, in joining TPP. Given the impact that trade deals, such as NAFTA, have had on American businesses and workers, I would argue that it is important that Congress not only be notified of new negotiations but also have the opportunity to vote on whether to move forward with bringing on additional countries into multinational trade negotiations.

If Congress were to approve the Trans-Pacific Partnership, it should not and must not be a blank check to bring in additional nations without congressional approval.

I am particularly concerned about countries that manipulate the value of their currency and gain an unfair advantage over U.S. workers, steal intellectual property from American innovators, engage in unfair labor practices, damage the environment, and do not abide by existing trade deals.

Just yesterday, a Federal grand jury indicted six Chinese citizens for stealing trade secrets. Last year, five Chinese military officers were caught stealing intellectual property from U.S. companies. The United States has brought 16 claims against China at the World Trade Organization, and the Chinese Government has consistently manipulated their currency against our dollar.

Despite these serious problems, the administration has said that they would welcome interest from China in joining TPP. If providing fast-track authority makes it easier for countries such as China to join the TPP, robust congressional oversight is critical.

Senator BROWN and I have offered an amendment to explicitly ensure that this oversight is available and that Congress has the opportunity to vote on the addition of any new countries to TPP negotiations. Our amendment will require the President to notify Congress before entering negotiations with another country seeking to join the TPP. It provides 90 days for Congress to conduct hearings and investigations and ultimately hold any potential new entrant accountable for unfair trade practices.

The House and Senate will need to affirmatively pass a resolution of approval for any new country to join TPP negotiations.

Nations such as China will not be able to join through unilateral action by a future White House. I urge my colleagues to support the Brown-Peters amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299

I would also like to urge my colleagues to support the Portman-Stabenow amendment on currency manipulation. A study by the Center for Automotive Research found that the TPP, as currently negotiated, will allow Japan to manipulate its currency, and this practice will likely lead to the elimination of over 25,000 American auto industry jobs.

Our workers and manufacturers can compete with anyone in the world, but they deserve a level playing field. Currency manipulation is the most significant trade barrier of our time, and it must be stopped. That is why I am supporting the Portman-Stabenow currency amendment, and I hope my colleagues will join me in standing up for American workers and fighting back against unfair currency manipulation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, trade is a major issue for a manufacturing State such as Wisconsin. I am very proud of the fact that the State I represent has had a rich history of making things. In fact, I don't think we can have an economy that is built to last that doesn't make things as a key part, a key sector of the overall economy. So this debate on trade promotion authority and the trade bills that may follow to the floor of the Senate and the House take on a particular disproportionate impact in a State such as Wisconsin that makes things.

We have lost a lot of those manufacturing jobs in recent years. We can't lay the entire blame on trade policies, but certainly some of our past trade deals have had a significant impact. It is hard to find folks in the State of Wisconsin who don't recall that in a negative way, who haven't suffered the results of mistakes we have made in the past.

That brings me to this debate we are having this evening and I hope tomorrow and beyond on trade promotion authority. What trade promotion authority asks us to do as Senators in the United States and Representatives over in the House is to cede some of our usual powers—our usual powers to amend bills to make them stronger, to make them more informed, to improve them, to perfect them—fast-track trade promotion authority asks us to relinquish those powers and to take a simple up-or-down, yes-or-no vote on a future trade deal that comes before us under this fast-track authority.

Now, that may bring up the question of why would one ever support ceding those powers and relinquishing those powers, and I think that, ultimately, one hypothetically can do that because what we can do is take the time in the fast-track debate to set the conditions, to set the negotiating principles that have to be met in order to be able to relinquish that power later.

That is where we get into this issue of process right now. It is so critical that we take the time to debate the conditions that we need to see present as representatives of people from States across this country, that we take the time to debate thoroughly these amendments so that we know the trade deals that will come before us later will be fair—not just free but fair. So I hope we take the time to debate all of these provisions because they matter in people's lives. They matter to middle-class, working Wisconsinites, some who have lost jobs in recent years and decades because of mistakes we have made in prior trade deals.

I come to the floor this evening to share with my colleagues that I have filed nine separate amendments to this trade promotion authority. I know we won't have the chance to fully debate and vote on all of them, but I think it is important that we try to have a thorough and comprehensive consideration. So far, we have only voted on two amendments, and there are only a handful that are pending for consideration. So on that point, I wish to take a few moments to address just four of the amendments that I think are crucial to my State of Wisconsin and the middle-class workers whom I have the honor of representing.

My first amendment is No. 1317. It is cosponsored by my colleagues Senator FRANKEN and Senator BLUMENTHAL. It strengthens the principle negotiating objective with respect to trade-remedy laws. This is talking about enforcement and having teeth in that enforcement. These trade remedies ensure that American manufacturers and their workers would compete on a level playing field globally.

American manufacturers fight an uphill battle to keep their prices low while foreign companies sell goods in the United States often at subsidized prices. U.S. manufacturing has already suffered financial losses—and thousands of jobs, I might add—as a result of unfair trade practices. My amendment would strengthen our ability to fight on behalf of our American manufacturing workers.

A second amendment I have offered is No. 1365, and I am proud to have joined forces with Senator BLUMENTHAL. It would restrict trade promotion authority for any trade agreement that includes a country that criminalizes individuals based on sexual orientation or otherwise persecutes or punishes individuals based on their sexual orientation or gender identity. These countries are identified for us in the State Department's annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices.

At least 75 countries across the globe continue to criminalize homosexuality, subjecting lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people to imprisonment, various forms of corporal punishment and, in some countries, the death penalty. For example, in Brunei, a newly adopted law provides for execution by stoning for homosexuality. As we all know, Brunei is part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership free-trade agreement that is now under negotiation.

Senators voting here on this legislation should know and understand this. If we do not adopt my amendment, we will be granting our highest trading status to a country that executes people based on whom they love. This is not hyperbole. This is a fact. The United States should not reward countries that deny the fundamental humanity of LGBT people by subjecting them to harsh penalties and even death simply because of who they are or whom they love.

My third amendment, No. 1320, would add a principal negotiating objective to ensure that any trade agreement actually increases manufacturing jobs and wages in the United States. Many Wisconsin communities, as I mentioned earlier, bear the scars of NAFTA and other flawed so-called free-trade agreements. From closed factories to foreclosed homes to devastated communities, Wisconsinites know all too well what happens when politicians in Washington tell them that they know what is best for them in Wisconsin.

Let me give a few numbers on trade from Wisconsin's perspective.

On jobs, according to the Economic Policy Institute, NAFTA has led to the loss of more than 680,000 jobs, most—60 percent of them—manufacturing jobs in the United States as a whole.

Since China joined the WTO in the year 2000, there has been a net loss of over 2.7 million U.S. jobs. Of that amount, Wisconsin has lost around 68,000 jobs between the years 2001 and 2013 because of our trade deficit with China and their currency manipulation.

Now, in 2011 we passed the South Korea Free Trade Agreement. In the years since, the growth of the U.S. trade deficit with South Korea has cost us more than 75,000 U.S. jobs.

On wages, competing with workers in China and other low-wage countries, it has reduced wages of 100 million U.S. workers without a college degree, a total loss of about $180 billion each year.

Since China joined the WTO, U.S. workers who lost their jobs because of trade with China have lost more than $37 billion in wages as a result of accepting lower-waged jobs.

The final amendment I wish to describe is amendment No. 1319, cosponsored by my colleague Senator MERKLEY, who was speaking with all of us earlier this evening. This amendment would require the administration to notify the public when it waives ''Buy American'' requirements. Wisconsin workers make things, and we have been one of the top manufacturing States in the Nation for generations. Now, if we hope to continue making things, we think we should continue to have our own government as a customer. Or, put another way, U.S. taxpayer dollars should support U.S. jobs. That is why I am a strong supporter of ''Buy American'' provisions that require Federal agencies to purchase American-made products. Free-trade agreements have historically allowed foreign nations way too much leeway when bidding for our government projects and contracts while not affording American companies the same access.

Now, I believe the issues I have brought up this evening and these four amendments are really important issues—important to our country, important to our standing in the world, and important to my State of Wisconsin. These are issues that the Senate should debate. I urge the majority leader to allow an open and robust amendment process so that we can vote on these critical provisions.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1411, AS MODIFIED

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have a modification to my amendment No. 1411 at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

In the language proposed to be stricken on page 27, lines 6 & 7 strike ''appropriate.'' and insert:
appropriate.

(12) FOREIGN CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency practices is to seek to establish accountability through enforceable rules, transparency, reporting, monitoring, cooperative mechanisms, or other means to address exchange rate manipulation involving protracted large scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets and a persistently undervalued foreign exchange rate to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to a trade agreement, consistent with existing obligations of the United States as a member of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, due to inclement weather causing a flight delay, I was unavoidably detained during consideration of Brown amendment No. 1242 and missed the rollcall vote that occurred on Monday, May 18. As a cosponsor of S. 568, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act of 2015, and supporter of trade adjustment assistance for workers here at home, had I been present I would have voted yea.

BADGER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT LAND PARCEL

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, in the closing days of last Congress, I was proud to see this body include a provision in the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act, P.L. 113–291, to transfer a parcel of land at the former Badger Army Ammunition Plant near Baraboo, WI, from the Department of Defense to the Department of the Interior. I worked throughout the drafting of this legislation to include this provision, which is of great importance to Wisconsin.

During discussions on the specific legislative text to be included in the bill, a question was raised as to how the language might apply to Department of Defense contractors, particularly any Badger Army Ammunition Plant operators. I understand the legislative language that refers to ''activities of the Department of Defense'' to include activities undertaken by the officers and agents employed or contracted by the Department of Defense, meaning that under the terms of this provision, the Army retains responsibility for remediation of environmental contamination resulting from activities undertaken by the Department of Defense and its contractors. This clarification is critical because Badger Army Ammunition Plant was operated by the Department of Defense contractors, and contamination at the site was caused as a direct result of their activities.

I wrote to the Department of Defense to request their clarification on this matter, and I ask unanimous consent that my letter and their response be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, January 12, 2015.

Mr. JOHN CONGER,
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Installations & Environment, Department of Defense, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CONGER: The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (PL 113–291) includes a provision (Section 3078) transferring administrative jurisdiction, from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of the Interior, of property located on the site of the former Badger Army Ammunition Plant (BAAP) near Baraboo, Wisconsin. I worked throughout the drafting of this legislation to include this provision, and would like to thank you for the assistance provided by your staff in drafting the legislative language that became part of the final bill.

During discussions on the specific legislative text to be included in the bill, a question was raised as to how the language might apply to Department of Defense contractors, particularly any BAAP operators. I understand the legislative language that refers to ''activities of the Department of Defense'' to include activities undertaken by the officers and agents employed or contracted by the Department of Defense, meaning that under the terms of this provision, the Army retains responsibility for remediation of environmental contamination resulting from activities undertaken by DOD and its contractors. This clarification is critical because BAAP was operated by DOD contractors, and contamination at the site was caused as a direct result of their activities. I would appreciate your views on this matter.

I have worked on this project for 16 years, and I am extremely grateful for the assistance provided by DOD and the Army to help craft a legislative solution. Thank you for your consideration of this request and for all that you do in support of the men and women of our Armed Forces.

Sincerely,

TAMMY BALDWIN,
United States Senator.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. TAMMY BALDWIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BALDWIN: Thank you for your January 12, 2015, letter requesting clarification of section 3078 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Pub. L. 113–291), transfer of administrative jurisdiction, from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of the Interior, of the property at the former Badger Army Ammunition Plant (BAAP) near Baraboo, Wisconsin. You asked how the act applies to the former Department of Defense operating contractors at BAAP.

The operating contractor for BAAP would have been responsible for operating the plant in accordance with the terms of the contract. Such an operating status would not change the underlying responsibility of the United States Army for the activities at the plant simply because they were performed by its contractor. This is not to say that the contractor would be absolved of responsibility for its activities while performing under the contract, but that responsibility would be governed by the terms of the contract as between the contractor and the United States Army.

To the extent that the contractor's activities were performed pursuant to and in accordance with the contract, the United States Army would retain responsibility for the activities that occurred in the operation of the plant. During those periods you appear to be most interested in, the Army was the owner of the plant for purposes of the environmental laws. We cannot prejudge any actual issue relating to who would be responsible for actions that occurred at the plant. Such responsibility would be determined after a careful review of the law and its application to the specific facts.

I hope you find this information helpful, please let me know if I can be of any further assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONGER,
Performing the Duties of the Assistant Secretary of Defense.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL R. MARTIN UMBARGER

• Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today I recognize and honor the extraordinary service of MG R. Martin Umbarger, the Adjutant General of Indiana, and to wish him well upon his retirement. A dedicated and loyal public servant, Major General Umbarger has served the people of Indiana and the United States in the Indiana Army National Guard for more than 45 years.

A native of Bargersville, IN, Major General Umbarger enlisted in the Indiana Army National Guard in 1969 after graduating from the University of Evansville. Shortly thereafter, in June 1971, he was commissioned as a second lieutenant, Infantry Branch, following his graduation from the Indiana Military Academy as a Distinguished Military Graduate. Since then, he has dedicated more than four decades to serving his State and his country. Some of his notable assignments include serving as Commanding General of the 76th Infantry Brigade; the Assistant Division Commander for Training, 38th Infantry Division; and the Deputy Commanding General, Reserve Component, U.S. Forces Command. On March 11, 2004, Gov. Joseph Kernan appointed Major General Umbarger to lead the Nation's fourth-largest National Guard contingent as the Adjutant General of Indiana, a position he was reappointed to by Gov. Mitch Daniels on December 1, 2004, and further reappointed by Gov. Mike Pence on December 13, 2012.

During the past 11 years as the Adjutant General, Major General Umbarger has led the Indiana Army and Air National Guard, as well as the more than 15,800 Indiana Guard, Reserve, and State employees, challenging them to embody the National Guard's motto, ''Always Ready, Always There.'' He has directed the training and deployment of nearly every unit of the Indiana Army and Air National Guard in support of the global war on terror and helped establish and oversee the well-respected J9 Resilience Program to support Guard members and their families during predeployment, deployment, and postdeployment. He also served as a member of the Secretary of the Army's Reserve Forces Policy Committee and the Secretary of Defense's Reserve Forces Policy Board.

Major General Umbarger has earned numerous awards and decorations, including: the Legion of Merit, Oak Leaf Cluster; Meritorious Service Medal, Oak Leaf Cluster; Army Commendation Medal Army; Achievement Medal; Armed Forces Reserve Medal, with two gold hourglass devices; Indiana Long Service Medal, and Indiana Distinguished Service Medal, Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster.

In addition to his service in the Indiana National Guard, Major General Umbarger has given his time and efforts to serving his community through many local and national organizations, including the Indiana Feed and Grain Association, the board of trustees of Johnson Memorial Hospital, the board of trustees of Franklin College, the Johnson County Animal Shelter, the Bargersville Masonic Lodge, the National Guard Association of the United States, the National Guard Association of Indiana, and the Association of the United States Army.

We thank Major General Umbarger for his service, dedication, and commitment to protecting Hoosiers and our Nation. Indiana has a long and proud tradition of serving our country, and Major General Umbarger's leadership has played a critical role in ensuring that our brave men and women have the training and support they need. General Umbarger has made the Indiana National Guard a national model and has left a strong Indiana National Guard. On behalf of Hoosiers, we wish Major General Umbarger and his wife Rowana the best in the years ahead.●

REMEMBERING A. ALFRED TAUBMAN

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the remarkable legacy of A. Alfred Taubman, an innovator whose work shaped the modern retail process for Americans and whose philanthropic endeavors have made an immeasurable impact across metro Detroit.

Mr. Taubman's story is an embodiment of the American dream. A first generation American, and the son of immigrants who fled Europe in the Great Depression looking for a chance to build a better life, Mr. Taubman came from humble beginnings. From this foundation, Mr. Taubman sought to follow his father into a career as a builder and quickly became a visionary by setting new trends in the retail shopping industry, which made him one of the most successful businessmen in the State of Michigan.

Despite entering the building trade without much formal higher education, he quickly honed his skills and by the age of 25 started his own business. In the wake of World War II, as the construction industry focused on suburban homes and industrial facilities, Mr. Taubman saw another dimension to America's burgeoning middle class, the opportunity for a new type of retail hub for suburban America: the shopping mall.

Mr. Taubman was a student of life, and took to heart the adage that learning is a lifelong experience; a principle which was integrated into his work. When he saw the opportunity to change and improve the retail shopping experience, he delved into understanding every facet and physiological component. This was a body of knowledge that he built into a formidable retail acumen. With this knowledge, he became a trendsetter, identifying untapped potential in developing communities and he led many successful endeavors.

While renowned for his groundbreaking work in the retail shopping industry, Mr. Taubman was an equally avid and passionate philanthropist, with a deep appreciation for the State of Michigan and the arts. His own work as a watercolorist inspired him to make gifts and donations to the Detroit Institute of Arts worth hundreds of millions of dollars. His charitable giving also extended to the University of Michigan's School of Medicine, where his donations have been used to fund stem cell research, holding the promise to cure degenerative diseases including ALS, as well as the College for Creative Studies and Lawrence Technological University, which are shaping the next generation of artists and innovators. Having suffered from the effects of dyslexia, he also generously supported programs to promote adult literacy, which led to him being recognized as an honorary chair for Reading Works.

A. Alfred Taubman's reach was both deep and broad in every endeavor he pursued. From his work in the commercial retail industry to his philanthropic endeavors, Mr. Taubman has left a legacy that will last for generations. His passion, knowledge, and leadership will be greatly missed, but I know they will inspire future entrepreneurs, creative thinkers, and community activists to succeed and make a difference in their communities.●

TRIBUTE TO DURWARD ''BUTCH'' WADDILL

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Durward C. ''Butch'' Waddill, a veteran of the Vietnam war. On behalf of all Montanans and all Americans, I say ''thank you'' to Butch for his service to our Nation.

It is my honor to share the story of Butch's service in Vietnam, because no story of bravery should ever be forgotten. Butch was born on November 20, 1946 in Battle Creek, MI. Butch's parents were both in the Army: his mother was an Army nurse and his father was in the Medical Service Corps. Butch spent most of his childhood traveling among Army bases before settling in California.

In 1964, Butch enlisted in the Marine Corps during his senior year of high school. Butch joined the infantry and attended training at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego and Camp Pendleton. Butch was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment and was deployed to Okinawa for a 13-month assignment. After 1 month of training, Butch was sent as one of the first units to Vietnam in July 1965. His unit made a tactical landing on the beach in Da Nang.

Butch spent the next 13 months in Vietnam before he was reassigned to Camp Lejeune in North Carolina. Butch joined the 2nd Reconnaissance Battalion for a Caribbean cruise until he volunteered to return to Vietnam for a second tour. Back in Vietnam, Butch served with Company D, 3rd Reconnaissance Battalion, 3rd Marine Division.

On November 9, 1967, Butch was monitoring his battalion's radio net from a base at Phu Bai when he heard his reconnaissance team had been ambushed and was having trouble evacuating casualties. Butch hadn't been assigned to patrol because he was preparing to attend Navy diving school in the Philippines. Butch rushed to board a helicopter that was going to attempt to extract the team and insisted on joining the rescue effort. At the team's location, the thick jungle extended for miles and there were no available clearings that were suitable for the helicopter to land. Butch requested to be lowered by cable through the jungle canopy. Without regard for his own safety, Butch immediately organized the evacuation of the two most seriously wounded. Then continuing his brave mission he helped rescue the remaining team members. He administered first aid while directing fire to protect the team's escape.

Butch was left on the ground because there was no additional room for him on the chopper. Alone in the jungle, Butch gathered the team's rifles and radios. Butch didn't know if they would be able to return for him because it was getting dark and he might have to stay the night and risk getting shot or taken prisoner. When a helicopter returned to hoist him out, Butch was dragged through heavy underbrush for hundreds of yards which caused multiple injuries. Once inside the helicopter, Butch had blood on his face, hat, and all the way to his boots. Butch had 3 rifles slung over each shoulder and a giant load of radio and other gear. Maj. Bobby Thatcher says he will never forget the look on Butch's bloody face—a huge smile and big white teeth.

Butch's unmatched bravery resulted in the rescue of all the members of the reconnaissance team while under extreme combat conditions. Maj. Bobby Thatcher says Butch's actions were the single bravest thing he has ever seen, before or since. Butch's bold initiative, undaunted courage, and complete dedication to duty display the true meaning of selfless service.

Butch finished his second tour of Vietnam in August 1968 and returned to

the U.S. where he was promoted to second lieutenant while stationed in Hawaii. After 9 months in Hawaii, Butch volunteered, yet again, to return to Vietnam. Butch began his third tour of Vietnam in August 1969 and was assigned to the 1st Reconnaissance Battalion. Butch was eventually reassigned to the 3rd battalion, 5th Marine Regiment as platoon commander and promoted to company commander. After his third tour, Butch continued his service until August 1988. His distinguished 24 years of military service included serving as an instructor at Quantico, to the staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Pentagon.

Butch retired to Nice, France for 7 years where he served as a body guard for a Saudi Arabian Princess and as security officer for the American International School. In 1995, Butch returned to the United States and lived in Colorado for a year. After visiting a friend Montana, Butch decided to move there in 1996. Butch served in the Montana Legislature in the early 2000s. Butch and his life partner Marilyn Wolff are members of the Montana Wilderness Association where they work to protect our state's public lands.

It is my privilege to honor Butch Waddill's true heroism, sacrifice, and dedication to service by presenting him with the Silver Star Medal. Thank you, Butch.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13303 OF MAY 22, 2003, WITH RESPECT TO THE STABILIZATION OF IRAQ—PM 18

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 stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2015.

Obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in the country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Accordingly, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 19, 2015.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 91. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans.

H.R. 474. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a five-year extension to the homeless veterans reintegration programs and to provide clarification regarding eligibility for services under such programs.

H.R. 1038. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain a copy of any reprimand or admonishment received by an employee of the Department in the permanent record of the employee.

H.R. 1313. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the treatment of certain small business concerns for purposes of the Department of Veterans Affairs contracting goals and preferences.

H.R. 1382. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans.

H.R. 1816. An act to exclude from consideration as income under the United States Housing Act of 1937 payments of pension made under section 1521 of title 38, United States Code, to veterans who are in need of regular aid and attendance.

H.R. 1987. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution:

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Mr. ADERHOLT of Alabama, Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania, Mr. HULTGREN of Illinois, and Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PITTENGER of North Carolina, and Mr. HULTGREN of Illinois.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2252. An act to clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 91. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 474. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a five-year extension to the homeless veterans reintegration programs and to provide clarification regarding eligibility for services under such programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1038. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain a copy of any reprimand or admonishment received by an employee of the Department in the permanent record of the employee; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1313. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the treatment of certain small business concerns for purposes of Department of Veterans Affairs contracting goals and preferences; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1382. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1816. An act to exclude from consideration as income under the United States Housing Act of 1937 payments of pension made under section 1521 of title 38, United States Code, to veterans who are in need of regular aid and attendance; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1987. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–1606. A communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; ordered to lie on the table.

EC–1607. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Logistics and Materiel Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the percentage of funds that was expended during the preceding fiscal year and is projected to be expended during the current and ensuing fiscal year for the Department's depot maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1608. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary (Terrorism and Financial Intelligence), Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1609. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Turkey; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1610. A communication from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the foreign aviation authorities to which the Administration provided services during fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1611. A communication from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the foreign aviation authorities to which the Administration provided services during fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1612. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Member, IRS Oversight Board, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1613. A communication from the Lead Regulations Writer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revised Medical Criteria for Evaluating Cancer (Malignant Neoplastic Diseases)'' (RIN0960–AH43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1614. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–020); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1615. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–007); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1616. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–003); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1617. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14–145); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1618. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14–144); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1619. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates'' (Notice 2015–39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1620. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Triple Drop and Check'' (Rev. Rul. 2015–10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1621. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Eligibility for Minimum Essential Coverage for Purposes of the Premium Tax Credit'' (Notice 2015–37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1622. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Rev. Rul. 78–130'' (Rev. Rul. 2015–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1623. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Annual Price Inflation Adjustments for Contribution Limitations Made to a Health Savings Account Pursuant to Section 223 of the Internal Revenue Code'' (Rev. Proc. 2015–30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1624. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notional Principal Contracts; Swaps with Nonperiodic Payments'' ((RIN1545–BM62) (TD 9719)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1625. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly exception Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) as of December 31, 2014 (DCN OSS 2015–0656); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1626. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Admiral Samuel J. Locklear III, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1627. A joint communication from the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2016 report on the plan for the nuclear weapons stockpile, complex, delivery systems, and command and control systems; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1628. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Intelligence), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's plans to adopt continuous evaluation (CE) and Insider Threat capabilities within the Department of Defense (DoD); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1629. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Trinexapac-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9926–62) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1630. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Trichoderma asperelloides strain JM41R; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9926–87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1631. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fragrance Components; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9927–38) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1632. A communication from the Under Secretary for Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Strategic Economic and Community Development'' (RIN0570–AA94) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1633. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2015–0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1634. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA–2014–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1635. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, with respect to Belarus; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1636. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 on November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1637. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of a national emergency declared in Executive Order 13222 with respect to the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1638. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Integration of National Bank and Federal Savings Association Regulations: Licensing Rules; Final Rule'' (RIN1557–AD80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 19, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1639. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's annual report concerning military assistance and military exports; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1640. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a Determination and Certification under Section 40A of the Arms Export Control Act relative to countries not cooperating fully with United States antiterrorism efforts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1641. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a section of the Arms Export Control Act (RSAT 15–004); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1642. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–036); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1643. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of a determination to waive certain restrictions on maintaining a Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Office in Washington and on the receipt and expenditure of PLO funds for a period of six months; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1644. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of a determination to waive certain restrictions on maintaining a Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Office in Washington and on the receipt and expenditure of PLO funds for a period of six months; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1645. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of the Commission's Rules with Regard to Commercial Operation in the 3550–3650 MHz Band, Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking'' ((GN Docket No. 12–354) (FCC 15–47)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1646. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; NAAQS Update'' (FRL No. 9927–48–Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1647. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to Control Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Storage Tanks and Transport Vessels'' (FRL No. 9927–59–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1648. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Utah County—Trading of Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets for PM10 Transportation Conformity'' (FRL No. 9927–68–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1649. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia; 2011 Base Year Emissions Inventories for the Washington DC–MD–VA Nonattainment Area for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard'' (FRL No. 9927–70–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1650. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Justice, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1651. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances; Extension of Temporary Placement of UR–144, XLR11, and AKB48 in Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act'' (Docket No. DEA–414) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 18, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1652. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to the Rules of Practice for Trials Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board'' (RIN0651–AD00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 18, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1653. A communication from the Project Manager, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Employment Authorization for Certain H–4 Dependent Spouses; Final Rule'' (RIN1615–AB92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 12, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1654. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third quarter of fiscal year 2014 quarterly report of the Department of Justice's Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1655. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Chairman's Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1656. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1657. A communication from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''What is Due Process in Federal Civil Service Employment?''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1658. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Transportation's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1659. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act Inventory for fiscal years 2012 and 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1660. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Leasing of Osage Reservation Lands for Oil and Gas Mining'' (RIN1076–AF17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2015; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1376. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 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, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–49).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Jessie Hill Roberson, of Alabama, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2018.

*Monica C. Regalbuto, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management).

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) John D. Alexander and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Ricky L. Williamson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 10, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Eugene H. Black III and ending with Capt. William W. Wheeler III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2015.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Jeffrey G. Lofgren, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Michael G. Dana, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Matthew P. Beevers, to be Major General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. John N. Christenson, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Shoshana S. Chatfield, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. James W. Crawford III, to be Vice Admiral.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDs on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators .

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Rhys William Hunt, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with James D. Brantingham and ending with George T. Youstra, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Randall E. Ackerman and ending with Clinton R. Zumbrunnen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Joshua D. Burgess and ending with James R. Cantu, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Air Force nomination of Michael I. Etan, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Erik D. Masick, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Muhammad R. Khawaja and ending with Nikalesh Reddy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Marine Corps nomination of Henry C. Bodden, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of William E. Lanham, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Rebecca L. Wilkinson, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Matthew F. Amidon and ending with John A. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2015.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Michael J. Corrado and ending with Craig C. Ullman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 29, 2015.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Rory L. Aldridge and ending with Mark D. Zimmer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 29, 2015.

Navy nomination of Miriam Behpour, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Thomas P. Murphy, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Todd S. Levant, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Jennifer L. Borstelmann, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Robert S. Thompson, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Melissa C. Austin, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Anthony S. Ardito and ending with Roderick D. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nomination of Garrett T. Pankow, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of William M. Walker, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Christopher C. Meyer, to be Lieutenant Commander .

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey G. Bentson and ending with Paul N. Porensky, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nomination of Kevin D. Clarida, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Brianna E. Jackson, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Jared M. Spilka, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Francine Segovia, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Todd W. Mallory, to be Lieutenant Commander.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1368. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Inspector General for Monitoring the Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1369. A bill to allow funds under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to be used to provide training to school personnel regarding how to recognize child sexual abuse; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1370. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to adequately fund bridges in the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1371. A bill to impose a tax on certain trading transactions to invest in our families and communities, improve our infrastructure and our environment, strengthen our financial security, expand opportunity and reduce market volatility; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1372. A bill to repeal the crude oil export ban, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1373. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act to improve higher education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1374. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fair and consistent eligibility requirements for graduate medical schools operating outside the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1375. A bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. McCAIN:

S. 1376. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 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, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1377. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify and expand Federal criminal jurisdiction over Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1378. A bill to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1379. A bill to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to require the development of a plan for each sub-Saharan African country for negotiating and entering into free trade agreements and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. KAINE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1380. A bill to support early learning; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1381. A bill to require the President to make the text of trade agreements available to the public in order for those agreements to receive expedited consideration from Congress; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1382. A bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or

foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PERDUE:

S. 1383. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1384. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide for the discharge of student loan obligations upon the death of the student borrower, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1385. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from requiring race or ethnicity to be disclosed in connection with the transfer of a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1386. A bill to provide multiyear procurement authority for the procurement of up to six polar icebreakers to be owned and operated by the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1387. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1388. A bill to require the President to submit a plan for resolving all outstanding claims relating to property confiscated by the Government of Cuba before taking action to ease restrictions on travel to or trade with Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1389. A bill to authorize exportation of consumer communications devices to Cuba and the provision of telecommunications services to Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. Res. 180. A resolution urging additional sanctions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. Res. 181. A resolution designating May 19, 2015, as ''National Schizencephaly Awareness Day'' ; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 182. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Defense laboratories have been, and continue to be, on the cutting edge of scientific and technological advancement and supporting the designation of May 14, 2015, as the ''Department of Defense Laboratory Day'' ; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 141

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 141, a bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 275, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare program.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 405

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 405, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 497

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 571

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 571, a bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 624

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 624, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 739

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 739, a bill to modify the treatment of agreements entered into by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish nursing home care, adult day health care, or other extended care services, and for other purposes.

S. 743

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 743, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 799

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 799, a bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

S. 804

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 806

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr.

MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 806, a bill to amend section 31306 of title 49, United States Code, to recognize hair as an alternative specimen for preemployment and random controlled substances testing of commercial motor vehicle drivers and for other purposes.

S. 807

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 807, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform and reset the excise tax on beer, and for other purposes.

S. 836

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 836, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 925

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 925, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to convene a panel of citizens to make a recommendation to the Secretary regarding the likeness of a woman on the twenty dollar bill, and for other purposes.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 1049

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1049, a bill to allow the financing by United States persons of sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba.

S. 1088

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for voter registration through the Internet, and for other purposes.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1123, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term ''waters of the United States'', and for other purposes.

S. 1169

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1169, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

S. 1300

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1300, a bill to amend the section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide relief for adoptive families from immigrant visa feeds in certain situations.

S. 1324

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1324, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1360, a bill to amend the limitation on liability for passenger rail accidents or incidents under section 28103 of title 49, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 148

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 148, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

AMENDMENT NO. 1226

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1226 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1227

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1227 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1251

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1251 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1252

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1252 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1273

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1273 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1297

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1297 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue

Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1299 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1299 proposed to H.R. 1314, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 1317

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1317 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1319

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1319 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1334

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1334 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1335

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1335 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1336

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1336 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1337

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1337 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1365

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1365 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1369. A bill to allow funds under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to be used to provide training to school personnel regarding how to recognize child sexual abuse; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of myself and Senator BLUNT, to introduce bipartisan legislation that would expand approved uses for the Elementary and Secondary Education Acts professional development funding to include training for teachers and school personnel on how to recognize signs of sexual abuse in students.

According to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System, 865,643 children were victims of maltreatment in 2013. Approximately 7 percent, or 60,956 children, were victims of sexual abuse.

The vast majority of States require that teachers report suspicions of child abuse, but most teachers do not receive any training on how to see the signs.

According to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System, 61 percent of all reports of child abuse and neglect are made by professionals, yet only 17.5 percent of abuse and neglect is reported by education personnel.

Given the amount of time teachers and school personnel spend with children, it is critical that the warning signs of child sexual abuse are identified and reported and that action is taken. Students must also be provided appropriate resources and support if they have been abused.

The Helping Schools Protect Our Children Act of 2015 expands the list of allowable uses for Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, Title II funding to permit States to use this funding to provide training for teachers, principals, Specialized Instructional Support Personnel and paraprofessionals on how to recognize the signs of sexual abuse and handle the situation if sexual abuse is identified. Under current law, Title II provides grants to states for a variety of purposes related to recruitment, retention, and professional development of K–12 teachers and principals. Our bill would simply allow professional development funds to be used to provide school personnel with this important training.

I am proud that Senator ROY BLUNT has joined me as original cosponsor on this bill.

It is essential that as mandated reporters, school personnel have access to the proper training to recognize abuse. When no one steps in to stop abuse, children can be scarred for their entire lives. If we learn to recognize the signs of abuse or neglect, we will be better able to foster a safe environment for young people to learn and grow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1369

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Helping Schools Protect Our Children Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. TRAINING TEACHERS TO RECOGNIZE CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE.

(a) STATE ACTIVITIES.—Section 2113(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6613(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(19) Providing training for all school personnel, including teachers, principals, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, regarding how to recognize child sexual abuse.''.

(b) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY ACTIVITIES.—Section 2123(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6623(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

''(9) Providing training for all school personnel, including teachers, principals, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, regarding how to recognize child sexual abuse.''.

(c) ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITIES.—Section 2134(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6634(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) providing training for school personnel, including teachers, principals, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, regarding how to recognize child sexual abuse.''.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1372. A bill to repeal the crude oil export ban, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I am proud to introduce today, with my good friend from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, a bill that will wipe an outdated policy from our books while providing a boost to our domestic oil development and production industry. I am also pleased to have my great friends from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN, and Tennessee, Senator CORKER, join us in introducing this bill today. This bill would allow U.S. crude oil producers to compete on equal footing with most other major oil producing nations, helping to remove current barriers that prevent U.S. producers from receiving a fair price for their commodity on the world market.

Just last week, I joined Senator MURKOWSKI as she introduced her bill, The Energy Supply and Distribution Act, that looks to address the build-out of critical energy infrastructure and opening up access to new markets for our energy commodities, while also looking to make it easier to distribute our energy to our neighbors in Mexico and Canada. A provision in that bill also looks to repeal the current crude oil export ban. I will continue to advocate for that bill as well, and look forward to Senator MURKOWSKI bringing that bill before her Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. I view this bill as not only complimentary to the bill introduced last week, but also a way to keep the conversation going as I look to bring this bill up for debate in another Committee, before a different audience. Senator MURKOWSKI and I have been working on this effort for some time and we both felt it was time to show our cards and let our colleagues and others see where we are in this process. The language may be different, but the goal is the same.

Some people may wonder how we even got here, and why would we want to remove a policy that has brought little public or Congressional scrutiny for almost forty years. Well, in 1973, President Richard Nixon placed crude oil under price controls after the price of oil continued to rise. He created a ban on oil exports as an enforcement tool for his price controls, restricting sales outside the U.S. When President Ronald Reagan lifted those price controls, the accompanying export ban was retained. So basically, the current restricted trade environment for U.S. crude oil is an unintended consequence of a 1970's price control policy.

While certain exemptions were added over the years allowing for the export of some U.S. oil from California and Alaska, repeal of the overall prohibition on U.S. crude oil exports was never really seen as a major policy priority. All of that changed with the new oil production renaissance in the U.S, brought about by technological innovations that have allowed for pin-point accurate horizontal drilling and continued advances in hydraulic fracturing. These, and other advances, have allowed for exploration and production of shale in places like North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Texas, Colorado, and New Mexico. These shale oil and natural gas plays across the country have made the U.S. the number one combined crude oil and natural gas producer in the world. The situation on the ground has certainly changed and it is time to make sure our export policies are finally updated to reflect those changes.

This issue is of particular importance to North Dakota. Due to transportation and infrastructure constraints, producers in the Bakken are already selling their crude oil at an even steeper discount than U.S. producers in other plays. Combined with the recent downturn in the price of a barrel of oil, static or declining current global demand, and stable production from OPEC nations—U.S. crude producers in North Dakota and elsewhere have begun to feel the pinch. While other nations, including Iran and Russia, are able to sell their crude oil into the world market for the best price and can continue to maintain or pick up market share during this downturn, U.S. producers are constrained from competing on equal footing.

As recently as 2007, North Dakota ranked eight among U.S. oil producing states. However, due to the shale oil boom in the Bakken, North Dakota has been the number two oil producing state in the country since 2012—behind only Texas. While North Dakota continues to remain in that spot, there has been a steep downturn since September 2014. The state has over one hundred less drilling rigs then at the same time in September 2014, the number of wells awaiting completion are at near historic highs, capital expenditures in the U.S. are way down for oil companies, and we continue to see layoffs and reduced hours in the oil and oilfield services industries. North Dakota crude oil producers need access to the world market to maintain and continue to develop the valuable natural resource in the State.

Numerous studies in the past year including one by the non-partisan U.S. Government Accountability Office have found that repealing the ban on crude oil exports will lower U.S. gasoline prices. These studies concluded that we should export crude oil in the same manner that we export millions of barrels of gasoline and diesel every day. As a matter of fact, while some people continue to say that we need to keep our crude oil locked in or retail gasoline prices will rise—they fail to mention the fact that the U.S. is the number exporter in the world of refined petroleum products, including gasoline. So the facts just do not add up for their argument. Additionally, at a time of growing threats to international security, hardworking Americans in the energy sector are helping our nation become more secure, prosperous, and resilient to crises overseas. The administration's own National Security Strategy recognizes that energy abundance at home can translate to a strengthened geopolitical position on the global stage.

Unrestricted exports of U.S. crude oil is key to the long-term stability of consumer prices, continued investment and growth in U.S. development and production, resumption of job growth in the energy sector and supporting industries, and continued reduction in the U.S. trade deficit, while also providing national energy security. I hope our colleagues will join us in supporting this important effort to remove an outdated policy and put our U.S. crude oil on equal footing with crude oil from around the world.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1374. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fair and consistent eligibility requirements for graduate medical schools operating outside the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1374

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 ''Foreign Medical School Accountability Fairness Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

To establish consistent eligibility requirements for graduate medical schools operating outside of the United States and Canada in order to increase accountability and protect American students and taxpayer dollars.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Three for-profit schools in the Caribbean receive more than two-thirds of all Federal funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) that goes to students enrolled at foreign graduate medical schools, despite those three schools being exempt from meeting the same eligibility requirements as the majority of graduate medical schools located outside of the United States and Canada.

(2) The National Committee on Foreign Medical Education and Accreditation and the Department of Education recommend that all foreign graduate medical schools should be required to meet the same eligibility requirements to participate in Federal funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) and see no rationale for excluding certain schools.

(3) The attrition rate at United States medical schools averaged 3 percent for the class beginning in 2009 while rates at for-profit Caribbean schools have reached 26 percent or higher.

(4) In 2013, residency match rates for foreign trained graduates averaged 53 percent compared to 94 percent for graduates of medical schools in the United States.

(5) On average, students at for-profit medical schools operating outside of the United States and Canada amass more student debt than those at medical schools in the United States.

SEC. 4. REPEAL GRANDFATHER PROVISIONS.

Section 102(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) in the case of a graduate medical school located outside the United States—

''(I) at least 60 percent of those enrolled in, and at least 60 percent of the graduates of, the graduate medical school outside the United States were not persons described in section 484(a)(5) in the year preceding the year for which a student is seeking a loan under part D of title IV; and

''(II) at least 75 percent of the individuals who were students or graduates of the graduate medical school outside the United States or Canada (both nationals of the United States and others) taking the examinations administered by the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates received a passing score in the year preceding the year for which a student is seeking a loan under part D of title IV;''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by adding at the end the following:

''(V) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of a graduate medical school described in subclause (I) to qualify for participation in the loan programs under part D of title IV pursuant to this clause shall expire beginning on the first July 1 following the date of enactment of the Foreign Medical School Accountability Fairness Act of 2015.''.

SEC. 5. LOSS OF ELIGIBILITY.

If a graduate medical school loses eligibility to participate in the loan programs under part D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087a et seq.) due to the enactment of the amendments made by section 4, then a student enrolled at such graduate medical school on or before the date of enactment of this Act may, notwithstanding such loss of eligibility, continue to be eligible to receive a loan under such part D while attending such graduate medical school in which the student was enrolled upon the date of enactment of this Act, subject to the student continuing to meet all applicable requirements for satisfactory academic progress, until the earliest of—

(1) withdrawal by the student from the graduate medical school;

(2) completion of the program of study by the student at the graduate medical school; or

(3) the fourth June 30 after such loss of eligibility.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1375. A bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1375

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 ''America's Red Rock Wilderness Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Utah.

TITLE I—DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS

SEC. 101. GREAT BASIN WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Great Basin region of western Utah is comprised of starkly beautiful mountain ranges that rise as islands from the desert floor;

(2) the Wah Wah Mountains in the Great Basin region are arid and austere, with massive cliff faces and leathery slopes speckled with piñon and juniper;

(3) the Pilot Range and Stansbury Mountains in the Great Basin region are high enough to draw moisture from passing clouds and support ecosystems found nowhere else on earth;

(4) from bristlecone pine, the world's oldest living organism, to newly flowered mountain meadows, mountains of the Great Basin region are islands of nature that—

(A) support remarkable biological diversity; and

(B) provide opportunities to experience the colossal silence of the Great Basin; and

(5) the Great Basin region of western Utah should be protected and managed to ensure the preservation of the natural conditions of the region.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Antelope Range (approximately 17,000 acres).

(2) Barn Hills (approximately 20,000 acres).

(3) Black Hills (approximately 9,000 acres).

(4) Bullgrass Knoll (approximately 15,000 acres).

(5) Burbank Hills/Tunnel Spring (approximately 92,000 acres).

(6) Conger Mountains (approximately 21,000 acres).

(7) Crater Bench (approximately 35,000 acres).

(8) Crater and Silver Island Mountains (approximately 121,000 acres).

(9) Cricket Mountains Cluster (approximately 62,000 acres).

(10) Deep Creek Mountains (approximately 126,000 acres).

(11) Drum Mountains (approximately 39,000 acres).

(12) Dugway Mountains (approximately 24,000 acres).

(13) Essex Canyon (approximately 1,300 acres).

(14) Fish Springs Range (approximately 64,000 acres).

(15) Granite Peak (approximately 19,000 acres).

(16) Grassy Mountains (approximately 23,000 acres).

(17) Grouse Creek Mountains (approximately 15,000 acres).

(18) House Range (approximately 201,000 acres).

(19) Keg Mountains (approximately 38,000 acres).

(20) Kern Mountains (approximately 15,000 acres).

(21) King Top (approximately 110,000 acres).

(22) Ledger Canyon (approximately 9,000 acres).

(23) Little Goose Creek (approximately 1,200 acres).

(24) Middle/Granite Mountains (approximately 80,000 acres).

(25) Mount Escalante (approximately 18,000 acres).

(26) Mountain Home Range (approximately 90,000 acres).

(27) Newfoundland Mountains (approximately 22,000 acres).

(28) Ochre Mountain (approximately 13,000 acres).

(29) Oquirrh Mountains (approximately 9,000 acres).

(30) Painted Rock Mountain (approximately 26,000 acres).

(31) Paradise/Steamboat Mountains (approximately 144,000 acres).

(32) Pilot Range (approximately 45,000 acres).

(33) Red Tops (approximately 28,000 acres).

(34) Rockwell-Little Sahara (approximately 21,000 acres).

(35) San Francisco Mountains (approximately 39,000 acres).

(36) Sand Ridge (approximately 73,000 acres).

(37) Simpson Mountains (approximately 42,000 acres).

(38) Snake Valley (approximately 100,000 acres).

(39) Spring Creek Canyon (approximately 4,000 acres).

(40) Stansbury Island (approximately 10,000 acres).

(41) Stansbury Mountains (approximately 24,000 acres).

(42) Thomas Range (approximately 36,000 acres).

(43) Tule Valley (approximately 159,000 acres).

(44) Wah Wah Mountains (approximately 167,000 acres).

(45) Wasatch/Sevier Plateaus (approximately 29,000 acres).

(46) White Rock Range (approximately 5,200 acres).

SEC. 102. GRAND STAIRCASE-ESCALANTE WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) GRAND STAIRCASE AREA.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the area known as the Grand Staircase rises more than 6,000 feet in a series of great cliffs and plateaus from the depths of the Grand Canyon to the forested rim of Bryce Canyon;

(B) the Grand Staircase—

(i) spans 6 major life zones, from the lower Sonoran Desert to the alpine forest; and

(ii) encompasses geologic formations that display 3,000,000,000 years of Earth's history;

(C) land managed by the Secretary lines the intricate canyon system of the Paria River and forms a vital natural corridor connection to the deserts and forests of those national parks;

(D) land described in paragraph (2) (other than East of Bryce, Upper Kanab Creek, Moquith Mountain, Bunting Point, and Vermillion Cliffs) is located within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument; and

(E) the Grand Staircase in Utah should be protected and managed as a wilderness area.

(2) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(A) Bryce View (approximately 4,500 acres).

(B) Bunting Point (approximately 11,000 acres).

(C) Canaan Mountain (approximately 16,000 acres in Kane County).

(D) Canaan Peak Slopes (approximately 2,300 acres).

(E) East of Bryce (approximately 750 acres).

(F) Glass Eye Canyon (approximately 24,000 acres).

(G) Ladder Canyon (approximately 14,000 acres).

(H) Moquith Mountain (approximately 16,000 acres).

(I) Nephi Point (approximately 14,000 acres).

(J) Orderville Canyon (approximately 9,200 acres).

(K) Paria-Hackberry (approximately 188,000 acres).

(L) Paria Wilderness Expansion (approximately 3,300 acres).

(M) Parunuweap Canyon (approximately 43,000 acres).

(N) Pine Hollow (approximately 11,000 acres).

(O) Slopes of Bryce (approximately 2,600 acres).

(P) Timber Mountain (approximately 51,000 acres).

(Q) Upper Kanab Creek (approximately 49,000 acres).

(R) Vermillion Cliffs (approximately 26,000 acres).

(S) Willis Creek (approximately 21,000 acres).

(b) KAIPAROWITS PLATEAU.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Kaiparowits Plateau east of the Paria River is one of the most rugged and isolated wilderness regions in the United States;

(B) the Kaiparowits Plateau, a windswept land of harsh beauty, contains distant vistas and a remarkable variety of plant and animal species;

(C) ancient forests, an abundance of big game animals, and 22 species of raptors thrive undisturbed on the grassland mesa tops of the Kaiparowits Plateau;

(D) each of the areas described in paragraph (2) (other than Heaps Canyon, Little Valley, and Wide Hollow) is located within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument; and

(E) the Kaiparowits Plateau should be protected and managed as a wilderness area.

(2) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(A) Andalex Not (approximately 18,000 acres).

(B) The Blues (approximately 21,000 acres).

(C) Box Canyon (approximately 2,800 acres).

(D) Burning Hills (approximately 80,000 acres).

(E) Carcass Canyon (approximately 83,000 acres).

(F) The Cockscomb (approximately 11,000 acres).

(G) Fiftymile Bench (approximately 12,000 acres).

(H) Fiftymile Mountain (approximately 203,000 acres).

(I) Heaps Canyon (approximately 4,000 acres).

(J) Horse Spring Canyon (approximately 31,000 acres).

(K) Kodachrome Headlands (approximately 10,000 acres).

(L) Little Valley Canyon (approximately 4,000 acres).

(M) Mud Spring Canyon (approximately 65,000 acres).

(N) Nipple Bench (approximately 32,000 acres).

(O) Paradise Canyon-Wahweap (approximately 262,000 acres).

(P) Rock Cove (approximately 16,000 acres).

(Q) Warm Creek (approximately 23,000 acres).

(R) Wide Hollow (approximately 6,800 acres).

(c) ESCALANTE CANYONS.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) glens and coves carved in massive sandstone cliffs, spring-watered hanging gardens, and the silence of ancient Anasazi ruins are examples of the unique features that entice hikers, campers, and sightseers from around the world to Escalante Canyon;

(B) Escalante Canyon links the spruce fir forests of the 11,000-foot Aquarius Plateau with winding slickrock canyons that flow into Glen Canyon;

(C) Escalante Canyon, one of Utah's most popular natural areas, contains critical habitat for deer, elk, and wild bighorn sheep that also enhances the scenic integrity of the area;

(D) each of the areas described in paragraph (2) is located within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument; and

(E) Escalante Canyon should be protected and managed as a wilderness area.

(2) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(A) Brinkerhof Flats (approximately 3,000 acres).

(B) Colt Mesa (approximately 28,000 acres).

(C) Death Hollow (approximately 49,000 acres).

(D) Forty Mile Gulch (approximately 6,600 acres).

(E) Hurricane Wash (approximately 9,000 acres).

(F) Lampstand (approximately 7,900 acres).

(G) Muley Twist Flank (approximately 3,600 acres).

(H) North Escalante Canyons (approximately 176,000 acres).

(I) Pioneer Mesa (approximately 11,000 acres).

(J) Scorpion (approximately 53,000 acres).

(K) Sooner Bench (approximately 390 acres).

(L) Steep Creek (approximately 35,000 acres).

(M) Studhorse Peaks (approximately 24,000 acres).

SEC. 103. MOAB-LA SAL CANYONS WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the canyons surrounding the La Sal Mountains and the town of Moab offer a variety of extraordinary landscapes;

(2) outstanding examples of natural formations and landscapes in the Moab-La Sal area include the huge sandstone fins of Behind the Rocks, the mysterious Fisher Towers, and the whitewater rapids of Westwater Canyon; and

(3) the Moab-La Sal area should be protected and managed as a wilderness area.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Arches Adjacent (approximately 12,000 acres).

(2) Beaver Creek (approximately 41,000 acres).

(3) Behind the Rocks and Hunters Canyon (approximately 22,000 acres).

(4) Big Triangle (approximately 20,000 acres).

(5) Coyote Wash (approximately 28,000 acres).

(6) Dome Plateau-Professor Valley (approximately 35,000 acres).

(7) Fisher Towers (approximately 18,000 acres).

(8) Goldbar Canyon (approximately 9,000 acres).

(9) Granite Creek (approximately 5,000 acres).

(10) Mary Jane Canyon (approximately 25,000 acres).

(11) Mill Creek (approximately 14,000 acres).

(12) Porcupine Rim and Morning Glory (approximately 20,000 acres).

(13) Renegade Point (approximately 6,600 acres).

(14) Westwater Canyon (approximately 37,000 acres).

(15) Yellow Bird (approximately 4,200 acres).

SEC. 104. HENRY MOUNTAINS WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Henry Mountain Range, the last mountain range to be discovered and named by early explorers in the contiguous United States, still retains a wild and undiscovered quality;

(2) fluted badlands that surround the flanks of 11,000-foot Mounts Ellen and Pennell contain areas of critical habitat for mule deer and for the largest herd of free-roaming buffalo in the United States;

(3) despite their relative accessibility, the Henry Mountain Range remains one of the wildest, least-known ranges in the United States; and

(4) the Henry Mountain range should be protected and managed to ensure the preservation of the range as a wilderness area.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Bull Mountain (approximately 16,000 acres).

(2) Bullfrog Creek (approximately 35,000 acres).

(3) Dogwater Creek (approximately 3,400 acres).

(4) Fremont Gorge (approximately 20,000 acres).

(5) Long Canyon (approximately 16,000 acres).

(6) Mount Ellen-Blue Hills (approximately 140,000 acres).

(7) Mount Hillers (approximately 21,000 acres).

(8) Mount Pennell (approximately 147,000 acres).
(9) Notom Bench (approximately 6,200 acres).
(10) Oak Creek (approximately 1,700 acres).
(11) Ragged Mountain (approximately 28,000 acres).

SEC. 105. GLEN CANYON WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) the side canyons of Glen Canyon, including the Dirty Devil River and the Red, White and Blue Canyons, contain some of the most remote and outstanding landscapes in southern Utah;
(2) the Dirty Devil River, once the fortress hideout of outlaw Butch Cassidy's Wild Bunch, has sculpted a maze of slickrock canyons through an imposing landscape of monoliths and inaccessible mesas;
(3) the Red and Blue Canyons contain colorful Chinle/Moenkopi badlands found nowhere else in the region; and
(4) the canyons of Glen Canyon in the State should be protected and managed as wilderness areas.
(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:
(1) Cane Spring Desert (approximately 18,000 acres).
(2) Dark Canyon (approximately 134,000 acres).
(3) Dirty Devil (approximately 242,000 acres).
(4) Fiddler Butte (approximately 92,000 acres).
(5) Flat Tops (approximately 30,000 acres).
(6) Little Rockies (approximately 64,000 acres).
(7) The Needle (approximately 11,000 acres).
(8) Red Rock Plateau (approximately 213,000 acres).
(9) White Canyon (approximately 98,000 acres).

SEC. 106. SAN JUAN-ANASAZI WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) more than 1,000 years ago, the Anasazi Indian culture flourished in the slickrock canyons and on the piñon-covered mesas of southeastern Utah;
(2) evidence of the ancient presence of the Anasazi pervades the Cedar Mesa area of the San Juan-Anasazi area where cliff dwellings, rock art, and ceremonial kivas embellish sandstone overhangs and isolated benchlands;
(3) the Cedar Mesa area is in need of protection from the vandalism and theft of its unique cultural resources;
(4) the Cedar Mesa wilderness areas should be created to protect both the archaeological heritage and the extraordinary wilderness, scenic, and ecological values of the United States; and
(5) the San Juan-Anasazi area should be protected and managed as a wilderness area to ensure the preservation of the unique and valuable resources of that area.
(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:
(1) Allen Canyon (approximately 5,900 acres).
(2) Arch Canyon (approximately 30,000 acres).
(3) Comb Ridge (approximately 15,000 acres).
(4) East Montezuma (approximately 45,000 acres).
(5) Fish and Owl Creek Canyons (approximately 73,000 acres).
(6) Grand Gulch (approximately 159,000 acres).
(7) Hammond Canyon (approximately 4,400 acres).
(8) Nokai Dome (approximately 93,000 acres).
(9) Road Canyon (approximately 63,000 acres).
(10) San Juan River (Sugarloaf) (approximately 15,000 acres).
(11) The Tabernacle (approximately 7,000 acres).
(12) Valley of the Gods (approximately 21,000 acres).

SEC. 107. CANYONLANDS BASIN WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) Canyonlands National Park safeguards only a small portion of the extraordinary red-hued, cliff-walled canyonland region of the Colorado Plateau;
(2) areas near Arches National Park and Canyonlands National Park contain canyons with rushing perennial streams, natural arches, bridges, and towers;
(3) the gorges of the Green and Colorado Rivers lie on adjacent land managed by the Secretary;
(4) popular overlooks in Canyonlands Nations Park and Dead Horse Point State Park have views directly into adjacent areas, including Lockhart Basin and Indian Creek; and
(5) designation of those areas as wilderness would ensure the protection of this erosional masterpiece of nature and of the rich pockets of wildlife found within its expanded boundaries.
(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:
(1) Bridger Jack Mesa (approximately 33,000 acres).
(2) Butler Wash (approximately 27,000 acres).
(3) Dead Horse Cliffs (approximately 5,300 acres).
(4) Demon's Playground (approximately 3,700 acres).
(5) Duma Point (approximately 14,000 acres).
(6) Gooseneck (approximately 9,000 acres).
(7) Hatch Point Canyons/Lockhart Basin (approximately 149,000 acres).
(8) Horsethief Point (approximately 15,000 acres).
(9) Indian Creek (approximately 28,000 acres).
(10) Labyrinth Canyon (approximately 150,000 acres).
(11) San Rafael River (approximately 101,000 acres).
(12) Shay Mountain (approximately 14,000 acres).
(13) Sweetwater Reef (approximately 69,000 acres).
(14) Upper Horseshoe Canyon (approximately 60,000 acres).

SEC. 108. SAN RAFAEL SWELL WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) the San Rafael Swell towers above the desert like a castle, ringed by 1,000-foot ramparts of Navajo Sandstone;
(2) the highlands of the San Rafael Swell have been fractured by uplift and rendered hollow by erosion over countless millennia, leaving a tremendous basin punctuated by mesas, buttes, and canyons and traversed by sediment-laden desert streams;
(3) among other places, the San Rafael wilderness offers exceptional back country opportunities in the colorful Wild Horse Badlands, the monoliths of North Caineville Mesa, the rock towers of Cliff Wash, and colorful cliffs of Humbug Canyon;
(4) the mountains within these areas are among Utah's most valuable habitat for desert bighorn sheep; and
(5) the San Rafael Swell area should be protected and managed to ensure its preservation as a wilderness area.
(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:
(1) Cedar Mountain (approximately 15,000 acres).
(2) Devils Canyon (approximately 23,000 acres).
(3) Eagle Canyon (approximately 38,000 acres).
(4) Factory Butte (approximately 22,000 acres).
(5) Hondu Country (approximately 20,000 acres).
(6) Jones Bench (approximately 2,800 acres).
(7) Limestone Cliffs (approximately 25,000 acres).
(8) Lost Spring Wash (approximately 37,000 acres).
(9) Mexican Mountain (approximately 100,000 acres).
(10) Molen Reef (approximately 33,000 acres).
(11) Muddy Creek (approximately 240,000 acres).
(12) Mussentuchit Badlands (approximately 25,000 acres).
(13) Pleasant Creek Bench (approximately 1,100 acres).
(14) Price River-Humbug (approximately 120,000 acres).
(15) Red Desert (approximately 40,000 acres).
(16) Rock Canyon (approximately 18,000 acres).
(17) San Rafael Knob (approximately 15,000 acres).
(18) San Rafael Reef (approximately 114,000 acres).
(19) Sids Mountain (approximately 107,000 acres).
(20) Upper Muddy Creek (approximately 19,000 acres).
(21) Wild Horse Mesa (approximately 92,000 acres).

SEC. 109. BOOK CLIFFS AND UINTA BASIN WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) the Book Cliffs and Uinta Basin wilderness areas offer—
(A) unique big game hunting opportunities in verdant high-plateau forests;
(B) the opportunity for float trips of several days duration down the Green River in Desolation Canyon; and
(C) the opportunity for calm water canoe weekends on the White River;
(2) the long rampart of the Book Cliffs bounds the area on the south, while seldom-visited uplands, dissected by the rivers and streams, slope away to the north into the Uinta Basin;
(3) bears, Bighorn sheep, cougars, elk, and mule deer flourish in the back country of the Book Cliffs; and
(4) the Book Cliffs and Uinta Basin areas should be protected and managed to ensure the protection of the areas as wilderness.
(b) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System.
(1) Bourdette Draw (approximately 15,000 acres).
(2) Bull Canyon (approximately 2,800 acres).
(3) Chipeta (approximately 95,000 acres).
(4) Dead Horse Pass (approximately 8,000 acres).

(5) Desbrough Canyon (approximately 13,000 acres).
(6) Desolation Canyon (approximately 555,000 acres).
(7) Diamond Breaks (approximately 9,000 acres).
(8) Diamond Canyon (approximately 166,000 acres).
(9) Diamond Mountain (also known as ''Wild Mountain'') (approximately 27,000 acres).
(10) Dinosaur Adjacent (approximately 10,000 acres).
(11) Goslin Mountain (approximately 4,900 acres).
(12) Hideout Canyon (approximately 12,000 acres).
(13) Lower Bitter Creek (approximately 14,000 acres).
(14) Lower Flaming Gorge (approximately 21,000 acres).
(15) Mexico Point (approximately 15,000 acres).
(16) Moonshine Draw (also known as ''Daniels Canyon'') (approximately 10,000 acres).
(17) Mountain Home (approximately 9,000 acres).
(18) O-Wi-Yu-Kuts (approximately 13,000 acres).
(19) Red Creek Badlands (approximately 3,600 acres).
(20) Seep Canyon (approximately 21,000 acres).
(21) Sunday School Canyon (approximately 18,000 acres).
(22) Survey Point (approximately 8,000 acres).
(23) Turtle Canyon (approximately 39,000 acres).
(24) White River (approximately 23,000 acres).
(25) Winter Ridge (approximately 38,000 acres).
(26) Wolf Point (approximately 15,000 acres).

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) NAMES OF WILDERNESS AREAS.—Each wilderness area named in title I shall—
(1) consist of the quantity of land referenced with respect to that named area, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Utah BLM Wilderness''; and
(2) be known by the name given to it in title I.
(b) MAP AND DESCRIPTION.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated by this Act with—
(A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and
(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.
(2) FORCE OF LAW.—A map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map and legal description.
(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be filed and made available for public inspection in the Office of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 202. ADMINISTRATION.

Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, each wilderness area designated under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with—
(1) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and
(2) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

SEC. 203. STATE SCHOOL TRUST LAND WITHIN WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), if State-owned land is included in an area designated by this Act as a wilderness area, the Secretary shall offer to exchange land owned by the United States in the State of approximately equal value in accordance with section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)) and section 5(a) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1134(a)).
(b) MINERAL INTERESTS.—The Secretary shall not transfer any mineral interests under subsection (a) unless the State transfers to the Secretary any mineral interests in land designated by this Act as a wilderness area.

SEC. 204. WATER.

(a) RESERVATION.—
(1) WATER FOR WILDERNESS AREAS.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to each wilderness area designated by this Act, Congress reserves a quantity of water determined by the Secretary to be sufficient for the wilderness area.
(B) PRIORITY DATE.—The priority date of a right reserved under subparagraph (A) shall be the date of enactment of this Act.
(2) PROTECTION OF RIGHTS.—The Secretary and other officers and employees of the United States shall take any steps necessary to protect the rights reserved by paragraph (1)(A), including the filing of a claim for the quantification of the rights in any present or future appropriate stream adjudication in the courts of the State—
(A) in which the United States is or may be joined; and
(B) that is conducted in accordance with section 208 of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 560, chapter 651).
(b) PRIOR RIGHTS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this Act relinquishes or reduces any water rights reserved or appropriated by the United States in the State on or before the date of enactment of this Act.
(c) ADMINISTRATION.—
(1) SPECIFICATION OF RIGHTS.—The Federal water rights reserved by this Act are specific to the wilderness areas designated by this Act.
(2) NO PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED.—Nothing in this Act related to reserved Federal water rights—
(A) shall establish a precedent with regard to any future designation of water rights; or
(B) shall affect the interpretation of any other Act or any designation made under any other Act.

SEC. 205. ROADS.

(a) SETBACKS.—
(1) MEASUREMENT IN GENERAL.—A setback under this section shall be measured from the center line of the road.
(2) WILDERNESS ON 1 SIDE OF ROADS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a setback for a road with wilderness on only 1 side shall be set at—
(A) 300 feet from a paved Federal or State highway;
(B) 100 feet from any other paved road or high standard dirt or gravel road; and
(C) 30 feet from any other road.
(3) WILDERNESS ON BOTH SIDES OF ROADS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a setback for a road with wilderness on both sides (including cherry-stems or roads separating 2 wilderness units) shall be set at—
(A) 200 feet from a paved Federal or State highway;
(B) 40 feet from any other paved road or high standard dirt or gravel road; and
(C) 10 feet from any other roads.
(b) SETBACK EXCEPTIONS.—
(1) WELL-DEFINED TOPOGRAPHICAL BARRIERS.—If, between the road and the boundary of a setback area described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), there is a well-defined cliff edge, stream bank, or other topographical barrier, the Secretary shall use the barrier as the wilderness boundary.
(2) FENCES.—If, between the road and the boundary of a setback area specified in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), there is a fence running parallel to a road, the Secretary shall use the fence as the wilderness boundary if, in the opinion of the Secretary, doing so would result in a more manageable boundary.
(3) DEVIATIONS FROM SETBACK AREAS.—
(A) EXCLUSION OF DISTURBANCES FROM WILDERNESS BOUNDARIES.—In cases where there is an existing livestock development, dispersed camping area, borrow pit, or similar disturbance within 100 feet of a road that forms part of a wilderness boundary, the Secretary may delineate the boundary so as to exclude the disturbance from the wilderness area.
(B) LIMITATION ON EXCLUSION OF DISTURBANCES.—The Secretary shall make a boundary adjustment under subparagraph (A) only if the Secretary determines that doing so is consistent with wilderness management goals.
(C) DEVIATIONS RESTRICTED TO MINIMUM NECESSARY.—Any deviation under this paragraph from the setbacks required under in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) shall be the minimum necessary to exclude the disturbance.
(c) DELINEATION WITHIN SETBACK AREA.—The Secretary may delineate a wilderness boundary at a location within a setback under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) if, as determined by the Secretary, the delineation would enhance wilderness management goals.

SEC. 206. LIVESTOCK.

Within the wilderness areas designated under title I, the grazing of livestock authorized on the date of enactment of this Act shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations and procedures as the Secretary considers necessary, as long as the regulations and procedures are consistent with—
(1) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and
(2) section 101(f) of the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–628; 104 Stat. 4469).

SEC. 207. FISH AND WILDLIFE.

Nothing in this Act affects the jurisdiction of the State with respect to wildlife and fish on the public land located in the State.

SEC. 208. MANAGEMENT OF NEWLY ACQUIRED LAND.

Any land within the boundaries of a wilderness area designated under this Act that is acquired by the Federal Government shall—
(1) become part of the wilderness area in which the land is located; and
(2) be managed in accordance with this Act and other laws applicable to wilderness areas.

SEC. 209. WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid rights existing on the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal land referred to in title I is withdrawn from all forms of—
(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under public law;
(2) location, entry, and patent under mining law; and
(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1377. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify and expand Federal criminal jurisdiction over Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I reintroduce the Civilian Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act, CEJA. The U.S. has huge numbers of Government employees and contractors working overseas, but the legal framework governing them is unclear and outdated. To promote accountability, Congress must make sure that our criminal laws reach serious misconduct by U.S. Government employees and contractors wherever they act. The Civilian Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act accomplishes this important and common sense goal by allowing U.S. contractors and employees working overseas who commit specific crimes to be tried and sentenced under U.S. law.

Tragic events in Iraq and Afghanistan highlight the need to strengthen the laws providing for jurisdiction over American government employees and contractors working abroad. In September 2007, Blackwater security contractors working for the State Department shot more than 20 unarmed civilians on the streets of Baghdad, killing at least 14 of them, and causing a rift in our relations with the Iraqi government. Efforts to prosecute those responsible for these shootings were fraught with difficulties. The Blackwater trial has now concluded, eight years after this tragedy, with one former security contractor receiving a life sentence and three others receiving sentences of 30 years for their role. The trial was significantly delayed, however, as defendants argued in court that the U.S. Government did not have jurisdiction to prosecute them.

I worked with Senator SESSIONS and others in 2000 to pass the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act, MEJA, and then, again, to amend it in 2004, so that U.S. criminal laws would extend to all members of the U.S. military, to those who accompany them, and to contractors who work with the military. That law provides criminal jurisdiction over Defense Department employees and contractors, but it does not cover people working for other Federal agencies unless they are supporting a Defense Department mission. Although prosecutors were able to demonstrate that the Blackwater contractors met this criteria, had jurisdiction in that tragic incident been clear from the outset, it could have prevented some of the problems that delayed the case.

Other incidents have made it all too clear that the Blackwater case was not an isolated incident. Private security contractors have been involved in violent incidents and serious misconduct in Iraq and Afghanistan, including other shooting incidents in which civilians have been seriously injured or killed. MEJA does not cover many of the thousands of U.S. contractors and employees who are working abroad. The legislation I introduce today fills this gap.

Ensuring criminal accountability will also improve our national security and protect Americans overseas. Importantly, in those instances where the local justice system may be less than fair, this explicit jurisdiction will also protect Americans by providing the option of prosecuting them in the United States, rather than leaving them subject to potentially hostile and unpredictable local courts. Our allies, including those countries most essential to our counterterrorism and national security efforts, work best with us when we hold our own accountable.

The legislation I propose today has been carefully crafted to ensure that the intelligence community can continue its authorized activities unimpeded. This bill would also provide greater protection to American victims of crime, as it would lead to more accountability for crimes committed by U.S. Government contractors and employees against Americans working abroad.

This legislation provides another important benefit: It will lay the groundwork to expand U.S. preclearance operations in Canada—thereby enhancing national security and facilitating commerce and tourism with our largest trading partner. The U.S. currently stations U.S. Customs and Border Protection, CBP, Officers in select locations in Canada to inspect passengers and cargo bound for the United States before they leave Canada. These operations relieve congestion at U.S. airports, improve commerce, save money, and provide national security benefits. Earlier this year, Secretary Johnson was joined in Washington by Canada's Minister of Public Safety, Steven Blaney, for the signing of a new preclearance agreement that was negotiated under the Beyond the Border Action Plan. That agreement sets the stage for expansion of preclearance capacity for traffic in the marine, land, air and rail sectors between the United States and Canada. But one barrier in these discussions is that the United States lacks legal authority to prosecute U.S. officials engaged in preclearance operations if they commit crimes while stationed in Canada. CEJA would ensure that the U.S. has legal authority to hold our own officials accountable if they engage in wrongdoing, and thereby help pave the way to fully implementing the expanded Canada preclearance agreement.

In the past, legislation in this area has been bipartisan. I hope Senators of both parties will work together to pass this important reform.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1377

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 ''Civilian Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act of 2015'' or the ''CEJA''.

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION AND EXPANSION OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION OVER FEDERAL CONTRACTORS AND EMPLOYEES.

(a) EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OVER FEDERAL CONTRACTORS AND EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by transferring the text of section 3272 to the end of section 3271, redesignating such text as subsection (c) of section 3271, and, in such text, as so redesignated, by striking ''this chapter'' and inserting ''this section'';

(B) by striking the heading of section 3272; and

(C) by adding after section 3271, as amended by this paragraph, the following new sections:

''§ 3272. Offenses committed by Federal contractors and employees outside the United States

''(a)(1) Whoever, while employed by any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense or accompanying any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense, knowingly engages in conduct (or conspires or attempts to engage in conduct) outside the United States that would constitute an offense enumerated in paragraph (3) had the conduct been engaged in within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States shall be punished as provided for that offense.

''(2) A prosecution may not be commenced against a person under this subsection if a foreign government, in accordance with jurisdiction recognized by the United States, has prosecuted or is prosecuting such person for the conduct constituting the offense, except upon the approval of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General (or a person acting in either such capacity), which function of approval may not be delegated.

''(3) The offenses covered by paragraph (1) are the following:

''(A) Any offense under chapter 5 (arson) of this title.

''(B) Any offense under section 111 (assaulting, resisting, or impeding certain officers or employees), 113 (assault within maritime and territorial jurisdiction), or 114 (maiming within maritime and territorial jurisdiction) of this title, but only if the offense is subject to a maximum sentence of imprisonment of one year or more.

''(C) Any offense under section 201 (bribery of public officials and witnesses) of this title.

''(D) Any offense under section 499 (military, naval, or official passes) of this title.

''(E) Any offense under section 701 (official badges, identifications cards, and other insignia), 702 (uniform of armed forces and Public Health Service), 703 (uniform of friendly nation), or 704 (military medals or decorations) of this title.

''(F) Any offense under chapter 41 (extortion and threats) of this title, but only if the offense is subject to a maximum sentence of imprisonment of three years or more.

''(G) Any offense under chapter 42 (extortionate credit transactions) of this title.

''(H) Any offense under section 924(c) (use of firearm in violent or drug trafficking crime) or 924(o) (conspiracy to violate section 924(c)) of this title.

''(I) Any offense under chapter 50A (genocide) of this title.

''(J) Any offense under section 1111 (murder), 1112 (manslaughter), 1113 (attempt to

commit murder or manslaughter), 1114 (protection of officers and employees of the United States), 1116 (murder or manslaughter of foreign officials, official guests, or internationally protected persons), 1117 (conspiracy to commit murder), or 1119 (foreign murder of United States nationals) of this title.

''(K) Any offense under chapter 55 (kidnapping) of this title.

''(L) Any offense under section 1503 (influencing or injuring officer or juror generally), 1505 (obstruction of proceedings before departments, agencies, and committees), 1510 (obstruction of criminal investigations), 1512 (tampering with a witness, victim, or informant), or 1513 (retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant) of this title.

''(M) Any offense under section 1951 (interference with commerce by threats or violence), 1952 (interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises), 1956 (laundering of monetary instruments), 1957 (engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity), 1958 (use of interstate commerce facilities in the commission of murder for hire), or 1959 (violent crimes in aid of racketeering activity) of this title.

''(N) Any offense under section 2111 (robbery or burglary within special maritime and territorial jurisdiction) of this title.

''(O) Any offense under chapter 109A (sexual abuse) of this title.

''(P) Any offense under chapter 113B (terrorism) of this title.

''(Q) Any offense under chapter 113C (torture) of this title.

''(R) Any offense under chapter 115 (treason, sedition, and subversive activities) of this title.

''(S) Any offense under section 2442 (child soldiers) of this title.

''(T) Any offense under section 401 (manufacture, distribution, or possession with intent to distribute a controlled substance) or 408 (continuing criminal enterprise) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841, 848), or under section 1002 (importation of controlled substances), 1003 (exportation of controlled substances), or 1010 (import or export of a controlled substance) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 952, 953, 960), but only if the offense is subject to a maximum sentence of imprisonment of 20 years or more.

''(b) In addition to the jurisdiction under subsection (a), whoever, while employed by any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense and stationed or deployed in a country outside of the United States pursuant to a treaty or executive agreement in furtherance of a border security initiative with that country, engages in conduct (or conspires or attempts to engage in conduct) outside the United States that would constitute an offense for which a person may be prosecuted in a court of the United States had the conduct been engaged in within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States shall be punished as provided for that offense.

''(c) In this section:

''(1) The term 'employed by any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense' means—

''(A) being employed as a civilian employee, a contractor (including a subcontractor at any tier), an employee of a contractor (or a subcontractor at any tier), a grantee (including a contractor of a grantee or a subgrantee or subcontractor at any tier), or an employee of a grantee (or a contractor of a grantee or a subgrantee or subcontractor at any tier) of any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense;

''(B) being present or residing outside the United States in connection with such employment;

''(C) not being a national of or ordinarily resident in the host nation; and

''(D) in the case of such a contractor, contractor employee, grantee, or grantee employee, that such employment supports a program, project, or activity for a department or agency of the United States.

''(2) The term 'accompanying any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense' means—

''(A) being a dependant, family member, or member of household of—

''(i) a civilian employee of any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense; or

''(ii) a contractor (including a subcontractor at any tier), an employee of a contractor (or a subcontractor at any tier), a grantee (including a contractor of a grantee or a subgrantee or subcontractor at any tier), or an employee of a grantee (or a contractor of a grantee or a subgrantee or subcontractor at any tier) of any department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense, which contractor, contractor employee, grantee, or grantee employee is supporting a program, project, or activity for a department or agency of the United States other than the Department of Defense;

''(B) residing with such civilian employee, contractor, contractor employee, grantee, or grantee employee outside the United States; and

''(C) not being a national of or ordinarily resident in the host nation.

''(3) The term 'grant agreement' means a legal instrument described in section 6304 or 6305 of title 31, other than an agreement between the United States and a State, local, or foreign government or an international organization.

''(4) The term 'grantee' means a party, other than the United States, to a grant agreement.

''(5) The term 'host nation' means the country outside of the United States where the employee or contractor resides, the country where the employee or contractor commits the alleged offense at issue, or both.

''§ 3273. Regulations

''The Attorney General, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall prescribe regulations governing the investigation, apprehension, detention, delivery, and removal of persons described in sections 3271 and 3272 of this title.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (A) of section 3267(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(A) employed as a civilian employee, a contractor (including a subcontractor at any tier), or an employee of a contractor (or a subcontractor at any tier) of the Department of Defense (including a nonappropriated fund instrumentality of the Department);''.

(b) VENUE.—Chapter 211 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 3245. Optional venue for offenses involving Federal employees and contractors overseas

''In addition to any venue otherwise provided in this chapter, the trial of any offense involving a violation of section 3261, 3271, or 3272 of this title may be brought—

''(1) in the district in which is headquartered the department or agency of the United States that employs the offender, or any 1 of 2 or more joint offenders; or

''(2) in the district in which is headquartered the department or agency of the United States that the offender is accompanying, or that any 1 of 2 or more joint offenders is accompanying.''.

(c) SUSPENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Chapter 213 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3287 the following new section:

''§ 3287A. Suspension of limitations for offenses involving Federal employees and contractors overseas

''The statute of limitations for an offense under section 3272 of this title shall be suspended for the period during which the person is outside the United States or is a fugitive from justice within the meaning of section 3290 of this title.''.

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) HEADING AMENDMENT.—The heading of chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 212A—EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OVER OFFENSES OF CONTRACTORS AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT''.

(2) TABLES OF SECTIONS.—(A) The table of sections for chapter 211 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''3245. Optional venue for offenses involving Federal employees and contractors overseas.''.

(B) The table of sections for chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 3272 and inserting the following new items:

''3272. Offenses committed by Federal contractors and employees outside the United States.

''3273. Regulations.''.

(C) The table of sections for chapter 213 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3287 the following new item:

''3287A. Suspension of limitations for offenses involving Federal employees and contractors overseas.''.

(3) TABLE OF CHAPTERS.—The item relating to chapter 212A in the table of chapters for part II of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''212A. Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Over Offenses of Contractors and Civilian Employees of the Federal Government ..... 3271''.

SEC. 3. INVESTIGATIVE TASK FORCES FOR CONTRACTOR AND EMPLOYEE OVERSIGHT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF INVESTIGATIVE TASK FORCES FOR CONTRACTOR AND EMPLOYEE OVERSIGHT.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the head of any other department or agency of the Federal Government responsible for employing contractors or persons overseas, shall assign adequate personnel and resources, including through the creation of task forces, to investigate allegations of criminal offenses under chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), and may authorize the overseas deployment of law enforcement agents and other employees of the Federal Government for that purpose.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(1) INVESTIGATION.—The Attorney General shall have principal authority for the enforcement of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and shall have the authority to initiate, conduct, and supervise investigations of any alleged offense under this Act or an amendment made by this Act.

(2) LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—With respect to violations of sections 3271 and 3272 of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), the Attorney General may authorize any person serving in a law enforcement position in any other department or agency of the Federal Government, including a member of the Diplomatic Security Service of the Department of State or a military police officer of the Armed Forces, to exercise investigative and law enforcement authority, including those powers that may be exercised under section 3052 of title 18, United States Code, subject to such guidelines or policies as the Attorney General considers appropriate for the exercise of such powers.

(3) PROSECUTION.—The Attorney General may establish such procedures the Attorney General considers appropriate to ensure that Federal law enforcement agencies refer offenses under section 3271 or 3272 of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), to the Attorney General for prosecution in a uniform and timely manner.

(4) ASSISTANCE ON REQUEST OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any statute, rule, or regulation to the contrary, the Attorney General may request assistance from the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, or the head of any other department or agency of the Federal Government to enforce section 3271 or 3272 of title 18, United States Code (as so amended). The assistance requested may include the following:

(A) The assignment of additional employees and resources to task forces established by the Attorney General under subsection (a).

(B) An investigation into alleged misconduct or arrest of an individual suspected of alleged misconduct by agents of the Diplomatic Security Service of the Department of State present in the nation in which the alleged misconduct occurs.

(5) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 5 years, the Attorney General shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, submit to Congress a report containing the following:

(A) The number of prosecutions under chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), including the nature of the offenses and any dispositions reached, during the previous year.

(B) The actions taken to implement subsection (a), including the organization and training of employees and the use of task forces, during the previous year.

(C) Such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the President considers appropriate to enforce chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), and the provisions of this section.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''agency'' and ''department'' have the meanings given such terms in section 6 of title 18, United States Code.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any authority of the Attorney General or any Federal law enforcement agency to investigate violations of Federal law or deploy employees overseas.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVENESS.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Attorney General and the head of any other department or agency of the Federal Government to which this Act or an amendment made by this Act applies shall have 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act to ensure compliance with this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 5. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall be construed—

(1) to limit or affect the application of extraterritorial jurisdiction related to any other Federal law; or

(2) to limit or affect any authority or responsibility of a Chief of Mission as provided in section 207 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3927).

(b) INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall apply to the authorized intelligence activities of the United States Government.

SEC. 6. FUNDING.

If any amounts are appropriated to carry out this Act or an amendment made by this Act, the amounts shall be from amounts which would have otherwise been made available or appropriated to the Department of Justice.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 180—URGING ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS AGAINST THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. GARDNER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 180

Whereas the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) tested nuclear weapons on three separate occasions, in October 2006, in May 2009, and in February 2013;

Whereas nuclear experts have reported that the DPRK may currently have as many as 20 nuclear warheads and has the potential to possess as many as 100 warheads within the next 5 years;

Whereas, according to the 2014 Department of Defense (DoD) report, ''Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea'', the DPRK has proliferated nuclear technology to Libya via the proliferation network of Pakistani scientist A.Q. Khan;

Whereas, according to the 2014 DoD report, ''North Korea also provided Syria with nuclear reactor technology until 2007.'';

Whereas, on September 6, 2007, as part of ''Operation Orchard'', the Israeli Air Force destroyed the suspected nuclear facility in Syria;

Whereas, according to the 2014 DoD report, ''North Korea has exported conventional and ballistic missile-related equipment, components, materials, and technical assistance to countries in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.'';

Whereas, on November 29, 1987, DPRK agents planted explosive devices onboard Korean Air flight 858, which killed all 115 passengers and crew on board;

Whereas, on March 26, 2010, the DPRK fired upon and sank the South Korean warship Cheonan, killing 46 of her crew;

Whereas, on November 23, 2010, the DPRK shelled South Korea's Yeonpyeong Island, killing 4 South Korean citizens;

Whereas, on February 7, 2014, the United Nations ''Commission of Inquiry on human rights in DPRK ('Commission of Inquiry')'' released a report detailing the atrocious human rights record of the DPRK;

Whereas Dr. Michael Kirby, Chair of the Commission, stated on March 17, 2014, ''The Commission of Inquiry has found systematic, widespread, and grave human rights violations occurring in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It has also found a disturbing array of crimes against humanity. These crimes are committed against inmates of political and other prison camps; against starving populations; against religious believers; against persons who try to flee the country—including those forcibly repatriated by China.'';

Whereas Dr. Michael Kirby also stated, ''These crimes arise from policies established at the highest level of the State. They have been committed, and continue to take place in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, because the policies, institutions, and patterns of impunity that lie at their heart remain in place. The gravity, scale, duration, and nature of the unspeakable atrocities committed in the country reveal a totalitarian State that does not have any parallel in the contemporary world.'';

Whereas the Commission of Inquiry also notes, ''Since 1950, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has engaged in the systematic abduction, denial of repatriation, and subsequent enforced disappearance of persons from other countries on a large scale and as a matter of State policy. Well over 200,000 persons, including children, who were brought from other countries to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea may have become victims of enforced disappearance,'' and states that the DPRK has failed to account or address this injustice in any way;

Whereas, according to reports and analysis from organizations such as the International Network for the Human Rights of North Korean Overseas Labor, the Korea Policy Research Center, NK Watch, the Asan Institute for Policy Studies, the Center for International and Strategic Studies (CSIS), and the George W. Bush Institute, there may currently be as many as 100,000 North Korean overseas laborers in various nations around the world;

Whereas these forced North Korean laborers are often subjected to harsh working conditions under the direct supervision of DPRK officials, and their salaries contribute to anywhere from $150,000,000 to $230,000,000 a year to the DPRK state coffers;

Whereas, according to the Director of National Intelligence's (DNI) 2015 Worldwide Threat Assessment, ''North Korea's nuclear weapons and missile programs pose a serious threat to the United States and to the security environment in East Asia.'';

Whereas the 2015 DNI report states, ''North Korea has also expanded the size and sophistication of its ballistic missile forces, ranging from close-range ballistic missiles to ICBMs, while continuing to conduct test launches. In 2014, North Korea launched an unprecedented number of ballistic missiles.'';

Whereas, on December 19, 2015, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) declared that the DPRK was responsible for a cyberattack on Sony Pictures conducted on November 24, 2014;

Whereas, from 1998 to 2008, the DPRK was designated by the United States Government as a state sponsor of terrorism;

Whereas the DPRK is currently in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1695 (2006), 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009), 2087 (2013), and 2094 (2013);

Whereas the DPRK repeatedly violated agreements with the United States and the other so-called Six-Party Talks partners (the Republic of Korea, Japan, the Russian Federation, and the People's Republic of China) designed to halt its nuclear weapons program, while receiving significant concessions, including fuel, oil, and food aid;

Whereas the Six Party talks have not been held since December 2008; and

Whereas, on May 9, 2015, the DPRK claimed that it has test-fired a ballistic missile from a submarine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) finds that the DPRK represents a serious threat to the national security of the United States and United States allies in East Asia and to international peace and stability, and grossly violates the human rights of its own people;

(2) urges the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to impose additional sanctions against the DPRK, including targeting its financial assets around the world, specific designations relating to human rights abuses, and a redesignation of the DPRK as a state sponsor of terror; and

(3) warns the President against resuming the negotiations with the DPRK, either bilaterally or as part of the Six Party talks, without strict pre-conditions, including that the DPRK—

(A) adhere to its denuclearization commitments outlined in the 2005 Joint Statement of the Six-Party talks;

(B) commit to halting its ballistic missile programs and its proliferation activities;

(C) cease military provocations; and

(D) measurably and significantly improve its human rights record.

SENATE RESOLUTION 181—DESIGNATING MAY 19, 2015, AS ''NATIONAL SCHIZENCEPHALY AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 181

Whereas schizencephaly is an extremely rare developmental birth defect characterized by abnormal slits, or clefts, in the brain;

Whereas individuals with bilateral schizencephaly, the more severe case, commonly have developmental delays, delays in speech and language skills, problems with brain-spinal cord communication, limited mobility, and shorter lifespans;

Whereas schizencephaly is the second rarest brain malformation, and only approximately 7,000 cases have ever been reported;

Whereas promoting education and increasing awareness among health professionals and families will lead to early intervention and treatment options for individuals with schizencephaly; and

Whereas continued Federal support for medical research will help identify causes, improve diagnostics, and develop promising treatments for schizencephaly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates May 19, 2015, as ''National Schizencephaly Awareness Day''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 182—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT DEFENSE LABORATORIES HAVE BEEN, AND CONTINUE TO BE, ON THE CUTTING EDGE OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT AND SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 14, 2015, AS THE ''DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LABORATORY DAY''

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 182

Whereas a Defense laboratory is defined as any laboratory, Department of Defense-funded research and development center, or engineering center that is owned by a military service and funded by the Federal Government;

Whereas Defense laboratories should be commended for the unique role the laboratories have played in numerous innovations and advances in the areas of defense and national security;

Whereas technological progress is responsible for up to half the growth of the United States economy and is the principal driving force behind long-term economic growth and increases in the standard of living in the United States;

Whereas defense-supported research and development has led to new products and processes for state-of-the-art military weapons and technology, as well as for the public good;

Whereas Defense laboratories frequently partner with State and local governments and regional organizations to transfer technology to the private sector;

Whereas Defense laboratories are at the forefront of cutting-edge science and technology, earning prestigious national and international awards for research and technology transfer efforts;

Whereas the innovations produced at the Defense laboratories of the United States fuel economic growth by creating new industries, companies, and jobs;

Whereas the work of the Defense laboratories is essential to the continued prosperity of the United States; and

Whereas May 14, 2015, would be an appropriate day to designate as the ''Department of Defense Laboratory Day'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 14, 2015, as the ''Department of Defense Laboratory Day'' in recognition of the work and accomplishments of the national network of Defense laboratories;

(2) recognizes that supporting research and development, including federally sponsored work performed at the Defense laboratories, is key to maintaining United States innovation and competitiveness in a global economy;

(3) acknowledges that the knowledge base, technologies, and techniques generated in the Defense laboratory system serve as a foundation for the defense industrial base;

(4) reaffirms the importance of robust investment in Defense laboratories to preserving the technological superiority of the Armed Forces in the 21st century; and

(5) encourages the Defense laboratories, the executive branch agencies, and Congress to hold an outreach event on May 14, 2015, ''Department of Defense Laboratory Day'', to raise public awareness of the work of the Defense laboratories.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1366. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1367. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1368. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1369. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1370. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1371. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1372. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1373. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1374. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1375. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1376. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1377. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1378. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1379. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1380. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1381. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1382. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1383. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1384. Mr. HATCH (for Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ISAKSON , Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. INHOFE)) submitted an amendment intended

to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1385. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CORKER, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1386. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1387. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1388. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1389. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1390. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1391. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1392. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1393. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314 , supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1394. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1395. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1396. Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1397. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1398. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1399. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1400. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1401. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1402. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1403. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1404. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1405. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1406. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1407. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1408. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1409. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1410. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1411. Mr. HATCH proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1314, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1366. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 103(b), strike paragraph (2) and insert the following:

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(B) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—A trade agreement may not be entered into under this subsection if such agreement could subject policies of the United States Government or any State or local government in the United States to claims by foreign investors that would be decided outside the United States legal system.

SA 1367. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 103(b), strike paragraph (2) and insert the following:

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(B) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—A trade agreement may not be entered into under this subsection if such agreement could subject policies of State or local governments in the United States to claims by foreign investors that would be decided outside the United States legal system.

SA 1368. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 103(b), strike paragraph (2) and insert the following:

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(B) PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, AND CONSUMERS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement exempts policies for protecting the environment, public health, and consumers from any investor-state dispute settlement provisions included in the agreement.

SA 1369. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, line 6, strike ''makes progress in meeting'' and insert ''achieves''.

On page 88, line 10, strike ''makes progress in achieving'' and insert ''achieves''.

On page 88, lines 15 through 17, strike ''and to what extent the agreement makes progress in achieving'' and insert ''the agreement achieves''.

On page 92, line 24, strike ''make progress in achieving'' and insert ''achieve''.

SA 1370. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the

bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 44, strike line 4, and all that follows through page 93, line 2, and insert the following:

(2) CONDITIONS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement achieves the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(3) BILLS QUALIFYING FOR TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—(A) The provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (in this title referred to as ''trade authorities procedures'') apply to a bill of either House of Congress which contains provisions described in subparagraph (B) to the same extent as such section 151 applies to implementing bills under that section. A bill to which this paragraph applies shall hereafter in this title be referred to as an ''implementing bill''.

(B) The provisions referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) a provision approving a trade agreement entered into under this subsection and approving the statement of administrative action, if any, proposed to implement such trade agreement; and

(ii) if changes in existing laws or new statutory authority are required to implement such trade agreement or agreements, only such provisions as are strictly necessary or appropriate to implement such trade agreement or agreements, either repealing or amending existing laws or providing new statutory authority.

(c) EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL PROCESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 106(b)—

(A) the trade authorities procedures apply to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) before July 1, 2018; and

(B) the trade authorities procedures shall be extended to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) after June 30, 2018, and before July 1, 2021, if (and only if)—

(i) the President requests such extension under paragraph (2); and

(ii) neither House of Congress adopts an extension disapproval resolution under paragraph (5) before July 1, 2018.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT.—If the President is of the opinion that the trade authorities procedures should be extended to implementing bills described in paragraph (1)(B), the President shall submit to Congress, not later than April 1, 2018, a written report that contains a request for such extension, together with—

(A) a description of all trade agreements that have been negotiated under subsection (b) and the anticipated schedule for submitting such agreements to Congress for approval;

(B) a description of the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title, and a statement that such progress justifies the continuation of negotiations; and

(C) a statement of the reasons why the extension is needed to complete the negotiations.

(3) OTHER REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(A) REPORT BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The President shall promptly inform the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The Advisory Committee shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains—

(i) its views regarding the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(ii) a statement of its views, and the reasons therefor, regarding whether the extension requested under paragraph (2) should be approved or disapproved.

(B) REPORT BY INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.—The President shall promptly inform the United States International Trade Commission of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The International Trade Commission shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains a review and analysis of the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements implemented between the date of the enactment of this Act and the date on which the President decides to seek an extension requested under paragraph (2).

(4) STATUS OF REPORTS.—The reports submitted to Congress under paragraphs (2) and (3), or any portion of such reports, may be classified to the extent the President determines appropriate.

(5) EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTIONS.—(A) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ''extension disapproval resolution'' means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the _____ disapproves the request of the President for the extension, under section 103(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, of the trade authorities procedures under that Act to any implementing bill submitted with respect to any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) of that Act after June 30, 2018.'', with the blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress.

(B) Extension disapproval resolutions—

(i) may be introduced in either House of Congress by any member of such House; and

(ii) shall be referred, in the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules.

(C) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to extension disapproval resolutions.

(D) It is not in order for—

(i) the House of Representatives to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules;

(ii) the Senate to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance; or

(iii) either House of Congress to consider an extension disapproval resolution after June 30, 2018.

(d) COMMENCEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS.—In order to contribute to the continued economic expansion of the United States, the President shall commence negotiations covering tariff and nontariff barriers affecting any industry, product, or service sector, and expand existing sectoral agreements to countries that are not parties to those agreements, in cases where the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States. Such sectors include agriculture, commercial services, intellectual property rights, industrial and capital goods, government procurement, information technology products, environmental technology and services, medical equipment and services, civil aircraft, and infrastructure products. In so doing, the President shall take into account all of the negotiating objectives set forth in section 102.

SEC. 104. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT, CONSULTATIONS, AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION.

(a) CONSULTATIONS WITH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—

(1) CONSULTATIONS DURING NEGOTIATIONS.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) meet upon request with any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement;

(B) upon request of any Member of Congress, provide access to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(C) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(D) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under subsection (c) and all committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over laws that could be affected by a trade agreement resulting from the negotiations; and

(E) with regard to any negotiations and agreement relating to agricultural trade, also consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(2) CONSULTATIONS PRIOR TO ENTRY INTO FORCE.—Prior to exchanging notes providing for the entry into force of a trade agreement, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis with Members of Congress and committees as specified in paragraph (1), and keep them fully apprised of the measures a trading partner has taken to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date that the agreement enters into force.

(3) ENHANCED COORDINATION WITH CONGRESS.—

(A) WRITTEN GUIDELINES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with Congress, including coordination with designated congressional advisers under subsection (b), regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) CONTENT OF GUIDELINES.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall enhance coordination with Congress through procedures to ensure—

(i) timely briefings upon request of any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress conducted under this title, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement; and

(ii) the sharing of detailed and timely information with Members of Congress, and their staff with proper security clearances as appropriate, regarding those negotiations and pertinent documents related to those negotiations (including classified information), and with committee staff with proper security clearances as would be appropriate in the light of the responsibilities of that committee over the trade agreements programs affected by those negotiations.

(C) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(b) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—

(A) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In each Congress, any Member of the House of Representatives may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consulting with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(B) SENATE.—In each Congress, any Member of the Senate may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the President pro tempore of the Senate, after consultation with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(2) CONSULTATIONS WITH DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the congressional advisers for trade policy and negotiations designated under paragraph (1).

(3) ACCREDITATION.—Each Member of Congress designated as a congressional adviser under paragraph (1) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiating sessions relating to trade agreements.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL ADVISORY GROUPS ON NEGOTIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—By not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 30 days after the convening of each Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall convene the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall convene the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations (in this subsection referred to collectively as the ''congressional advisory groups'').

(2) MEMBERS AND FUNCTIONS.—

(A) MEMBERSHIP OF THE HOUSE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.—In each Congress, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the House of Representatives:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the House of Representatives that would have, under the Rules of the House of Representatives, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(B) MEMBERSHIP OF THE SENATE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.—In each Congress, the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the Senate:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the Senate that would have, under the Rules of the Senate, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(C) ACCREDITATION.—Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(i) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in negotiations for any trade agreement to which this title applies. Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B)(ii) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in the negotiations by reason of which the member is in one of the congressional advisory groups.

(D) CONSULTATION AND ADVICE.—The congressional advisory groups shall consult with and provide advice to the Trade Representative regarding the formulation of specific objectives, negotiating strategies and positions, the development of the applicable trade agreement, and compliance and enforcement of the negotiated commitments under the trade agreement.

(E) CHAIR.—The House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(F) COORDINATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES.—Members of any committee represented on one of the congressional advisory groups may submit comments to the member of the appropriate congressional advisory group from that committee regarding any matter related to a negotiation for any trade agreement to which this title applies.

(3) GUIDELINES.—

(A) PURPOSE AND REVISION.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines to facilitate the useful and timely exchange of information between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall provide for, among other things—

(i) detailed briefings on a fixed timetable to be specified in the guidelines of the congressional advisory groups regarding negotiating objectives and positions and the status of the applicable negotiations, beginning as soon as practicable after the congressional advisory groups are convened, with more frequent briefings as trade negotiations enter the final stage;

(ii) access by members of the congressional advisory groups, and staff with proper security clearances, to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(iii) the closest practicable coordination between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups at all critical periods during the negotiations, including at negotiation sites;

(iv) after the applicable trade agreement is concluded, consultation regarding ongoing compliance and enforcement of negotiated commitments under the trade agreement; and

(v) the timeframe for submitting the report required under section 105(d)(3).

(4) REQUEST FOR MEETING.—Upon the request of a majority of either of the congressional advisory groups, the President shall meet with that congressional advisory group before initiating negotiations with respect to a trade agreement, or at any other time concerning the negotiations.

(d) CONSULTATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on public access to information regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) PURPOSES.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) facilitate transparency;

(B) encourage public participation; and

(C) promote collaboration in the negotiation process.

(3) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall include procedures that—

(A) provide for rapid disclosure of information in forms that the public can readily find and use; and

(B) provide frequent opportunities for public input through Federal Register requests for comment and other means.

(4) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(e) CONSULTATIONS WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with advisory committees established pursuant to section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall enhance coordination with advisory committees described in that paragraph through procedures to ensure—

(A) timely briefings of advisory committees and regular opportunities for advisory committees to provide input throughout the negotiation process on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas represented by those committees; and

(B) the sharing of detailed and timely information with each member of an advisory committee regarding negotiations and pertinent documents related to the negotiation (including classified information) on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas the member represents, and with a designee with proper security clearances of each such member as appropriate.

(3) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(f) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION OF CHIEF TRANSPARENCY OFFICER IN THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—Section 141(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) There shall be in the Office one Chief Transparency Officer. The Chief Transparency Officer shall consult with Congress on transparency policy, coordinate transparency in trade negotiations, engage and assist the public, and advise the United States Trade Representative on transparency policy.''.

SEC. 105. NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS.

(a) NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS BEFORE NEGOTIATION.—

(1) NOTICE.—The President, with respect to any agreement that is subject to the provisions of section 103(b), shall—

(A) provide, at least 90 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, written notice to Congress of the President's intention to enter into the negotiations with that country and set forth in the notice the date on which the President intends to initiate those negotiations, the specific United States objectives for the negotiations with that country, and whether the President intends to seek an agreement, or changes to an existing agreement;

(B) before and after submission of the notice, consult regarding the negotiations with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, such other committees of the House and Senate as the President deems appropriate, and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c);

(C) upon the request of a majority of the members of either the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c), meet with the requesting congressional advisory group before initiating the negotiations or at any other time concerning the negotiations; and

(D) after consulting with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance, and at least 30 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and regularly update thereafter, a detailed and comprehensive summary of the specific objectives with respect to the negotiations, and a description of how the agreement, if successfully concluded, will further those objectives and benefit the United States.

(2) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING AGRICULTURE.—

(A) ASSESSMENT AND CONSULTATIONS FOLLOWING ASSESSMENT.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to the subject matter under section 102(b)(3)(B) with any country, the President shall—

(i) assess whether United States tariffs on agricultural products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country;

(ii) consider whether the tariff levels bound and applied throughout the world with respect to imports from the United States are higher than United States tariffs and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(iii) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(B) SPECIAL CONSULTATIONS ON IMPORT SENSITIVE PRODUCTS.—(i) Before initiating negotiations with regard to agriculture and, with respect to agreements described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 107(a), as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(I) identify those agricultural products subject to tariff rate quotas on the date of enactment of this Act, and agricultural products subject to tariff reductions by the United States as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements, for which the rate of duty was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate which was not less than 97.5 percent of the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994;

(II) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning—

(aa) whether any further tariff reductions on the products identified under subclause (I) should be appropriate, taking into account the impact of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned;

(bb) whether the products so identified face unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including those not based on scientific principles in contravention of the Uruguay Round Agreements; and

(cc) whether the countries participating in the negotiations maintain export subsidies or other programs, policies, or practices that distort world trade in such products and the impact of such programs, policies, and practices on United States producers of the products;

(III) request that the International Trade Commission prepare an assessment of the probable economic effects of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned and on the United States economy as a whole; and

(IV) upon complying with subclauses (I), (II), and (III), notify the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate of those products identified under subclause (I) for which the Trade Representative intends to seek tariff liberalization in the negotiations and the reasons for seeking such tariff liberalization.

(ii) If, after negotiations described in clause (i) are commenced—

(I) the United States Trade Representative identifies any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) for tariff reductions which were not the subject of a notification under clause (i)(IV), or

(II) any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) is the subject of a request for tariff reductions by a party to the negotiations,

the Trade Representative shall, as soon as practicable, notify the committees referred to in clause (i)(IV) of those products and the reasons for seeking such tariff reductions.

(3) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING THE FISHING INDUSTRY.—Before initiating, or continuing, negotiations that directly relate to fish or shellfish trade with any country, the President shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and shall keep the Committees apprised of the negotiations on an ongoing and timely basis.

(4) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING TEXTILES.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to textiles and apparel products with any country, the President shall—

(A) assess whether United States tariffs on textile and apparel products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(B) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(5) ADHERENCE TO EXISTING INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT AGREEMENT OBLIGATIONS.—In determining whether to enter into negotiations with a particular country, the President shall take into account the extent to which that country has implemented, or has accelerated the implementation of, its international trade and investment commitments to the United States, including pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS BEFORE ENTRY INTO AGREEMENT.—

(1) CONSULTATION.—Before entering into any trade agreement under section 103(b), the President shall consult with—

(A) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(B) each other committee of the House and the Senate, and each joint committee of Congress, which has jurisdiction over legislation involving subject matters which would be affected by the trade agreement; and

(C) the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c).

(2) SCOPE.—The consultation described in paragraph (1) shall include consultation with respect to—

(A) the nature of the agreement;

(B) how and to what extent the agreement will achieve the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(C) the implementation of the agreement under section 106, including the general effect of the agreement on existing laws.

(3) REPORT REGARDING UNITED STATES TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—

(A) CHANGES IN CERTAIN TRADE LAWS.—The President, not less than 180 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate—

(i) the range of proposals advanced in the negotiations with respect to that agreement, that may be in the final agreement, and that could require amendments to title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) or to chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.); and

(ii) how these proposals relate to the objectives described in section 102(b)(16).

(B) RESOLUTIONS.—(i) At any time after the transmission of the report under subparagraph (A), if a resolution is introduced with respect to that report in either House of Congress, the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) shall apply to that resolution if—

(I) no other resolution with respect to that report has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to those procedures; and

(II) no procedural disapproval resolution under section 106(b) introduced with respect to a trade agreement entered into pursuant to the negotiations to which the report under subparagraph (A) relates has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be.

(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ''resolution'' means only a resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the _____ finds that the proposed changes to United States trade remedy laws contained in the report of the President transmitted to Congress on _____ under section 105(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 with respect to _____, are inconsistent with the negotiating objectives described in section 102(b)(16) of that Act.'', with the first blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress, the second blank space being filled with the appropriate date of the report, and the third blank space being filled with the name of the country or countries involved.

(iii) Resolutions in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee.

(iv) Resolutions in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(v) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(vi) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(vii) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) shall apply to resolutions.

(4) ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS.—The report required under section 135(e)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(e)(1)) regarding any trade agreement entered into under subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 shall be provided to the President, Congress, and the United States Trade Representative not later than 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 103(a)(2) or 106(a)(1)(A) of the intention of the President to enter into the agreement.

(c) INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION ASSESSMENT.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION TO COMMISSION.—The President, not later than 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall provide the International Trade Commission (referred to in this subsection as the ''Commission'') with the details of the agreement as it exists at that time and request the Commission to prepare and submit an assessment of the agreement as described in paragraph (2). Between the time the President makes the request under this paragraph and the time the Commission submits the assessment, the President shall keep the Commission current with respect to the details of the agreement.

(2) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 105 calendar days after the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a report assessing the likely impact of the agreement on the United States economy as a whole and on specific industry sectors, including the impact the agreement will have on the gross domestic product, exports and imports, aggregate employment and employment opportunities, the production, employment, and competitive position of industries likely to be significantly affected by the agreement, and the interests of United States consumers.

(3) REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL LITERATURE.—In preparing the assessment under paragraph (2), the Commission shall review available economic assessments regarding the agreement, including literature regarding any substantially equivalent proposed agreement, and shall provide in its assessment a description of the analyses used and conclusions drawn in such literature, and a discussion of areas of consensus and divergence between the various analyses and conclusions, including those of the Commission regarding the agreement.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make each assessment under paragraph (2) available to the public.

(d) REPORTS SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEES WITH AGREEMENT.—

(1) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—The President shall—

(A) conduct environmental reviews of future trade and investment agreements, consistent with Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169), dated November 16, 1999, and its relevant guidelines; and

(B) submit a report on those reviews and on the content and operation of consultative mechanisms established pursuant to section 102(c) to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(2) EMPLOYMENT IMPACT REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—The President shall—

(A) review the impact of future trade agreements on United States employment, including labor markets, modeled after Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169) to the extent appropriate in establishing procedures and criteria; and

(B) submit a report on such reviews to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(3) REPORT ON LABOR RIGHTS.—The President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, on a timeframe determined in accordance with section 104(c)(3)(B)(v)—

(A) a meaningful labor rights report of the country, or countries, with respect to which the President is negotiating; and

(B) a description of any provisions that would require changes to the labor laws and labor practices of the United States.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make all reports required under this subsection available to the public.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E), the President shall also submit to Congress a plan for implementing and enforcing the agreement.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The implementation and enforcement plan required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) BORDER PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required at border entry points, including a list of additional customs and agricultural inspectors.

(B) AGENCY STAFFING REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required by Federal agencies responsible for monitoring and implementing the trade agreement, including personnel required by the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture (including additional personnel required to implement sanitary and phytosanitary measures in order to obtain market access for United States exports), the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of the Treasury, and such other agencies as may be necessary.

(C) CUSTOMS INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS.—A description of the additional equipment and facilities needed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(D) IMPACT ON STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—A description of the impact the trade agreement will have on State and local governments as a result of increases in trade.

(E) COST ANALYSIS.—An analysis of the costs associated with each of the items listed in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(3) BUDGET SUBMISSION.—The President shall include a request for the resources necessary to support the plan required by paragraph (1) in the first budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, after the date of the submission of the plan.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make the plan required under this subsection available to the public.

(f) OTHER REPORTS.—

(1) REPORT ON PENALTIES.—Not later than one year after the imposition by the United States of a penalty or remedy permitted by a trade agreement to which this title applies, the President 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 effectiveness of the penalty or remedy applied under United States law in enforcing United States rights under the trade agreement, which shall address whether the penalty or remedy was effective in changing the behavior of the targeted party and whether the penalty or remedy had any adverse impact on parties or interests not party to the dispute.

(2) REPORT ON IMPACT OF TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 5 years thereafter, the United States International Trade Commission 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 economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements with respect to which Congress has enacted an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures since January 1, 1984.

(3) ENFORCEMENT CONSULTATIONS AND REPORTS.—(A) The United States Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate after acceptance of a petition for review or taking an enforcement action in regard to an obligation under a trade agreement, including a labor or environmental obligation. During such consultations, the United States Trade Representative shall describe the matter, including the basis for such action and the application of any relevant legal obligations.

(B) As part of the report required pursuant to section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2213), the President shall report annually to Congress on enforcement actions taken pursuant to a trade agreement to which the United States is a party, as well as on any public reports issued by Federal agencies on enforcement matters relating to a trade agreement.

(g) ADDITIONAL COORDINATION WITH MEMBERS.—Any Member of the House of Representatives may submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and any Member of the Senate may submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate the views of that Member on any matter relevant to a proposed trade agreement, and the relevant Committee shall receive those views for consideration.

SEC. 106. IMPLEMENTATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) NOTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION.—Any agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall enter into force with respect to the United States if (and only if)—

(A) the President, at least 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into the trade agreement, notifies the House of Representatives and the Senate of the President's intention to enter into the agreement, and promptly thereafter publishes notice of such intention in the Federal Register;

(B) the President, at least 60 days before the day on which the President enters into the agreement, publishes the text of the agreement on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative;

(C) within 60 days after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress a description of those changes to existing laws that the President considers would be required in order to bring the United States into compliance with the agreement;

(D) the President, at least 30 days before submitting to Congress the materials under subparagraph (E), submits to Congress—

(i) a draft statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the agreement; and

(ii) a copy of the final legal text of the agreement;

(E) after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress, on a day on which both Houses of Congress are in session, a copy of the final legal text of the agreement, together with—

(i) a draft of an implementing bill described in section 103(b)(3);

(ii) a statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the trade agreement; and

(iii) the supporting information described in paragraph (2)(A);

(F) the implementing bill is enacted into law; and

(G) the President, not later than 30 days before the date on which the agreement enters into force with respect to a party to the agreement, submits written notice to Congress that the President has determined that the party has taken measures necessary to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date on which the agreement enters into force.

(2) SUPPORTING INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The supporting information required under paragraph (1)(E)(iii) consists of—

(i) an explanation as to how the implementing bill and proposed administrative action will change or affect existing law; and

(ii) a statement—

(I) asserting that the agreement achieves the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(II) setting forth the reasons of the President regarding—

(aa) how the agreement achieves the applicable purposes, policies, and objectives referred to in subclause (I);

(bb) whether and how the agreement changes provisions of an agreement previously negotiated;

(cc) how the agreement serves the interests of United States commerce; and

(dd) how the implementing bill meets the standards set forth in section 103(b)(3).

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make the supporting information described in subparagraph (A) available to the public.

(3) RECIPROCAL BENEFITS.—In order to ensure that a foreign country that is not a party to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) does not receive benefits under the agreement unless the country is also subject to the obligations under the agreement, the implementing bill submitted with respect to the agreement shall provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement apply only to the parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement. The implementing bill may also provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement do not apply uniformly to all parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement.

(4) DISCLOSURE OF COMMITMENTS.—Any agreement or other understanding with a foreign government or governments (whether oral or in writing) that—

(A) relates to a trade agreement with respect to which Congress enacts an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures; and

(B) is not disclosed to Congress before an implementing bill with respect to that agreement is introduced in either House of Congress,

shall not be considered to be part of the agreement approved by Congress and shall have no force and effect under United States law or in any dispute settlement body.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(1) FOR LACK OF NOTICE OR CONSULTATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) if during the 60-day period beginning on the date that one House of Congress agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution for lack of notice or consultations with respect to such trade agreement or agreements, the other House separately agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.

(B) PROCEDURAL DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION.—(i) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''procedural disapproval resolution'' means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.'', with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements with respect to which the President is considered to have failed or refused to notify or consult.

(ii) For purposes of clause (i) and paragraphs (3)(C) and (4)(C), the President has ''failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015'' on negotiations with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements if—

(I) the President has failed or refused to consult (as the case may be) in accordance with sections 104 and 105 and this section with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(II) guidelines under section 104 have not been developed or met with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(III) the President has not met with the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations pursuant to a request made under section 104(c)(4) with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements; or

(IV) the agreement or agreements fail to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title.

SA 1371. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) LIMITATION ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES FOR AGREEMENTS WITH CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) with a country that has a minimum wage that is less than $2.00 an hour, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

SA 1372. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) LIMITATION ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES FOR AGREEMENTS WITH CERTAIN

COUNTRIES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) with a country that has a minimum wage that is less than $3.00 an hour, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

SA 1373. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) LIMITATION ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES FOR AGREEMENTS WITH CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) with a country that has a minimum wage that is less than $4.00 an hour, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

SA 1374. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—TRADE ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. MODIFICATION OF FACTORS CONSIDERED IN FINAL DETERMINATION IN ANTIDUMPING OR COUNTERVAILING DUTY INVESTIGATION IN CASE OF AN ALLEGATION OF CRITICAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

(a) COUNTERVAILING DUTIES.—Clause (ii) of section 705(b)(4)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

''(ii) LIKELY TO SERIOUSLY UNDERMINE THE REMEDIAL EFFECT OF A COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDER.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall find under clause (i) that imports of subject merchandise subject to the affirmative determination under subsection (a)(2) are likely to undermine seriously the remedial effect of the countervailing duty order to be issued under section 706 if the Commission determines that imports of such merchandise after the filing of the petition under this subtitle substantially weaken the remedial effect of any subsequent countervailing duty order.

''(II) FACTORS IN DETERMINATION.—In making a determination under subclause (I) with respect to imports of subject merchandise described in that subclause, the Commission shall consider, based on the facts available, the following:

''(aa) An increase in the market share in the United States of imports of such merchandise after the filing of the petition.

''(bb) An increase in underselling of the domestic like product by imports of such merchandise, in terms of frequency or magnitude, after the filing of the petition.

''(cc) A significant buildup of inventories of imports of such merchandise in the United States, whether held by United States importers, purchasers, or end users, after the filing of the petition.

''(dd) A weakening of the industry of the domestic like product after the filing of the petition.

''(ee) Any other circumstances indicating that, after the filing of the petition, imports of such merchandise substantially weaken the remedial effect of the countervailing duty order.

''(III) ASSESSMENT OF COMPETITION.—The Commission shall consider items (aa) through (ee) of subclause (II) based on the particular conditions of competition in the relevant industry.

''(IV) TIME PERIOD.—The period of time evaluated in making a determination under subclause (I) shall not include any period after the issuance of the preliminary determination by the administering authority under section 703(b) with respect to the subject merchandise.''.

(b) ANTIDUMPING DUTIES.—Clause (ii) of section 735(b)(4)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

''(ii) LIKELY TO SERIOUSLY UNDERMINE THE REMEDIAL EFFECT OF AN ANTIDUMPING DUTY ORDER.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall find under clause (i) that imports of subject merchandise subject to the affirmative determination under subsection (a)(3) are likely to undermine seriously the remedial effect of the antidumping duty order to be issued under section 736 if the Commission determines that imports of such merchandise after the filing of the petition under this subtitle substantially weaken the remedial effect of any subsequent antidumping duty order.

''(II) FACTORS IN DETERMINATION.—In making a determination under subclause (I) with respect to imports of subject merchandise described in that subclause, the Commission shall consider, based on the facts available, the following:

''(aa) An increase in the market share in the United States of imports of such merchandise after the filing of the petition.

''(bb) An increase in underselling of the domestic like product by imports of such merchandise, in terms of frequency or magnitude, after the filing of the petition.

''(cc) A significant buildup of inventories of imports of such merchandise in the United States, whether held by United States importers, purchasers, or end users, after the filing of the petition.

''(dd) A weakening of the industry of the domestic like product after the filing of the petition.

''(ee) Any other circumstances indicating that, after the filing of the petition, imports of such merchandise substantially weaken the remedial effect of the antidumping duty order.

''(III) ASSESSMENT OF COMPETITION.—The Commission shall consider items (aa) through (ee) of subclause (II) based on the particular conditions of competition in the relevant industry.

''(IV) TIME PERIOD.—The period of time evaluated in making a determination under subclause (I) shall not include any period after the issuance of the preliminary determination by the administering authority under section 733(b) with respect to the subject merchandise.''.

SEC. 302. MODIFICATION OF DETERMINATION OF THREAT OF MATERIAL INJURY BASED ON IMMINENT FUTURE IMPORTS IN ANTIDUMPING OR COUNTERVAILING DUTY INVESTIGATION.

Section 771(7)(F) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(F)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) EFFECT OF IMMINENT FUTURE IMPORTS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclauses (II) and (III), the Commission may determine under this subparagraph that an industry in the United States is threatened with material injury by reason of imports (or sales for importation) of the subject merchandise notwithstanding the results of an evaluation under subparagraph (C)(iii) with respect to the effect of imports of the subject merchandise on that industry if the Commission determines that imminent future imports of the subject merchandise will likely lead to a change of circumstances concerning the state of that industry.

''(II) FUTURE PERFORMANCE ESTIMATE.—The Commission shall determine under this subparagraph that an industry in the United States is threatened with material injury if the performance of that industry is likely to be materially worse than it would have been in the absence of the likely volume of imports of subject merchandise in the imminent future.

''(III) FOREIGN PROJECTIONS.—With respect to considering economic factors described in clause (i)(II), in a case in which production capacity in or exports to the United States from the exporting country are projected by foreign producers to decline in the imminent future and such projection is contrary to information examined by the Commission in the investigation, such projection shall require verification or independent corroboration before being considered under this subparagraph.''.

SEC. 303. PREVENTION OF DUTY EVASION THROUGH IDENTIFICATION OF PERSONS AND COUNTRIES RESPONSIBLE FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE CUSTOMS LAWS.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS WHO VIOLATE THE CUSTOMS LAWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may publish semi-annually in the Federal Register a list of any producer, manufacturer, supplier, seller, exporter, or other person located outside the customs territory of the United States to which the Commissioner has issued a penalty claim under section 592(b)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1592(b)(2)) citing any of the violations of the customs laws described in paragraph (3).

(2) EFFECT OF PETITION FOR REMISSION OR MITIGATION.—If a person to which a penalty claim described in paragraph (1) is issued files a petition for remission or mitigation under section 618 of that Act (19 U.S.C. 1618) with respect to the penalty claim, the Secretary may not include the person on a list published under paragraph (1) until a final determination is made under such section 618.

(3) VIOLATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The violations of the customs laws described in this paragraph are the following:

(i) Using documentation, or providing documentation subsequently used by the importer of record, that indicates a false or fraudulent country of origin or source of goods described in subparagraph (B) being entered into the customs territory of the United States.

(ii) Using counterfeit visas, licenses, permits, bills of lading, commercial invoices, packing lists, certificates of origin, or similar documentation, or providing counterfeit visas, licenses, permits, bills of lading, commercial invoices, packing lists, certificates of origin, or similar documentation subsequently used by the importer of record, with respect to the entry into the customs territory of the United States of goods described in subparagraph (B).

(iii) Manufacturing, producing, supplying, or selling goods described in subparagraph (B) that are falsely or fraudulently labeled as to country of origin or source.

(iv) Engaging in practices that aid or abet the transshipment, through a country other than the country of origin, of goods described in subparagraph (B), in a manner that conceals the true origin of the goods or permits the evasion of quotas or duties on, or voluntary restraint agreements with respect to, imports of the goods.

(B) GOODS DESCRIBED.—Goods described in this subparagraph are—

(i) textile or apparel goods; or

(ii) goods subject to antidumping or countervailing duty orders under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.).

(4) REMOVAL FROM LIST.—Any person included on a list published under paragraph (1) may petition the Secretary to be removed from the list. If the Secretary finds that the person has not committed any violations of the customs laws described in paragraph (3) for a period of not less than 3 years after the date on which the person was included on the list, the Secretary shall remove the person from the list as of the next publication of the list under paragraph (1).

(5) REASONABLE CARE REQUIRED FOR SUBSEQUENT IMPORTS.—

(A) RESPONSIBILITY OF IMPORTERS AND OTHERS.—After a person has been included on a list published under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall require any importer of record entering, introducing, or attempting to introduce into the commerce of the United States any goods described in paragraph (3)(B) that were either directly or indirectly produced, manufactured, supplied, sold, exported, or transported by the person on the list to show, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that such importer has exercised reasonable care to ensure that those goods are accompanied by documentation, packaging, and labeling that are accurate as to the origin of those goods. Such reasonable care shall not include reliance solely on information provided by the person on the list.

(B) FAILURE TO EXERCISE REASONABLE CARE.—If the Commissioner determines that an imported good is not from the country claimed on the documentation accompanying the good, the failure to exercise reasonable care described in subparagraph (A) shall be considered when the Commissioner determines whether the importer of record is in violation of section 484(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1484(a)) or regulations issued under that section.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF HIGH-RISK COUNTRIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may publish annually in the Federal Register a list of countries—

(A) in which illegal activities have occurred involving transshipped goods or activities designed to evade quotas or duties of the United States on goods; and

(B) the governments of which fail to demonstrate a good faith effort to cooperate with United States authorities in ceasing such activities.

(2) REMOVAL FROM LIST.—Any country that is on the list published under paragraph (1) that subsequently demonstrates a good faith effort to cooperate with United States authorities in ceasing activities described in that paragraph shall be removed from the list, and such removal shall be published in the Federal Register as soon as practicable.

(3) REASONABLE CARE REQUIRED FOR SUBSEQUENT IMPORTS.—

(A) RESPONSIBILITY OF IMPORTERS OF RECORD.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall require any importer of record entering, introducing, or attempting to introduce into the commerce of the United States goods indicated, on the documentation, packaging, or labeling accompanying such goods, to be from any country on the list published under paragraph (1) to show, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that the importer, consignee, or purchaser has exercised reasonable care to identify the true country of origin of the good.

(B) FAILURE TO EXERCISE REASONABLE CARE.—If the Commissioner determines that a good described in subparagraph (A) is not from the country claimed on the documentation accompanying the good, the failure to exercise reasonable care under that subparagraph shall be considered when the Commissioner determines whether the importer of record is in violation of section 484(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1484(a)) or regulations issued under that section.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSIONER.—The term ''Commissioner'' means the Commissioner responsible for U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(2) COUNTRY.—The term ''country'' means a foreign country or territory, including any overseas dependent territory or possession of a foreign country.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SA 1375. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 102(b), add at the end the following:

(21) FOOD SAFETY.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to food safety are—

(A) to ensure that a trade agreement does not weaken or diminish food safety standards that protect public health;

(B) to promote strong food safety laws and regulations in the United States; and

(C) to maintain and strengthen food safety inspection systems, including the continuous inspection of meat, poultry, seafood, and egg products exported to the United States.

SA 1376. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''September 30, 2015''.

(b) DUAL-USE EXPORTS.—Section 1(c) of Public Law 103–428 (12 U.S.C. 635 note) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''September 30, 2015''.

(c) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 2(b)(9)(B)(iii) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(9)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''September 30, 2015''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or June 30, 2015.

SA 1377. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''.

(b) DUAL-USE EXPORTS.—Section 1(c) of Public Law 103–428 (12 U.S.C. 635 note) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''.

(c) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 2(b)(9)(B)(iii) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(9)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''July 31, 2015''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or June 30, 2015.

SA 1378. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 111(7), insert after subparagraph (C) the following:

(D) the provision of equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value, as set forth in ILO Convention No. 100 Concerning Equal Remuneration for Men and Women Workers for Work of Equal Value;

SA 1379. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 119, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(e) REAUTHORIZATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND CAREER TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 272(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2372(a)) is amended by striking ''for each of the fiscal years 2009 and 2010'' and all that follows through ''December 31, 2010,'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021''.

SA 1380. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain

organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. REPORT ON AUTOMOTIVE IMPORTS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to Congress a report on imports into the United States of automobiles and auto parts, including an analysis of, for the year preceding the submission of the report—

(1) any changes to the supply chain in the United States with respect to automobiles and auto parts;

(2) any changes to employment in the United States with respect to automobiles and auto parts; and

(3) the impact of imports into the United States of automobiles and auto parts on the changes described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

SA 1381. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS WITH COUNTRIES THAT MANIPULATE THEIR CURRENCIES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement under section 103(b) with a country that engages in protracted large-scale intervention in one direction in the currency exchange markets to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to the trade agreement.

SA 1382. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 2, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 4, line 6, and insert the following:

(1) to achieve an overall balance of payments over a reasonable period of time, eliminate persistent trade deficits, and reverse the accumulation of foreign debt;

(2) to obtain the reduction or elimination of barriers and distortions that are directly related to trade and investment and that increase the United States trade deficit;

(3) to further strengthen the system of international trade and investment disciplines and procedures, including dispute settlement;

(4) to foster economic growth, raise living standards, enhance the competitiveness of the United States, promote full employment in the United States, and substantially reduce global current account imbalances;

(5) to ensure that trade and environmental policies are mutually supportive and to seek to protect and preserve the environment and enhance the international means of doing so, while optimizing the use of the world's resources;

(6) to promote respect for worker rights and the rights of children consistent with core labor standards of the ILO (as set out in section 111(7)) and an understanding of the relationship between trade and worker rights;

(7) to seek provisions in trade agreements under which parties to those agreements ensure that they do not weaken or reduce the protections afforded in domestic environmental and labor laws as an encouragement for trade;

(8) to ensure that trade agreements afford small businesses equal access to international markets amd increased net export results and provide for the reduction or elimination of trade and investment barriers that disproportionately impact small businesses;

SA 1383. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. BONUSES FOR COST-CUTTERS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act of 2015''.

(b) COST SAVINGS ENHANCEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''or identification of surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority'' after ''mismanagement'';

(ii) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''or identification'' after ''disclosure''; and

(iii) in the matter following paragraph (2), by inserting ''or identification'' after ''disclosure''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) The Inspector General of an agency or other agency employee designated under subsection (b) shall refer to the Chief Financial Officer of the agency any potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee, along with any recommendations of the Inspector General or other agency employee.

''(d)(1) If the Chief Financial Officer of an agency determines that rescission of potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee would not hinder the effectiveness of the agency, except as provided in subsection (e), the head of the agency shall transfer the amount of the surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority from the applicable appropriations account to the general fund of the Treasury.

''(2) Title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 681 et seq.) shall not apply to transfers under paragraph (1).

''(3) Any amounts transferred under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction, except that in the case of a fiscal year for which there is no Federal budget deficit, such amounts shall be used to reduce the Federal debt (in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

''(e)(1) The head of an agency may retain not more than 10 percent of amounts to be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury under subsection (d).

''(2) Amounts retained by the head of an agency under paragraph (1) may be—

''(A) used for the purpose of paying a cash award under subsection (a) to 1 or more employees who identified the surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority; and

''(B) to the extent amounts remain after paying cash awards under subsection (a), transferred or reprogrammed for use by the agency, in accordance with any limitation on such a transfer or reprogramming under any other provision of law.

''(f)(1) The head of each agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management an annual report regarding—

''(A) each disclosure of possible fraud, waste, or mismanagement or identification of potentially surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority by an employee of the agency determined by the agency to have merit;

''(B) the total savings achieved through disclosures and identifications described in subparagraph (A); and

''(C) the number and amount of cash awards by the agency under subsection (a).

''(2)(A) The head of each agency shall include the information described in paragraph (1) in each budget request of the agency submitted to the Office of Management and Budget as part of the preparation of the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

''(B) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Government Accountability Office an annual report on Federal cost saving and awards based on the reports submitted under subparagraph (A).

''(g) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

''(1) ensure that the cash award program of each agency complies with this section; and

''(2) submit to Congress an annual certification indicating whether the cash award program of each agency complies with this section.

''(h) Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act of 2015, and every 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the operation of the cost savings and awards program under this section, including any recommendations for legislative changes.''.

(2) OFFICERS ELIGIBLE FOR CASH AWARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 4509 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term 'agency'—

''(1) has the meaning given that term under section 551(1); and

''(2) includes an entity described in section 4501(1).

''(b) PROHIBITION.—An officer may not receive a cash award under this subchapter if the officer—

''(1) serves in a position at level I of the Executive Schedule;

''(2) is the head of an agency; or

''(3) is a commissioner, board member, or other voting member of an independent establishment.''.

(B) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 4509 and inserting the following:

''4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers.''.

SA 1384. Mr. HATCH (for Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. INHOFE)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed

to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(a), add the following:

(14) to ensure that trade agreements do not require changes to the immigration laws of the United States.

SA 1385. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CORKER, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 102(b)(11) and insert the following:

(11) FOREIGN CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency practices is to seek to establish accountability through enforceable rules, transparency, reporting, monitoring, cooperative mechanisms, or other means to address exchange rate manipulation involving protracted large scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets and a persistently undervalued foreign exchange rate to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to a trade agreement, consistent with existing obligations of the United States as a member of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

SA 1386. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. COMMUNITY COLLEGE TO CAREER FUND.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Community College to Career Fund Act''.

(b) COMMUNITY COLLEGE TO CAREER FUND.—Title I of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Subtitle F—Community College to Career Fund

''SEC. 199. COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM.

''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From funds appropriated under section 199D(a)(1), the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education, in accordance with the interagency agreement described in section 199E, shall award competitive grants to eligible entities described in subsection (b) for the purpose of developing, offering, improving, or providing educational or career training programs for workers.

''(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—

''(1) PARTNERSHIPS WITH EMPLOYERS OR AN EMPLOYER OR INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIP.—

''(A) GENERAL DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, an 'eligible entity' means any of the entities described in subparagraph (B) (or a consortium of any of such entities) in partnership with employers or an employer or industry partnership representing multiple employers.

''(B) DESCRIPTION OF ENTITIES.—The entities described in this subparagraph are—

''(i) a community college;

''(ii) a 4-year public institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))) that offers 2-year degrees, and that will use funds provided under this section for activities at the certificate and associate degree levels;

''(iii) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b))); or

''(iv) a private or nonprofit, 2-year institution of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)) in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, or the Republic of Palau.

''(2) ADDITIONAL PARTNERS.—

''(A) AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL PARTNERS.—In addition to partnering with employers or an employer or industry partnership representing multiple employers as described in paragraph (1)(A), an entity described in paragraph (1) may include in the partnership described in paragraph (1) 1 or more of the organizations described in subparagraph (B). An eligible entity that includes 1 or more such organizations shall collaborate with the State or local board in the area served by the eligible entity.

''(B) ORGANIZATIONS.—The organizations described in this subparagraph are as follows:

''(i) An adult education provider or institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)).

''(ii) A community-based organization.

''(iii) A joint labor-management partnership.

''(iv) A State or local board.

''(v) Any other organization that the Secretaries consider appropriate.

''(c) EDUCATIONAL OR CAREER TRAINING PROGRAM.—For purposes of this section, the Governor of the State in which at least 1 of the entities described in subsection (b)(1)(B) of an eligible entity is located shall establish criteria for an educational or career training program leading to a recognized postsecondary credential for which an eligible entity submits a grant proposal under subsection (d).

''(d) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application containing a grant proposal to the Secretaries at such time and containing such information as the Secretaries determine is required, including a detailed description of—

''(1) the specific educational or career training program for which the grant proposal is submitted and how the program meets the criteria established under subsection (e), including the manner in which the grant will be used to develop, offer, improve, or provide the educational or career training program;

''(2) the extent to which the program will meet the educational or career training needs of workers in the area served by the eligible entity;

''(3) the extent to which the program will meet the needs of employers in the area for skilled workers in in-demand industry sectors and occupations;

''(4) the extent to which the program described fits within any overall strategic plan developed by the eligible entity;

''(5) any previous experience of the eligible entity in providing educational or career training programs, the absence of which shall not automatically disqualify an eligible institution from receiving a grant under this section; and

''(6) in the case of a project that involves an educational or career training program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential described in subsection (f), how the program leading to the credential meets the criteria described in subsection (c).

''(e) CRITERIA FOR AWARD.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Grants under this section shall be awarded based on criteria established by the Secretaries, that include the following:

''(A) A determination of the merits of the grant proposal submitted by the eligible entity involved to develop, offer, improve, or provide an educational or career training program to be made available to workers.

''(B) An assessment of the likely employment opportunities available in the area to individuals who complete an educational or career training program that the eligible entity proposes to develop, offer, improve, or provide.

''(C) An assessment of prior demand for training programs by individuals eligible for training and served by the eligible entity, as well as availability and capacity of existing (as of the date of the assessment) training programs to meet future demand for training programs.

''(2) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretaries shall give priority to eligible entities that—

''(A) include a partnership, with employers or an employer or industry partnership, that—

''(i) pays a portion of the costs of educational or career training programs; or

''(ii) agrees to hire individuals who have attained a recognized postsecondary credential resulting from the educational or career training program of the eligible entity;

''(B) enter into a partnership with a labor organization or labor-management training program to provide, through the program, technical expertise for occupationally specific education necessary for a recognized postsecondary credential leading to a skilled occupation in an in-demand industry sector;

''(C) are focused on serving individuals with barriers to employment, low-income, non-traditional students, students who are dislocated workers, students who are veterans, or students who are long-term unemployed;

''(D) include community colleges serving areas with high unemployment rates, including rural areas;

''(E) are eligible entities that include an institution of higher education eligible for assistance under title III or V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.; 20 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); and

''(F) include a partnership, with employers or an employer or industry partnership, that increases domestic production of goods, such as advanced manufacturing or production of clean energy technology.

''(f) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds awarded under this section shall be used for one or more of the following:

''(1) The development, offering, improvement, or provision of educational or career training programs, that provide relevant job

training for skilled occupations that will meet the needs of employers in in-demand industry sectors, and which may include registered apprenticeship programs, on-the-job training programs, and programs that support employers in upgrading the skills of their workforce.

''(2) The development and implementation of policies and programs to expand opportunities for students to earn a recognized postsecondary credential, including a degree, in in-demand industry sectors and occupations, including by—

''(A) facilitating the transfer of academic credits between institutions of higher education, including the transfer of academic credits for courses in the same field of study;

''(B) expanding articulation agreements and policies that guarantee transfers between such institutions, including through common course numbering and use of a general core curriculum; and

''(C) developing or enhancing student support services programs.

''(3) The creation of workforce programs that provide a sequence of education and occupational training that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential, including a degree, including programs that—

''(A) blend basic skills and occupational training;

''(B) facilitate means of transitioning participants from non-credit occupational, basic skills, or developmental coursework to for-credit coursework within and across institutions;

''(C) build or enhance linkages, including the development of dual enrollment programs and early college high schools, between secondary education or adult education programs (including programs established under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.) and title II of this Act);

''(D) are innovative programs designed to increase the provision of training for students, including students who are members of the National Guard or Reserves, to enter skilled occupations in in-demand industry sectors; and

''(E) support paid internships that will allow students to simultaneously earn credit for work-based learning and gain relevant employment experience in an in-demand industry sector or occupation, which shall include opportunities that transition individuals into employment.

''(4) The support of regional or national in-demand industry sectors to develop skills consortia that will identify pressing workforce needs and develop solutions such as—

''(A) standardizing industry certifications;

''(B) developing new training technologies; and

''(C) collaborating with industry employers to define and describe how specific skills lead to particular jobs and career opportunities.

''SEC. 199A. PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE AND PAY-FOR-SUCCESS JOB TRAINING PROJECTS.

''(a) AWARD GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From funds appropriated under section 199D(a)(2), the Secretaries, in accordance with the interagency agreement described in section 199E, shall award grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities described in subsection (b) who achieve specific performance outcomes and criteria agreed to by the Secretaries under subsection (c) to carry out job training projects. Projects funded by grants under this section shall be referred to as either Pay-for-Performance or Pay-for-Success projects, as set forth in subsection (b).

''(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall be a State or local organization (which may be a local workforce organization) in partnership with an entity such as a community college or other training provider, who—

''(1) in the case of an entity seeking to carry out a Pay-for-Performance project, agrees to be reimbursed under the grant primarily on the basis of achievement of specified performance outcomes and criteria agreed to by the Secretaries under subsection (c); or

''(2) in the case of an entity seeking to carry out a Pay-for-Success project—

''(A) enters into a partnership with an investor, such as a philanthropic organization that provides funding for a specific project to address a clear and measurable job training need in the area to be served under the grant; and

''(B) agrees to be reimbursed under the grant only if the project achieves specified performance outcomes and criteria agreed to by the Secretaries under subsection (c).

''(c) PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES AND CRITERIA.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this subtitle, the Secretaries shall establish and publish specific performance measures, which include performance outcomes and criteria, for the initial qualification and reimbursement of eligible entities to receive a grant under this section. At a minimum, to receive such a grant, an eligible entity shall—

''(1) identify a particular program area and client population that is not achieving optimal outcomes;

''(2) provide evidence that the proposed strategy for the job training project would achieve better outcomes;

''(3) clearly articulate and quantify the improved outcomes of such new approach;

''(4) for a Pay-for-Success project, specify a monetary value that would need to be paid to obtain such outcomes and explain the basis for such value;

''(5) identify data that would be required to evaluate whether outcomes are being achieved for a target population and a comparison group;

''(6) identify estimated savings that would result from the improved outcomes, including to other programs or units of government;

''(7) demonstrate the capacity to collect required data, track outcomes, and validate those outcomes; and

''(8) specify how the entity will meet any other criteria the Secretaries may require.

''(d) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY FOR PAY-FOR-SUCCESS PROJECTS.—Funds appropriated to carry out Pay-for-Success projects pursuant to section 199D(a)(2) shall, upon obligation, remain available for disbursement until expended, notwithstanding section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and, if later deobligated, in whole or in part, be available until expended under additional Pay-for-Success grants under this section.

''SEC. 199B. BRING JOBS BACK TO AMERICA GRANTS.

''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From funds appropriated under section 199D(a)(3), the Secretaries, in accordance with the interagency agreement described in section 199E, shall award grants to State or local governments for job training and recruiting activities that can quickly provide businesses with skilled workers in order to encourage businesses to relocate to or remain in areas served by such governments. The Secretaries shall coordinate activities with the Secretary of Commerce in carrying out this section.

''(b) PURPOSE AND USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds awarded under this section may be used by a State or local government to issue subgrants, using procedures established by the Secretaries, to eligible entities, including those described in section 199(b), to assist such eligible entities in providing job training necessary to provide skilled workers for businesses that have relocated or are considering relocating operations outside the United States, and may instead relocate to or remain in the areas served by such governments, and in conducting recruiting activities.

''(c) APPLICATION.—A State or local government seeking a grant under the program established under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the Secretaries in such manner and containing such information as the Secretaries may require. At a minimum, each application shall include—

''(1) a description of the eligible entity the State or local government proposes to assist in providing job training or recruiting activities;

''(2) a description of the proposed or existing business facility involved, including the number of jobs relating to such facility and the average wage or salary of those jobs; and

''(3) a description of any other resources that the State has committed to assisting such business in locating such facility, including tax incentives provided, bonding authority exercised, and land granted.

''(d) CRITERIA.—The Secretaries shall award grants under this section to the State and local governments that—

''(1) the Secretaries determine are most likely to succeed, with such a grant, in assisting an eligible entity in providing the job training and recruiting necessary to cause a business to relocate to or remain in an area served by such government;

''(2) will fund job training and recruiting programs that will result in the greatest number and quality of jobs;

''(3) have committed State or other resources, to the extent of their ability as determined by the Secretaries, to assist a business to relocate to or remain in an area served by such government; and

''(4) have met such other criteria as the Secretaries consider appropriate, including criteria relating to marketing plans, and benefits for ongoing area or State strategies for economic development and job growth.

''SEC. 199C. GRANTS FOR ENTREPRENEUR AND SMALL BUSINESS STARTUP TRAINING.

''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From funds appropriated under section 199D(a)(4), the Secretaries, in accordance with the interagency agreement described in section 199E, shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities described in subsection (b) to provide training in starting a small business and entrepreneurship. The Secretaries shall coordinate activities with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration in carrying out this section, including coordinating the development of criteria and selection of proposals.

''(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible entity' means an entity described in section 199(b)(1)(B) (or a consortium of any of such entities) in partnership with at least 1 local or regional economic development entity described in paragraph (2).

''(2) ADDITIONAL PARTNERS.—Local or regional economic development entities described in this paragraph are the following:

''(A) Small business development centers.

''(B) Women's business centers.

''(C) Regional innovation clusters.

''(D) Local accelerators or incubators.

''(E) State or local economic development agencies.

''(c) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application containing a grant proposal in such manner and containing such information as the Secretaries and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration

shall require. Such information shall include a description of the manner in which small business and entrepreneurship training (including education) will be provided, the role of partners in the arrangement involved, and the manner in which the proposal will integrate local economic development resources and partner with local economic development entities.

''(d) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds awarded under this section shall be used to provide training in starting a small business and entrepreneurship, including through online courses, intensive seminars, and comprehensive courses.

''SEC. 199D. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program established by section 199;

''(2) such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program established by section 199A;

''(3) such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program established by section 199B; and

''(4) such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program established by section 199C.

''(b) RECIPIENT.—For each amount appropriated under paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a), 50 percent shall be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor and 50 percent shall be appropriated to the Secretary of Education.

''(c) ADMINISTRATIVE COST.—Not more than 5 percent of the amounts made available under paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a) may be used by the Secretaries to administer the program described in that paragraph, including providing technical assistance and carrying out evaluations for the program described in that paragraph.

''(d) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—Except as provided in section 199A(d), the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for a fiscal year shall be available for Federal obligation for that fiscal year and the succeeding 2 fiscal years.

''SEC. 199E. INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall jointly develop policies for the administration of this subtitle in accordance with such terms as the Secretaries shall set forth in an interagency agreement. Such interagency agreement, at a minimum, shall include a description of the respective roles and responsibilities of the Secretaries in carrying out this subtitle (both jointly and separately), including—

''(1) how the funds available under this subtitle will be obligated and disbursed and compliance with applicable laws (including regulations) will be ensured, as well as how the grantees will be selected and monitored;

''(2) how evaluations and research will be conducted on the effectiveness of grants awarded under this subtitle in addressing the education and employment needs of workers, and employers;

''(3) how technical assistance will be provided to applicants and grant recipients;

''(4) how information will be disseminated, including through electronic means, on best practices and effective strategies and service delivery models for activities carried out under this subtitle; and

''(5) how policies and processes critical to the successful achievement of the education, training, and employment goals of this subtitle will be established.

''(b) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall have the authority to transfer funds between the Department of Labor and the Department of Education to carry out this subtitle in accordance with the agreement described in subsection (a). The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall have the ability to transfer funds to the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to carry out sections 199B and 199C, respectively.

''(c) REPORTS.—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall jointly develop and submit a biennial report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, describing the activities carried out under this subtitle and the outcomes of such activities.

''SEC. 199F. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this subtitle:

''(1) COMMUNITY COLLEGE.—The term 'community college' has the meaning given the term 'junior or community college' in section 312(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1058(f)).

''(2) NONTRADITIONAL STUDENT.—The term 'nontraditional student' has the meaning given the term in section 803(j) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1161c(j)).

''(3) RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL.—The term 'recognized postsecondary credential' means a credential consisting of—

''(A) an industry-recognized certificate;

''(B) a certificate of completion of an apprenticeship registered under the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly known as the 'National Apprenticeship Act'; 50 Stat. 664, chapter 663; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.); or

''(C) an associate or baccalaureate degree.

''(4) SECRETARIES.—The term 'Secretaries' means the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act is amended by inserting after the items relating to subtitle E of title I the following:

''Subtitle F—Community College to Career Fund

''Sec. 199. Community college and industry partnerships program.
''Sec. 199A. Pay-for-Performance and Pay-for-Success job training projects.
''Sec. 199B. Bring jobs back to America grants.
''Sec. 199C. Grants for entrepreneur and small business startup training.
''Sec. 199D. Authorization of appropriations.
''Sec. 199E. Interagency agreement.
''Sec. 199F. Definitions.''.

SA 1387. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 111(6)(B), add the following:

(viii) The Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

SA 1388. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT DO NOT COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) with a country that—

(A) does not have in effect laws prohibiting, in a manner similar to the prohibition under section 1597 of title 18, United States Code, an employer from knowingly destroying, concealing, removing, confiscating, or possessing an actual or purported passport or other travel documentation of an employee; or

(B) the Secretary of State recommends in the most recent annual report on trafficking in persons submitted under section 110(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(1)) should improve the enforcement of such laws.

SA 1389. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I, add the following:

SEC. 1_____. DRUG IMPORTATION.

(a) PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) until the Secretary of Health and Human Services promulgates regulations under section 804(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 384(b)).

(b) AMENDMENTS TO FFDCA.—Section 804(a)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 384(a)(1)) is amended, by striking ''pharmacist or wholesaler'' and inserting ''pharmacist, wholesaler, or the head of a relevant agency of the Federal Government''.

(c) PRESCRIPTION DRUG IMPORTATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding the importation of prescription drugs is to permit the importation of such drugs from any country that is a party to a trade agreement with the United States, pursuant to section 804 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 384).

SA 1390. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 24, line 10, strike ''sustained or recurring''.

SA 1391. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 102(a), add at the end the following:

(13) to advance the goal of improving the social and economic status of women and achieving gender equality by promoting the adoption of international standards to reduce gender-based violence in the workplace.

SA 1392. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON RATIFICATION OF THE ILO CONVENTION NO. 111 ON DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT AND OCCUPATION.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) trading partners of the United States should pursue policies designed to promote equality of opportunity and treatment with a view toward eliminating discrimination in employment and occupation;

(2) it should be the policy of the United States to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to eliminating any distinction, exclusion, or preference that has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment in employment or occupation, including on the basis of race, sex, or religion; and

(3) the Senate should move promptly to approve a resolution of ratification of ILO Convention No. 111 on Discrimination in Employment and Occupation, one of the 8 core conventions of the ILO, which has been ratified by 172 of the 185 member countries of the ILO.

SA 1393. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON RECRUITING MEMBERS SEPARATING FROM THE ARMED FORCES TO SERVE AS U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OFFICERS.

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

(1) U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers carry out critical law enforcement duties at ports of entry associated with screening—

(A) foreign visitors to the United States;

(B) citizens of the United States who are returning to the United States; and

(C) cargo imported into the United States.

(2) It is in the national interest of the United States for ports of entry to be adequately staffed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers.

(3) The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76) provided funding to hire and complete the training of 2,000 new U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers by the end of fiscal year 2015.

(4) The hiring and training of officers described in paragraph (3) has been moving forward more slowly than anticipated.

(5) It is estimated that approximately 250,000 to 300,000 individuals undergo discharge or release from the Armed Forces each year, some of whom will have skills transferable to the law enforcement duties required at ports of entry and be qualified to serve as U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the Sense of Congress that additional recruiting efforts should be undertaken to ensure that individuals undergoing discharge or release from the Armed Forces are aware of opportunities for employment as U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers.

SA 1394. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike sections 208 through 212 and insert the following:

SEC. 208. DISQUALIFICATION ON RECEIPT OF DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS IN A MONTH FOR WHICH UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION IS RECEIVED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 223(d)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 423(d)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C)(i) If for any week in whole or in part within a month an individual is paid or determined to be eligible for unemployment compensation, such individual shall be deemed to have engaged in substantial gainful activity for such month.

''(ii) For purposes of clause (i), the term 'unemployment compensation' means—

''(I) 'regular compensation', 'extended compensation', and 'additional compensation' (as such terms are defined by section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act (26 U.S.C. 3304 note)); and

''(II) trade adjustment assistance under title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.).''.

(b) TRIAL WORK PERIOD.—Section 222(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 422(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6)(A) For purposes of this subsection, an individual shall be deemed to have rendered services in a month if the individual is entitled to unemployment compensation for such month.

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'unemployment compensation' means—

''(i) 'regular compensation', 'extended compensation', and 'additional compensation' (as such terms are defined by section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act (26 U.S.C. 3304 note)); and

''(ii) trade adjustment assistance under title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.).''.

(c) DATA MATCHING.—The Commissioner of Social Security shall implement the amendments made by this section using appropriate electronic data.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to individuals who initially apply for disability insurance benefits on or after January 1, 2016.

SA 1395. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. PROTECTION OF INDIAN EXPORTS AND TREATY RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any trade agreement for which negotiations are conducted under this title shall ensure that—

(1) goods of or for the benefit of Indian tribes may be exported through ports in the United States;

(2) Indian treaty rights are protected; and

(3) goods of or for the benefit of Indian tribes have the opportunity to compete in the world market.

(b) CONFLICTING INTERESTS.—If different Indian tribes have conflicting interests under subsection (a), the head of an appropriate Federal agency, as designated by the President, shall act to resolve that conflict.

(c) INDIAN TRIBE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given that term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

SA 1396. Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE III—MANUFACTURING SKILLS ACT OF 2015

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Manufacturing Skills Act of 2015''.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ''eligible entity'' means a State or a metropolitan area.

(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' means each of the following:

(A) An institution of higher education, as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(B) A postsecondary vocational institution, as defined in section 102(c) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1002(c)).

(3) MANUFACTURING SECTOR.—The term ''manufacturing sector'' means a manufacturing sector classified in code 31, 32, or 33 of the most recent version of the North American Industry Classification System developed under the direction of the Office of Management and Budget.

(4) METROPOLITAN AREA.—The term ''metropolitan area'' means a standard metropolitan statistical area, as designated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(5) PARTNERSHIP.—The term ''Partnership'' means the Manufacturing Skills Partnership established in section 311(a).

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Subtitle A—Manufacturing Skills Program

SEC. 311. MANUFACTURING SKILLS PROGRAM.

(a) MANUFACTURING SKILLS PARTNERSHIP.—The Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Education, Secretary of the Department of Defense, and Director of the National Science Foundation shall jointly establish a Manufacturing Skills Partnership consisting of the Secretaries and the Director, or their representatives. The Partnership shall—

(1) administer and carry out the program established under this subtitle;

(2) establish and publish guidelines for the review of applications, and the criteria for selection, for grants under this subtitle; and

(3) submit an annual report to Congress on—

(A) the eligible entities that receive grants under this subtitle; and

(B) the progress such eligible entities have made in achieving the milestones identified in accordance with section 312(b)(2)(H).

(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts appropriated to carry out this subtitle, the Partnership shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities to enable the eligible entities to carry out their proposals submitted in the application under section 312(b)(2), in order to promote reforms in workforce education and skill training for manufacturing in the eligible entities.

(2) GRANT DURATION.—A grant awarded under paragraph (1) shall be for a 3-year period, with grant funds under such grant distributed annually in accordance with subsection (c)(2).

(3) SECOND GRANTS.—If amounts are made available to award grants under this subtitle for subsequent grant periods, the Partnership may award a grant to an eligible entity that previously received a grant under this subtitle after such first grant period expires. The Partnership shall evaluate the performance of the eligible entity under the first grant in determining whether to award the eligible entity a second grant under this subtitle.

SEC. 312. APPLICATION AND AWARD PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity that desires to receive a grant under this subtitle shall—

(1) establish a task force, consisting of leaders from the public, nonprofit, and manufacturing sectors, representatives of labor organizations, representatives of elementary schools and secondary schools, and representatives of institutions of higher education, to apply for and carry out a grant under this subtitle; and

(2) submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Partnership may require.

(b) APPLICATION CONTENTS.—The application described in subsection (a)(2) shall include—

(1) a description of the task force that the eligible entity has assembled to design the proposal described in paragraph (2);

(2) a proposal that—

(A) identifies, as of the date of the application—

(i) the current strengths of the State or metropolitan area represented by the eligible entity in manufacturing; and

(ii) areas for new growth opportunities in manufacturing;

(B) identifies, as of the date of the application, manufacturing workforce and skills challenges preventing the eligible entity from expanding in the areas identified under subparagraph (A)(ii), such as—

(i) a lack of availability of—

(I) strong career and technical education;

(II) educational programs in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics; or

(III) a skills training system; or

(ii) an absence of customized training for existing industrial businesses and sectors;

(C) identifies challenges faced within the manufacturing sector by underrepresented and disadvantaged workers, including veterans, in the State or metropolitan area represented by the eligible entity;

(D) provides strategies, designed by the eligible entity, to address challenges identified in subparagraphs (B) and (C) through tangible projects and investments, with the deep and sustainable involvement of manufacturing businesses;

(E) identifies and leverages innovative and effective career and technical education or skills training programs in the field of manufacturing that are available in the eligible entity;

(F) leverages other Federal funds in support of such strategies;

(G) reforms State or local policies and governance, as applicable, in support of such strategies; and

(H) holds the eligible entity accountable, on a regular basis, through a set of transparent performance measures, including a timeline for the grant period describing when specific milestones and reforms will be achieved; and

(3) a description of the source of the matching funds required under subsection (d) that the eligible entity will use if selected for a grant under this subtitle.

(c) AWARD BASIS.—

(1) SELECTION BASIS AND MAXIMUM NUMBER OF GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Partnership shall award grants under this subtitle, by not earlier than January 1, 2015, and not later than March 31, 2015, to the eligible entities that submit the strongest and most comprehensive proposals under subsection (b)(2).

(B) MAXIMUM NUMBER OF GRANTS.—For any grant period, the Partnership shall award not more than 5 grants under this subtitle to eligible entities representing States and not more than 5 grants to eligible entities representing metropolitan areas.

(2) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Partnership shall award grants under this subtitle in an amount that averages, for all grants issued for a 3-year grant period, $10,000,000 for each year, subject to subparagraph (C) and paragraph (3).

(B) AMOUNT.—In determining the amount of each grant for an eligible entity, the Partnership shall take into consideration the size of the industrial base of the eligible entity.

(C) INSUFFICIENT APPROPRIATIONS.—For any grant period for which the amounts available to carry out this subtitle are insufficient to award grants in the amount described in subparagraph (A), the Partnership shall award grants in amounts determined appropriate by the Partnership.

(3) FUNDING CONTINGENT ON PERFORMANCE.—In order for an eligible entity to receive funds under a grant under this subtitle for the second or third year of the grant period, the eligible entity shall demonstrate to the Partnership that the eligible entity has achieved the specific reforms and milestones required under the timeline included in the eligible entity's proposal under subsection (b)(2)(H).

(4) CONSULTATION WITH POLICY EXPERTS.—The Partnership shall assemble a panel of manufacturing policy experts and manufacturing leaders from the private sector to serve in an advisory capacity in helping to oversee the competition and review the competition's effectiveness.

(d) MATCHING FUNDS.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this subtitle shall provide matching funds toward the grant in an amount of not less than 50 percent of the costs of the activities carried out under the grant. Matching funds under this subsection shall be from non-Federal sources and shall be in cash or in-kind.

SEC. 313. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2016.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.

Subtitle B—Audit of Federal Education and Skills Training

SEC. 321. AUDIT OF FEDERAL EDUCATION AND SKILLS TRAINING.

(a) AUDIT.—By not later than March 31, 2016, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, acting through the Advanced Manufacturing National Program Office, shall conduct an audit of all Federal education and skills training programs related to manufacturing to ensure that States and metropolitan areas are able to align Federal resources to the greatest extent possible with the labor demands of their primary manufacturing industries. In carrying out the audit, the Director shall work with States and metropolitan areas to determine how Federal funds can be more tailored to meet their different needs.

(b) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—By not later than March 31, 2016, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall prepare and submit a report to Congress that includes—

(1) a summary of the findings from the audit conducted under subsection (a); and

(2) recommendations for such legislative and administrative actions to reform the existing funding for Federal education and skills training programs related to manufacturing as the Director determines appropriate.

Subtitle C—Offset

SEC. 331. RESCISSION OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FUNDS.

(a) RESCISSION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an amount equal to the amount of funds made available to carry out subtitle A for a fiscal year shall be rescinded, in accordance with subsection (b), from the unobligated discretionary funds available to the Secretary from prior fiscal years.

(b) RETURN OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, by not later than 15 days after funds are appropriated or made available to carry out subtitle A, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) identify from which appropriations accounts available to the Secretary of Labor the rescission described in subsection (a) shall apply; and

(2) determine the amount of the rescission that shall apply to each account.

SA 1397. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend

the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT UNDERMINE STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) that includes provisions that could subject policies of State or local governments in the United States to claims by foreign investors that would be decided outside the United States legal system.

SA 1398. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT UNDERMINE THE PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ABOUT FOOD.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) that includes provisions that could limit the right of the United States to provide information to the public on food for sale in United States markets, including through the use of nondiscriminatory labeling requirements.

SA 1399. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, strike lines 4 through 9, and insert the following:

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(B) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if the agreement fully protects the right of the United States to require, in a nondiscriminatory manner, disclosure of the country of origin of food sold in the United States.

SA 1400. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, strike lines 4 through 9, and insert the following:

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(B) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if the agreement fully protects the right of the United States to provide information to the public on food for sale in United States markets, including through the use of nondiscriminatory labeling requirements.

SA 1401. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT UNDERMINE PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, AND CONSUMERS.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) unless the agreement exempts policies for protecting the environment, public health, and consumers from any investor-state dispute settlement provisions included in the agreement.

SA 1402. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT UNDERMINE UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) that includes provisions that could subject policies of the United States Government or any State or local government in the United States to claims by foreign investors that would be decided outside the United States legal system.

SA 1403. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 23, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(ii) adopts and maintains measures ensuring a minimum wage that is appropriately comparable to the Federal minimum wage in the United States, taking into account the local cost of living and other factors,

---

SA 1404. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT UNDERMINE THE PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ABOUT FOOD.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) that includes provisions that could limit the right of the United States to require, in a nondiscriminatory manner, disclosure of the country of origin of food sold in the United States.

SA 1405. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(a)(2)(A)(ii)(II), add the following:

(ee) whether and how the agreement will increase production and employment in the United States and whether and how the agreement will increase the wages of workers in the United States.

SA 1406. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 119, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 204. CONSIDERATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS THAT LEAD TO RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIALS.

Section 236(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(12) In approving training for adversely affected workers and adversely affected incumbent workers under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give consideration to training programs that lead to recognized postsecondary credentials and are aligned with in-demand occupations.''.

SA 1407. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. REPORT ON IMPORTS OF STEEL.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter while this title is in effect, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to Congress a report on imports

into the United States of steel, including an analysis of, for the year preceding the submission of the report—

(1) any changes to the supply chain in the United States with respect to steel;

(2) any changes to employment in the United States with respect to steel; and

(3) the impact of imports into the United States of steel on the changes described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

SA 1408. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—FEDERAL RESERVE TRANSPARENCY

SECTION 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Federal Reserve Transparency Act of 2015''.

SEC. 302. AUDIT REFORM AND TRANSPARENCY FOR THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 714 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, an audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks under subsection (b) of such section 714 shall be completed within 12 months of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A report on the audit required under subsection (a) shall be submitted by the Comptroller General to the Congress before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which such audit is completed and made available to the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the committee and each subcommittee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and any other Member of Congress who requests it.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include a detailed description of the findings and conclusion of the Comptroller General with respect to the audit that is the subject of the report, together with such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Comptroller General may determine to be appropriate.

(c) REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking all after ''in writing.''.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (f).

SEC. 303. AUDIT OF LOAN FILE REVIEWS REQUIRED BY ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of the review of loan files of homeowners in foreclosure in 2009 or 2010, required as part of the enforcement actions taken by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System against supervised financial institutions.

(b) CONTENT OF AUDIT.—The audit carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the guidance given by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to independent consultants retained by the supervised financial institutions regarding the procedures to be followed in conducting the file reviews;

(2) the factors considered by independent consultants when evaluating loan files;

(3) the results obtained by the independent consultants pursuant to those reviews;

(4) the determinations made by the independent consultants regarding the nature and extent of financial injury sustained by each homeowner as well as the level and type of remediation offered to each homeowner; and

(5) the specific measures taken by the independent consultants to verify, confirm, or rebut the assertions and representations made by supervised financial institutions regarding the contents of loan files and the extent of financial injury to homeowners.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Congress containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the audit required under subsection (a).

SA 1409. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) FOR AGREEMENTS THAT SUBJECT UNITED STATES WORKERS TO UNFAIR COMPETITION ON THE BASIS OF WAGES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) unless the agreement—

(A) establishes a minimum wage that each party to the agreement is required to establish and maintain before the trade agreement is implemented; and

(B) stipulates that the minimum wage required for each party to the agreement increase over time, to continuously reduce the disparity between the lowest and highest minimum wages paid by parties to the agreement.

SA 1410. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

(B) EXCEPTION.—

(i) INVOKING EXCEPTION.—If the Secretary of State submits to the appropriate congressional committees a letter stating that a country subject to subparagraph (A) has taken concrete actions to implement the principal recommendations in the most recent annual report on trafficking in persons, this paragraph shall not apply with respect to agreements with that country.

(ii) CONTENT OF LETTER; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—A letter submitted under clause (i) with respect to a country shall—

(I) include a description of the concrete actions that the country has taken to implement the principal recommendations described in clause (i); and

(II) be made available to the public.

(iii) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(I) the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(II) the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SA 1411. Mr. HATCH proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; as follows:

In lieu of the text proposed to be stricken, insert the following:

(11) FOREIGN CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency practices is to seek to establish accountability through enforceable rules, transparency, reporting, monitoring, cooperative mechanisms, or other means to address exchange rate manipulation involving protracted large scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets and a persistently undervalued foreign exchange rate to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to a trade agreement, consistent with existing obligations of the United States as a member of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WICKER. 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 May 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''FAA Reauthorization: Air Traffic Control Modernization and Reform.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''No Place to Grow Up: How to Safely Reduce Reliance on Foster Care Group Homes.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on May 19, 2015, at 2:45 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. WICKER. 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 May 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: Examining EEOC's Enforcement and Litigation Programs.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, at 2 p.m., in SR–428A Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''An Examination of Proposed Environment Regulation's Impacts on America's Small Businesses.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND TERRORISM

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Body Cameras: Can Technology Increase Protection for Law Enforcement Officers and the Public?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES, WATER, AND WILDLIFE

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''S. 1140, The Federal Water Quality Protection Act.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL SCHIZENCEPHALY AWARENESS DAY

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 181, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows.

A resolution (S. Res. 181) designating May 19, 2015, as ''National Schizencephaly Awareness Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 181) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 14, 2015, AS THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LABORATORY DAY

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 182.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 182) expressing the sense of the Senate that Defense laboratories have been, and continue to be, on the cutting edge of scientific and technological advancement and supporting the designation of May 14, 2015, as the ''Department of Defense Laboratory Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 182) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 2015

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 20; 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; that following leader remarks, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1314.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, Senators should be aware that the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to both the underlying bill and the substitute amendment is at 1 p.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DAINES. 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 8:15 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 20, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL K. HANIFAN
BRIG. GEN. DANIEL M. KRUMREI

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL HUGH T. CORBETT
COLONEL ANDREW LAWLOR
COLONEL RODERICK R. LEON GUERRERO
COLONEL GERVASIO ORTIZ LOPEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. WILLIAM C. MAYVILLE, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOSEPH E. TOFALO

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL MICHAEL S. CEDERHOLM
COLONEL DENNIS A. CRALL
COLONEL BRADFORD J. GERING
COLONEL JAMES F. GLYNN
COLONEL GREGORY L. MASIELLO
COLONEL DAVID W. MAXWELL
COLONEL STEPHEN M. NEARY
COLONEL STEPHEN D. SKLENKA
COLONEL ROGER B. TURNER, JR.
COLONEL RICK A. URIBE

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE VETERANS OF THE MAY 19, 2015 EASTERN IOWA HONOR FLIGHT

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, today, over eighty Iowa veterans of World War II, the Korean War and the Vietnam War will travel to our nation's capital. Together, they will visit the monuments that were built in their honor by a grateful nation.

For many, today will be the first time they will see the National World War II Memorial, the Korean War Veterans Memorial and the Vietnam War Memorial. I can think of no greater honor than to be able to greet them and thank Iowa's—and our nation's—heroes for their service to our country.

That is why I am deeply honored to join them for their visit to the National World War II Memorial to personally thank these heroes for their service to our nation and to pay tribute to the incredible sacrifice they made for our country.

We owe these heroes a debt of gratitude and the Honor Flight demonstrates that we as a state and as a country will never forget the debt we owe those who have worn our nation's uniform. As a reminder of the service and sacrifice of the Greatest Generation, I am proud to have a piece of marble in my office from the quarry that was used to build the World War II Memorial. Our World War II, Korean War and Vietnam War veterans rose to defend not just our nation, but the freedoms, democracy, and values that make our country the greatest nation on earth. They did so as one people and one country. Their sacrifices and determination in the face of great threats to our way of life are both humbling and inspiring.

I am tremendously proud to welcome the Eastern Iowa Honor Flight and Iowa's veterans of World War II, the Korean War and the Vietnam War to our nation's capital today. On behalf of every Iowan I represent, I thank them for their service to our country.

HONORING THE TUSCUMBIA HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC TEAM

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Tuscumbia High School Academic Team on its Class 1 State Championship win at the Missouri Scholar Bowl Tournament.

These students and their coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing the Tuscumbia High School Academic Team for a job well done.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on account of a flight delay. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on roll call vote 240, roll call vote 241, and roll call vote 242.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF VIRGINIA AIR NATIONAL GUARD BRIGADIER GENERAL WAYNE A. WRIGHT

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank Brigadier General Wayne A. Wright for his 34 years of service to our nation and to congratulate him on his announced retirement.

Brigadier General Wayne A. Wright retires as the Chief of Staff/Air Component Commander, Virginia Air National Guard, responsible for the command and control of 1,230 Virginia Air National Guard members, representing five organizations. Provided to the Governor and Adjutant General of Virginia, Air Guard military forces protect and defend the Commonwealth, and when activated to federal military duty, provide those same forces to the President of the United States.

General Wright entered the United States Air Force and received his commission in 1981 after graduating from the University of South Carolina. He transitioned from active duty to the Georgia Air National Guard in 1992. General Wright has held various leadership and command positions at the squadron, group, wing and major command levels. His assignments involved operations and formal training of United States Air Force and allied Command and Control personnel. He also worked in the developmental and operational testing arena. General Wright is a Master Air Battle Manager with qualifications in six ground-based Command and Control systems including joint and allied systems.

General Wright has been awarded the Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal (with 2 Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters), Air Force Commendation Medal (with 2 Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters), Army Commendation Medal, Air Force Achievement Medal (with 1 Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster), Air Force Outstanding Unit Award (with 2 Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters), Air Force Organizational Excellence Award, Combat Readiness Medal, National Defense Service Medal (with 1 Bronze Service Star), Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal, Air Force Overseas Ribbon Short Tour, Air Force Overseas Ribbon Long Tour, Air Force Longevity Service Award Ribbon (with 1 Silver and 1 Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster), and the Air Force Training Ribbon.

Brigadier General Wright has excelled throughout his distinguished career and I am honored to pay tribute to this Airman. I thank Wayne's wife, Jeanette, and their daughter, Jessica and son in-law, Jeremy along with their children, Noah and Haley as well as their son Justin and his wife Caitlin for the many years they have supported Wayne while he served his country. I wish Wayne and Jeanette Godspeed, and continued happiness as they start a new chapter in their lives.

HONORING JOAN ERIKSEN

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Joan Eriksen, who is completing twenty-one years of service on the Mendocino Lake Community College District Board of Trustees, where she has been a leader and driving force in a multitude of valuable community projects and programs.

Ms. Eriksen has diligently guided the college district in overcoming fiscal challenges during economic downturns and has been a powerful and consistent advocate for high-quality educational opportunities for students in remote areas. She provided strong leadership to secure critical funding to develop and improve College facilities and stellar oversight in the construction of these projects. The permanent structures now housing classrooms and facilities for students in Willits and Lake County are in large part a result of her hard work.

As a skilled relationship builder with the extended community and a valuable role model for new board members over the years of her service, Ms. Eriksen's heartfelt commitment to Mendocino College and the Mendocino Lake Community College District—as well as its staff, students, and the community it serves—will leave a lasting impact for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting to honor and thank Joan Eriksen for her years of dedicated service to the students of Mendocino College and the Mendocino Lake Community College District. On behalf of the many individuals she has served, I am privileged to express deep appreciation to Ms. Eriksen for her exemplary leadership, and convey to her best wishes as she pursues new endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S BELOVED ARTHUR MICHAEL ''COACH MAC'' MCMILLION

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and legacy of Northwest Florida's beloved Arthur Michael ''Coach Mac'' McMillion. For more than 30 years, Coach Mac was a fixture in Northwest Florida athletics, helping to shape the lives of countless young men and women, and the Northwest Florida community mourns his passing.

Born and raised in Eau Claire, Wisconsin, Coach Mac from a young age exemplified the hard work and dedication necessary to excel on the playing field. Following his successful playing career—during which he garnered All State honors in high school football and captained his college team, the University of Eau Claire—Coach Mac and his wife Barb moved to Texas, where he began his coaching career.

In 1985, Coach Mac and his family moved to Northwest Florida. For eight years, Coach Mac served as Head Coach in football, basketball and weight lifting at Earnest Ward High School, before moving to Milton High School. Over the next 20 years, Coach Mac coached football and basketball at Milton, as well as starting the girls first weight lifting program. For the last ten years of his tenure at Milton High, Coach Mac led the Milton High football program as head coach. Coach Mac then began the next chapter in his life, moving to Hobbs Middle School where he worked as the Dean of Students until his passing.

As anyone who has played sports can tell you, the best coaches are leaders both on and off the field, and Coach Mac epitomized these values. His goal as a coach and educator was to shape his students and players to be successful on the field and in their lives, and he has had an immeasurable influence on thousands of students over the years. Above all of the many accolades he earned as a player and coach, Coach Mac's greatest joy in life was family, and to his family and friends he will always be remembered as a loving and devoted husband, father and grandfather.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am honored to recognize the life and legacy of Arthur Michael ''Coach Mac'' McMillion. My wife Vicki and I extend our heartfelt prayers and condolences to his wife Barb; four children, Amie, Missy, Mikey, and Tommy; four grandsons, Nate, Rhett, Jon and Luke; father and step-mother, Art and Ruth; sister, Beth; and the entire McMillion family.

RECOGNIZING JIM GARRETT; FAMILY CHAMPION OF THE ALZHEIMER'S ASSOCIATION

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jim Garrett, a dedicated leader in the fight against Alzheimer's. On Wednesday, June 10, 2015, Mr. Garrett will be honored by the Alzheimer's Association as Family Champion for his faithful leadership on the Association's Board of Directors, and for his continued commitment to supporting the advancement of research for the treatment of this terrible disease.

The Alzheimer's Association is a tremendous organization that provides professionally staffed services and critical resources for Alzheimer's patients and their families. This organization is largely funded by the altruism of people such as Jim Garrett, who in addition to being a natural caregiver is also a successful businessman, acting as Chairman of a well-known New England company, Rapid Refills. Jim Garrett's public spirit can best be seen in his spearheading of the Purple Pump Up Program, which donates a certain percentage of Rapid Refills' earnings to the Alzheimer's Association, promoting the continuation of research and treatment, and making a difference in the lives of all those affected by this disease.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Jim Garrett on this day for his tremendous contributions to the Alzheimer's Association, and his efforts in the fight against Alzheimer's disease.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF MANDIE DELL AARON NIXON

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to first of all say how much I appreciate this opportunity to address my colleagues and the Nation and to talk for just a few moments about a loving and caring woman, Mrs. Mandie Dell Aaron Nixon.

Mandie Dell Aaron Nixon passed away a few days ago. She was a special woman, and a dedicated worker for the Lord. She loved lifting up the name of Jesus, praising him with all her heart. She let her light shine.

Mandie Dell Aaron Nixon was born in Camden, Alabama, to the late Reverend Henry Aaron and missionary, Mariah Aaron. Being born in a Christian home, she accepted the Lord into her heart at a very early age. Mandie was a loving wife, sister, and mother to her five children. She is survived by two children, three sisters, and a host of five generations of grandchildren. Her entire beloved family mourns this hour.

But let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that not only her family mourns, for this caring woman touched many lives. During her journey here on Earth, Mandie loved with her whole heart. She was active in her church community, even President of the Mother's Board for many years. She always had something nice to say about everyone. When she looked at you, she always saw the best in you, and would make sure to impart words of encouragement and wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dedicated woman and one who was humble and humbled herself before God, and understood not only who she was but whose she was.

And so I just want to rise this afternoon to say these few words about this generous, loving woman, Mandie Dell Aaron Nixon. Let me just say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, God bless Mandie Dell Aaron Nixon. She fought the good fight, she finished her race, and she kept the faith. And most of all, she will be truly missed by many.

HONORING THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE 2015 CONGRESSIONAL ART COMPETITION

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, once again, I come to the floor to recognize the great success of strong local schools working with dedicated parents and teachers. I rise today to congratulate and honor a number of outstanding high school artists from the 11th Congressional District of New Jersey. Each of these talented young men and women participated in the 2015 Congressional Art Competition. Their works of art are exceptional.

Fifty-seven participated. That is a wonderful response, and I would very much like to build on that participation for future competitions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the winners of our art competition. First place was awarded to Camila Rosario from Wayne Valley High School for her Colored Pencil artwork entitled, ''Joy and Innocence of Childhood.'' Second place was awarded to Melissa Danitz from Chatham High School for her Oil on Canvas artwork titled ''Colors on a City Street.'' Third place was awarded to Jamilynn Rose from Hanover Park High School for her Prisma Pencil on black paper artwork titled ''Sonic Boom.''

Honorable Mentions were awarded to: Natalie Almonte from Boonton High School for her Arcylic artwork titled ''Girl with the Silver Earrings'' and Jason Levine from Livingston High School for his Digital artwork titled ''Gravity.''

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize each artist for their participation by indicating their high school, their name, and the title of their contest entries.

BOONTON HIGH SCHOOL

Natalie Almonte, Boonton, ''Girl with the Silver Earrings

Karyn Hansen, ''Art Dreams''

Perri Phelps, ''Girl With Red Hair''

Carla Garcia, ''As You See Me''

CHATHAM HIGH SCHOOL

Phoebe Nichols, ''Scratchboard Portrait''

Melissa Danitz, ''Colors on a City Street''

Sofie Michalak, ''Toothbrush''

HANOVER PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Jamilynn Rose, ''Sonic Boom''

Laura Romanski, ''Spring''

Alexandra Eveland, ''Candle Sticks''

Matt Einloth, ''The Big Apple''

JEFFERSON TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL

Courtney Weber, ''Bryant Park''

Christopher Best, ''Autumn Colonial''

Olivia Lisa, ''Horseshoe Lake''

LIVINGSTON HIGH SCHOOL

Kristin Leechow, ''Artistic Freedom''

Jason Levine, ''Gravity''

Sorasicha Nithikasem, ''July in America''

Lucas Ochoa ''Wired''

MONTCLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

Hannah Brown, ''Seven Turtles''

Katelyn Hall, ''People Watching''

Jane Boehlert ''Dorm Room''

MONTVILLE TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL

Rachel Higgins ''Into the Sea''
Lianne Pflug, ''Music to My Ears''
Leigh Deitz, ''Fugitive''

MORRIS CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL

Sabrina Huresky, ''Random Items Nameplate''
Zoe Yin, ''View of China''
Leo Lin, ''Satellite View of Capital''

MORRIS KNOLLS HIGH SCHOOL

Raelle D'Aitilio, ''Buying Time''
Olivia Kuchta, ''Mirror, Mirror''
Chiyere Emili, ''African Culture''

MOUNTAIN LAKES HIGH SCHOOL

Joy Xie, ''Under the Sunlight''
Yian Wang, ''Fish Snack''

NUTLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Deana DiLauri, ''Outside the Box''
Cassandra Rebutoc, ''Pop the Pink!''
Leticia Donato, ''Summer Sun''
Patricia Bobila, ''Among the Autumn Leaves''

PASSAIC VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Victoria Phillips, ''Rule of Rose''
Lindsey Heale, ''In the Studio''

PARSIPPANY CHRISTIAN SCHOOL

Daniel McMillen, ''Coil''
Tamia McNab, ''Artist Den''
Nicholas McMillen, ''Soulness''
Carolina Sachno, ''Go Fish''

RANDOLPH HIGH SCHOOL

Olivia Lawler, ''My Childhood''

SPARTA HIGH SCHOOL

Domari Thomas, ''Survival''
Mitch Coyle; ''3 Seasons''
Kacey Campbell, ''Self Portrait''
Madeline Abatemarco, ''Fantasy Scape''

WAYNE VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Camila Rosario, ''Joy and Innocence of Childhood''
Lilit Balagyozyan, ''Cautionary Tale''
Lauren Valledor, ''An Afternoon in Washington Square Park''
Olivia Lozy, ''Still Life of Pickle Bottles''

WEST ESSEX REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL

Ariana Daly, ''The Moment Winter Falls''

WEST MORRIS MENDHAM HIGH SCHOOL

Emma Jang, ''Empty''
Ryan Corbett ''I Will Work to End Racism''

WEST ORANGE HIGH SCHOOL

Arlenis Roberts, ''Elephant Hand Piece''

WHIPPANY PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Eric Kahn, ''Hiding Behind Feathers''
Shayna Miller, ''Papilionoidea''

Each year the winner of the competition has their art work displayed with other winners from across the country in a special corridor here at the U.S. Capitol. Thousands of our fellow Americans walk through the exhibition and are reminded of the vast talents of our young men and women. Indeed, all of these young artists are winners, and we should be proud of their achievements so early in life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating these talented young people from New Jersey's 11th Congressional District.

HONORING WORLD WAR II FIGHTER ACE DONALD McPHERSON

HON. ADRIAN SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Donald McPherson of Adams, Nebraska, on receiving the Congressional Gold Medal for his valiant service to our nation as an American Fighter Ace in World War II.

Mr. McPherson is one of two surviving fighter aces in Nebraska. These brave pilots earned the title of fighter aces after shooting down five enemies in battle. Mr. McPherson earned three Distinguished Flying Crosses and four Air Medals while assigned to fighter squadron VF–83 aboard the U.S.S. *Essex* in the Pacific. In his F6F Hellcat, Mr. McPherson directly faced our enemies in the skies to defend our country and preserve our liberty.

As Memorial Day approaches, we remember our fallen and honor those still with us who served beside them. The legacies of our selfless military heroes, including Mr. McPherson, must be celebrated and protected for future generations to understand the true cost of freedom.

On behalf of the people of Nebraska's Third District, I thank Mr. McPherson for his service to our country and congratulate him on his Congressional Gold Medal recognition this week.

A PATHWAY TO FREEDOM: RESCUE AND REFUGE FOR VICTIMS OF SEX TRAFFICKING

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I recently chaired a hearing focusing on the fight against human trafficking—an insidious human rights abuse that thrives in an environment of secrecy, of silence, and of a mindset that says that it is somebody else's problem.

The truth of the matter is that combating modern-day slavery is everybody's business. We are all in this together. Cooperation and coordination are key to mitigating—and someday ending—this pervasive cruelty.

Significant progress has been made since I authored landmark legislation—the Trafficking Victim's Protection Act of 2000, or TVPA—to combat sex and labor trafficking in the United States and globally. When I first introduced the TVPA in 1998 however, I was repeatedly told by detractors that it was a ''solution in search of a problem.''

The Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and its 2003 and 2005 reauthorizations, which I also authored, launched a bold new strategy that included sheltering, political asylum, and other protections for the victims; long jail sentences and asset confiscation for the traffickers; and tough sanctions for governments that failed to meet minimum standards prescribed in the TVPA.

And for the first time ever, the law recognized the exploited as victims—not perpetrators of a crime. Since 2004, the TVPA has resulted in Anti-Human Trafficking Task Forces in 42 cities across the U.S. These task forces identify potential victims of human trafficking, coordinate local and federal law enforcement to rescue victims, assist with referrals for victim care, and train law enforcement.

Last week's hearing concentrated on rescue and refuge.

In January of 2000, I received actionable information that eight Ukrainian women were being exploited by sex traffickers in two bars in Montenegro. The women had been lured there with promises of legitimate work, then forced into prostitution. One desperate victim, however, called her mother for help using the phone of one of the men exploiting her.

When informed, I immediately called the Prime Minister of Montenegro, Filip Vujanovic, who personally ordered an immediate raid on the bar. As a result, seven of the eight women were rescued and returned to their families in Ukraine. Tragically, the eighth woman was trafficked to Albania prior to the raid.

We know that organized crime, street gangs, and pimps around the world have expanded into sex trafficking at an alarming rate. It is an extremely lucrative undertaking: a trafficker can make hundreds of thousands of dollars a year off just one victim. Unlike drugs or weapons, a human being can be held captive and sold into sexual slavery over and over again. Pornography and the devaluation of women are helping to drive demand.

And while our Department of Justice and Department of Homeland Security works with law enforcement abroad in sting operations to catch American pedophile sex tourists and rescue victims where there is a nexus with the United States, they cannot conduct rescue operations or run investigations that fall outside their jurisdiction.

Nevertheless, there still are victims—someone's young son or daughter being cruelly exploited. Into this gap steps non-governmental rescue operations. Some of the best are staffed by former Navy SEALs, ex-CIA agents, and even the occasional sitting member of State government. That is who we heard from last week—from witnesses that include a former CIA agent now involved in rescuing the most vulnerable, and a sitting state Attorney General.

We also heard from a former member of the Mexican Congress who has fought trafficking her entire career. And we heard from a victim of trafficking, who told us about the importance of refuge and rehabilitation following rescue.

Operation Underground Railroad has made it their business, literally and figuratively, to identify children being sex trafficked in other countries, and then to partner with the relevant foreign government entities for the rescue and rehabilitation of these children.

Operation Underground Railroad members frequently pose as American sex tourists who enlist traffickers to host sex parties for them—it is such a common occurrence in many Latin American nations that it provides the perfect cover for Operation Underground Railroad to lure the traffickers with the children for sale to a preset location, and then have the local authorities ready to bust the traffickers as well as rescue the children. Operation Underground Railroad also trains the local governments in how to conduct stings on traffickers, and on the rehabilitative needs of the trafficking victims.

Yet the magnitude of the problem remains huge.

Worldwide, in the past two years, 80,000 trafficking victims have been identified—a small percentage of the estimated 20.9 million victims in the world, but evidence that with a combination of encouragement, plus some persuasion and sustained pressure via sanctions imposed by the United States, countries are moving in the right direction.

Child traffickers cater to child predators—a crime that thrives on secrecy. In 1994, a young girl in my hometown was lured into the home of a convicted pedophile who lived across the street from her. Megan Kanka, seven, was raped and murdered.

No one, including Megan Kanka's parents, knew that their neighbor had been convicted of child sexual assault. The outrage over this tragedy led to enactment of Megan's Law—public sex offender registries—in every state in the country.

I thought up the idea for International Megan's Law to Prevent Demand for Child Sex Trafficking (H.R. 515), already passed by the House and now pending in the U.S. Senate, in a conversation with a trafficking in person's delegation from Thailand during a meeting in my office in 2007. I asked what Thai officials would do if we were to notify them of travel by a convicted pedophile. Each of the dozen officials said they would bar entry into their nation of such a predator.

A primary way to fight child trafficking is to fight demand created by sex tourists, which is what International Megan's Law does. We know from other official data that registered sex offenders are traveling disproportionately to countries where children are trafficked for sex.

A deeply-disturbing 2010 report by the Government Accountability Office entitled ''Current Situation Results in Thousands of Passports Issued to Registered Sex Offenders'' found that at least 4,500 U.S. passports were issued to registered sex offenders in fiscal year 2008 alone.

International Megan's Law seeks to protect children from sex tourism by notifying destination countries when convicted pedophiles plan to travel. And to protect American children, the bill encourages the President to use bilateral agreements and assistance to establish reciprocal notification—so that we will know when convicted child-sex offenders are coming here.

It is a primary duty of government to protect the weakest and most vulnerable among us from harm, but it also falls to each of us to watch for those who need the help of government, NGOs, and the faith community.

Combatting trafficking is everybody's business, and we heard from witnesses involved in the war against trafficking.

HONORING MARY ANN LUTZ

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

Whereas, Mary Ann Lutz has ably served the citizens of Monrovia as Mayor for six years (2009–2015); and also was elected and served the citizens of Monrovia as a member of the City Council for six years (2003–2009); and

Whereas, Mary Ann Lutz was a member of the Executive Committee of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments for the last four years; and provides guidance and counsel as President of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments; and

Whereas, Mary Ann Lutz has provided leadership for residents and fellow elected officials of the San Gabriel Valley with her commitment to regional government; and is recognized for her leadership and longtime advocacy for environmental causes, energy conservation, economic development, and critical water supply issues; and

Whereas, Mary Ann Lutz has championed the concerns of San Gabriel Valley residents regarding Storm Water Compliance and Mitigation affordability while serving as a member of the United States Conference of Mayors; and has served as a representative to the Gold Line Phase II Joint Powers Authority and the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts; and

Whereas, Mary Ann Lutz has volunteered her time as a liaison to the Monrovia Unified School District and to the Monrovia Public Library to promote educational achievement and the growth of literacy; and furthered educational excellence by participating with the Youth Employment Service (YES!) and the Adult School/ROP & Santa Fe Middle School Adopt-a-School programs; and

Whereas, Mary Ann Lutz's leadership and selfless service will be missed greatly by all the cities of the San Gabriel Valley; and would be appropriate to recognize the outstanding accomplishments and longtime commitment to serving the citizens of Monrovia and the residents of the San Gabriel Valley; and now, therefore, be it

Recognized, That Mayor Mary Ann Lutz of Monrovia has had an enduring influence and given exceptional contributions to the State of California; and we applaud her selfless commitment to the well-being of Southern California families; and we encourage all to honor the leadership and service provided for San Gabriel Valley residents by this wonderful leader.

CONGRATULATING MAJOR STEPHEN J. BONNER

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my constituent, Major Stephen J. Bonner of the U.S. Air Force, who has earned the Congressional Gold Medal for his distinguished service as an American fighter pilot with the Flying Tiger squadron in World War II.

Growing up in the 1930's during World War I, Major Bonner had always dreamt of becoming an ace. When he graduated from flight school in 1943, his dream came true when he was assigned to fly with the 76th Fighter Squadron in China, battling Japanese fighter pilots in his P–40 Warhawk.

During his time with the Air Force, Major Bonner became a member of the American Fighter Aces, who have been renowned as our country's most distinguished fighter pilots. In both World Wars, along with the Korean War, and the Vietnam War, these individuals have not only courageously defended our nation, but have also made outstanding achievements in aerial combat.

Major Bonner, now 96, lives with his daughter, Jane, just outside Carlinville in my district. I'm proud to congratulate Major Stephen Bonner for his outstanding accomplishments as an American Fighter Ace. The bravery and dedication he displayed as a pilot in World War II make him a very deserving recipient of the Congressional Gold Medal award, and I am proud to have such brave veterans like him in my district. Congratulations, Major Bonner.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JAMES A. WELDON

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to pay tribute to my good friend, Mr. James (Jim) A. Weldon, who sadly passed away on May 13, 2015.

Jim lived a life full of honor and compassion. He joined the U.S. Navy in 1953 and proudly served his country for six years. After his time in the Navy, he joined his family in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, where he began a career in the electrical industry and trained as an electrician. Jim went on to become a labor leader, following in the footsteps of his father, who had belonged to a painters union. For 38 years, Jim served as the leader of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 728, where he fought tirelessly for the rights of all workers, including for the right to earn a livable wage.

After 38 years leading Local Union 728, Jim retired. Of course, like so many people, we know how dedicated he was to the cause of helping others, Jim was not able to entirely retire from work that most assuredly filled his soul and his life with meaning. Therefore, in his retirement, he became the Vice President of the Florida Chapter of the Alliance for Retired Americans, where he continued to advocate for those who were in need of a voice. In addition to these immeasurable contributions to his community, Jim was also very proud to be listed on the honor roll of the Irish Cultural Institute of Florida and the Board of the Ft. Lauderdale Emerald Society. He also served his community as a Port Everglades Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers are with Jim's wife Gisela, as well as his two daughters, Kimberly and Kelly. I know that they are hurting, but I hope that they receive some comfort in knowing that their community grieves with them, as we all celebrate the life of a compassionate and dedicated man, Jim Weldon.

RECOGNIZING ROY A. DUMONT FOR HIS HONORABLE SERVICE TO THE NATION IN THE SECOND WORLD WAR AND HIS PATRIOTISM AND VALOR THEREIN

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the United States House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Mr. Roy A. Dumont for his honorable service in the Second World War.

Mr. Roy A. Dumont served the nation honorably in the United States Army 87th Infantry

Division, the "Golden Acorns," from 1942 through 1945. On this date, at the age of 92, Mr. Dumont traveled from his home in Flint, Michigan to Washington, D.C. in order to tour and pay homage at the World War II Memorial. To that effect, Mr. Dumont pays honor to the war to which he was a witness and remembers those known and unknown lost throughout the war. Therefore, he encourages all Americans to cherish and honor the sacrifice borne by our men and women in uniform from all theaters and eras.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Mr. Roy Dumont for his service and unyielding commitment to the nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, on roll call nos. 240 through 242 I missed these votes due to irregular flight operations on Sunday and a delayed flight on Monday. Had I been present, I would have voted Yes.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. EDNA IVANS

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Edna Ivans on her retirement after 48 years of working in the education system as a member of the West Hills Community College District Board of Trustees.

Mrs. Ivans was raised in Delano, California before going on to attend the University of Southern California's Pharmacy School. While studying for her degree, she met her husband, Nick Ivans. They would go on to settle in Avenal, California.

Beginning in June of 1967, Mrs. Ivans became an integral member of the West Hills Community College District (WHCCD) Board of Trustees. As the representative for Trustee Area 3, she was the force behind many projects that molded WHCCD into a successful, educational institution designed to serve the Central Valley's needs. WHCCD honored Mrs. Ivans for her work by naming the women's residence hall at the West Hills College Coalinga campus Edna L. Ivans Hall.

After 48 years of advocating on behalf of students and teachers alike, Mrs. Ivans retired on April 6, 2015.

Educators and students throughout the Central Valley of California have been extremely fortunate to have had someone as talented and dedicated as Mrs. Ivans working on their behalf to ensure a first rate education is within reach of everyone in the Central Valley. The Central Valley has benefitted greatly from her insight and perspective.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in commending Edna Ivans for her 48 years of dedicated public service as a Trustee for the West Hills Community College District and congratulating her on her recent retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that on May 18, 2015, I was attending my grandson's graduation ceremony in New Jersey and missed the three roll call votes of the day. Had I been present I would have voted:

AYE—Roll Call No. 240—H.R. 91—Veteran's I.D. Card Act

AYE—Roll Call No. 241—H.R. 1313—Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Relief Act

AYE—Roll Call No. 242—H.R. 1382—Boosting Rates of American Veteran Employment Act

RECOGNIZING ELK RIVER HIGH SCHOOL'S MOODY'S MEGA MATH CHALLENGE TEAM

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Elk River High School team that participated in the Moody's Mega Math Challenge. Joe Evans, Chase Gauthier, Zach Glasgow, Jordan Haack, Peter Jones, and Coach Curt Michener took home the third place Cum Laude Team Prize.

The Moody's Mega Math Challenge is a competition that encourages participants to use applied mathematics to solve everyday problems. This year's challenge problem required the team to create a cost-benefit analysis of higher education and degree choices.

1,128 teams with more than 6,000 students entered the competition, but Elk River's team was one of only six in the finals, and the only one from west of the Mississippi River. I am profoundly impressed by these students' hard work and their interest in mathematics. They made the 6th District proud.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body join me in congratulating Joe, Chase, Zach, Jordan, Peter, and Coach Michener on their impressive finish and on their academic accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO SGT. ERIC M. SEAMAN, USMC

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to his country are exceptional. Throughout the history of our republic we have asked young men and women to voluntarily step forward to guard and protect the freedoms we hold so dear. U.S. Marine Corps Sergeant Eric Matthew Seaman of Murrieta, California, took that step forward and assumed the duties, responsibilities and sacrifices that are required of all Americans who join the finest military in history. Today I ask that the House of Representatives honor and remember this incredible young man who died in service to his country.

As a decorated Marine Corps helicopter crew chief, Sgt. Seaman was called upon when a devastating earthquake ravaged the impoverished nation of Nepal. The disaster has killed more than 8,500 Nepalese citizens and destroyed more than half a million homes, many of which are in remote areas that are now cutoff from medical and food supplies due to landslides. Sgt. Seaman was selected to be a member of Joint Task Force 505, which was activated to support the government of Nepal by conducting humanitarian disaster relief operations. During the mission, Sgt. Seaman and other Task Force members distributed critical supplies to rural, hard to reach communities and provided impacted Nepalese people with the life sustaining supplies they so desperately needed. Tragically, on May 12, 2015, Sgt. Seaman, along with five other U.S. Marines and two Nepalese soldiers, died when their helicopter crashed during a supply mission in the Charikot region of Nepal.

President Ronald Reagan said, "Some people spend an entire lifetime wondering if they made a difference. The Marines don't have that problem." Sgt. Seaman embodies that sentiment and made invaluable contributions to the cause of liberty around the globe since joining the Marine Corps in 2009. Having deployed to Afghanistan and to Nepal, Sgt. Seaman bravely put himself in harm's way in order to carry out his mission, protect his country, and save the lives of innocent civilians. Those, Mr. Speaker, are the actions of a hero.

Sgt. Seaman is survived by his wife, Samantha, as well as a young son and daughter, and his parents, Bruce and Cheryl. The burdens and grief that they are left to endure are beyond calculation, but it is my hope that they can find some solace in knowing that their husband, father, and son served our country proudly and made truly life-saving contributions to people in tremendous need. Mr. Speaker, I know you and the entire House of Representatives join me in expressing my prayers and heartfelt condolences to Sgt. Seaman's family and friends.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL MALL REVITALIZATION AND DESIGNATION ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, we will kick off the fourth season of "Lunchtime Music on the Mall," which brings local and regional musicians to the National Mall to perform during the lunchtime hour, giving visitors and particularly our federal and other office workers downtown a break from the pace of business in Washington and an opportunity to enjoy their National Mall. The performances, featuring amateur and professional city and regional residents, are sponsored by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, the D.C. Commission on the Arts and Humanities, the D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation, the Smithsonian Institution and the National Park Service (NPS), in conjunction with my office. To preserve and enhance the National

Mall, a priceless space, I am reintroducing the National Mall Revitalization and Designation Act. Until the Trust for the National Mall was established in 2007, the National Mall was Washington's most neglected and underutilized federal property, despite being well-known and treasured. The Trust for the National Mall is already making a noteworthy and important difference, and its plan will give the Mall the majesty it deserves. In the meantime, there is much that can be done, from defining the Mall's official identity for the first time to adding low-cost basic amenities. My bill authorizes the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) to expand the boundaries of the Mall where commemorative works may be located, requires NCPC to study the commemorative works process, and requires the Secretary of the Interior to submit a plan within 180 days of passage to Congress to enhance visitor enjoyment, amenities and cultural experiences on the Mall.

I worked closely with NCPC and other agencies in drafting the bill. The bill would give NCPC the responsibility and necessary flexibility to designate Mall areas for commemorative works and, for the first time, to expand the official Mall area when appropriate to accommodate future commemorative works and cultural institutions.

In addition, tourists and workers downtown should be able to walk to the Mall and find attractive tables and chairs in the shade where good—not fast—food is available. Residents of the city and region should be able to find space for fun and games on the Mall, beyond the space between Third Street and the Lincoln Memorial.

Bordered by world-class cultural institutions, the Mall need not continue to be reduced to a mere lawn with a few—too few—old, ordinary benches and a couple of fast food stands until the expansive work of the Trust for the National Mall is completed. The plan by the Secretary of the Interior required by the bill would ensure chairs and tables for people who bring lunch to the Mall and the presence of cultural amenities. The NPS has my thanks for implementing and indeed sponsoring the part of the bill that calls for cultural amenities with Lunchtime Music on the Mall, which begins today. Lunchtime Music on the Mall is a good start to bringing the Mall alive during the workday. With the necessary imagination, making the Mall an inviting place with cultural and other amenities is achievable now.

The NCPC is well on its way to meeting the bill's requirement for an expansive, 21st-century definition of the Mall, particularly now that the Trust for the National Mall is doing such important work. Frustrated by continually fighting off proposals for new monuments, museums, and memorials on the already-crowded Mall space, I asked the NCPC to devise a Mall presentation plan. In 2003, Congress amended the Commemorative Works Act to create a reserve area—a no-build zone where new memorials may not be built. This action was helpful in quelling some but by no means all of the demand from groups for placement of commemorative works on what they view as the Mall.

However, recognizing the need for more commemorative work sites, NCPC and the Commission on Fine Arts (CFA) released a National Capital Framework Plan in 2009, which identifies sites near the Mall that are suitable for new commemorative works, including East Potomac Park, the Kennedy Center Plaza, and the new South Capitol gateway. Five new prestigious memorials are scheduled for such sites, including the Eisenhower Memorial and the U.S. Air Force Memorial. I appreciate that NCPC and the CFA work closely with the District of Columbia in designating off-Mall sites for new commemorative works. The District welcomes the expanded Mall into our local neighborhoods to increase the number of tourists who visit them, enhancing the work of the District of Columbia government and local organizations such as Cultural Tourism that offer tours of historic District neighborhoods. The off-Mall sites for commemorative works also complement development of entirely new neighborhoods near the Mall, particularly with the passage of my bills that are redeveloping both the Southwest and Southeast waterfronts.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I want to first thank the Chairman, the Ranking Member, and the committee staff for their hard work and effort that the bill before us represents. I particularly want to express my sincere thanks to Chairman WILSON and the members of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities subcommittee for what I believe are very fine contributions to the final bill. These initiatives span a variety of important areas, including cyberspace programs and authorities; technology transition and reauthorization of the Rapid Innovation Program; and research, development, and integration of advanced technologies such as railgun and directed energy. Also included in this legislation are critical provisions that address Special Operations, Counter-Terrorism, and Unconventional Warfare, including increasing Congressional oversight of sensitive operations, and the threats posed at home and abroad by weapons of mass destruction.

I also applaud the bill's investment in critically important undersea capabilities such as the peerless Virginia-class submarines, the Virginia Payload Module, the recapitalization of our national deterrent through the Ohio Replacement Program, and cutting-edge autonomous and unmanned systems.

These provisions demonstrate a shared, bipartisan commitment to the defense of our nation and support for our troops.

However, as we move forward with this bill, I note with great concern that it reflects a budget approach that locks in sequestration and severs that critical link between our national and economic security. I'm sure that dedicated public servants fighting organized crime at the Department of Justice, combatting terrorist financing mechanisms at the Treasury, or securing our borders and defending our critical infrastructure in cyberspace at Homeland Security would be shocked indeed to find out that what they did wasn't a matter of national security. One could just as soon tell the brilliant scientists and engineers at our national labs, or the teachers educating future generations that what they do isn't important to the future competitiveness of our nation. National security is not just tanks, ships, and airplanes.

The one-year nature of the approach in the bill is a flagrant abuse of a system designed to fund incremental and unpredictable costs of overseas operations, not to get around politically difficult votes for Members of Congress. It's bad management and worse policy; it doesn't live up to our commitment to the troops; it undermines our capability to conduct long-term strategy; and worst of all, it sets us up to have yet another round of budgeting by brinksmanship in a matter of months. Ducking debates is not why our constituents sent us here.

While I support the important policy measures contained in the bill, and I ultimately support its passage, it is so unfortunate that the one piece of legislation that has historically been the pinnacle of bipartisanship and one of the last vestiges of regular order has been taken hostage by a refusal to address the Budget Control Act. I applaud the bill's recognition that the President's budget accurately reflects the level of investment needed, but that is true across all departments and all of the elements of national power that together make the United States great. Let's take that realization to its logical conclusion and use the seeds of bipartisanship that the Armed Services Committee has worked so hard to preserve to build a long-term agreement that can finally unshackle us from the tyranny of budgetary uncertainty.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE WICONISCO HIGH SCHOOL ALUMNI ASSOCIATION ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 65TH CONSECUTIVE ANNUAL REUNION

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Wiconisco High School Alumni Association for exceptional civic activism—past and present—as reflected by the fact that the Association is hosting a 65th annual reunion. The Association has met every year since its first meeting in 1951 and has demonstrated a remarkable commitment to its members and the larger community. While the Wiconisco district designation no longer exists, the Alumni Association has remained dedicated to serving the redrawn district and the needs of its students.

When Wiconisco merged into the Williams Valley School District in 1965, the alumni did not lose their focus or commitment. Over the decades, the Wiconisco High School Alumni Association has supported the Williams Valley

Athletic Department, sponsored the local minstrel project, and actively provided scholarships to ensure the future success of area students. Since the scholarship program began in 1992, the Alumni Association has awarded over $200,000 to local graduates, and now awards a total of five scholarships annually.

I extend my gratitude to the members of the Wiconisco High School Alumni Association for their dedication to each other, to education, and to the improvement of their community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 12, Wednesday, May 13, Thursday, May 14, Friday, May 15, and Monday, May 18, 2015, I was out on medical leave on account of a successful procedure to clear a blocked artery and was unable to be present for recorded votes.

Had I been present, on May 12, I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 216, the Don't Tax Our Fallen First Responders Act (H.R. 606), ''no'' on roll call no. 217, the Edwards amendment to H.R. 1732, ''no'' on roll call no. 218, the Democratic Motion to Recommit with Instructions to H.R. 1732, ''yes'' on roll call no. 219, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act (H.R. 1732), and ''yes'' on roll call no. 220, the Defending Public Safety Employee's Retirement Act (H.R. 2146).

On May 13, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 221, the rule allowing floor debate on H.R. 1735, H.R. 36, and H.R. 2048 (H. Res. 255). On roll call no. 222, I would have voted ''no'' on the Democratic Motion to Recommit with Instructions, and I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 223, passage of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act (H.R. 36.) I also would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 224, passage of H.R. 2048, the Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ensuring Effective Discipline Over Monitoring Act of 2015.

On May 14, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 225, the rule allowing further debate on H.R. 1735 (H. Res. 260). I would also have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 226, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (H.R. 1191) and ''yes'' on roll call no. 227, the Hezbollah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (H.R. 2297).

Additionally, on amendments to H.R. 1735, I would have voted ''no'' on roll call no. 228, Polis amendment no. 2; ''yes'' on roll call no. 229, Brooks of Alabama amendment no. 5; ''yes'' on roll call no. 230, Walorski amendment no. 15; ''no'' on roll call no. 231, Smith of Washington amendment no. 16; and ''yes'' on roll call no. 232, McCaul amendment no. 17.

Had I been present on May 15, on amendments to H.R. 1735, I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 233, Rohrabacher amendment no. 23; ''yes'' on roll call no. 234, Lamborn amendment no. 27; ''no'' on roll call no. 235, Blumenauer amendment no. 32; ''yes'' on roll call no. 236, Lucas amendment no. 38; ''no'' on roll call no. 237, Nadler amendment no. 41; and ''no'' on roll call no. 238, the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 1735 with instruction. I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 239, final passage of H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

On May 18, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on roll call no. 240, the Veteran's I.D. Card Act (H.R. 91), ''yes'' on roll call no. 241, the Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Relief Act (H.R. 1313), and ''yes'' on roll call no. 242, the Boosting Rates of American Veteran Employment Act (H.R. 1382).

IN HONOR OF MARY COLLINS, STATE DIRECTOR OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mary Collins as she retires after 18 years as the State Director of the New Hampshire Small Business Development Center. In this position, Mary oversaw the Center's statewide, regional, and satellite offices, educational programs, and economic development initiatives. Mary was a dedicated leader and instrumental in ensuring the success of small businesses in the Granite State. Her commitment to New Hampshire small businesses has had a deep impact on our state.

The New Hampshire Small Business Development Center (NH SBDC) assists approximately 3,000 small businesses across the state each year through advising and education programs. New Hampshire's economy depends on a strong commitment to providing support for these small businesses. As State Director, Mary had a deep understanding of this and made sure the NH SBDC was a widely available resource for Granite State small businesses. With years of dedicated service as State Director, Mary has positioned the NH SBDC well for a future of continuing to assist small businesses in our state.

In addition to her position at the NH SBDC, Mary has also served on many boards and as a member of many organizations across the state and in her hometown community. She was on the board of directors of the New Hampshire High Technology Council, New Hampshire Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research, and New Hampshire International Trade Advisory Board. In addition, she served as a member of the Nashua Chamber of Commerce's Advocacy Committee, the Legislative Committee for the National Association of Small Business Development Centers, and the New Hampshire Legislature's Business Regulation Commission.

Mary has received recognition on several occasions for her great service to our state and community. She received the Business Excellence Hall of Fame Award from the NH Business Review in 2007, the NH Business & Industry Award in 2009, and the Citizens Bank Good Citizens Award in 2010. This year, Mary received the Mary Dumais Memorial Fund Award, in honor of her dedication to working with women entrepreneurs and women-owned businesses.

I feel very lucky to have had the opportunity to work alongside Mary over the past few years. I look forward to continuing to work with the NH SBDC and on behalf of small businesses in the Granite State.

On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire's Second Congressional District, I thank Mary for everything she has done for small businesses in our state making it a better place to live, work, and raise a family. I am honored to recognize and congratulate Mary on her retirement and wish her the best of luck on her next steps.

CONGRATULATING ALL ABOUT TREES, LLC, FOR EARNING THE 2015 SPRINGFIELD AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SMALL BUSINESS AWARD

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Noel Boyer and his team at All About Trees, LLC, in Springfield, Missouri, for being awarded the 2015 Springfield Area Chamber of Commerce Small Business Award.

Noel, who is a board certified master arborist with the International Society of Arboriculture, took over the now 22-year-old business in 2005 and has grown it into the accomplished business it is today. For more than a decade, he and his well-seasoned team have been caring for Springfield's trees, further glorifying the Queen City's ''Tree City USA'' designation.

All About Trees is a fine example of how careful, strategic planning and customer care leads to success. The business has not only improved the looks of Springfield area lawns, but has rooted itself as a mainstay in our local economy and community.

I congratulate Noel Boyer and All About Trees for being awarded this prestigious honor. I look forward to seeing this small business continue its great work and quality service in Springfield for many, many years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following Roll Call votes on May 18, 2015 and would like to reflect that I would have voted as follows:

Roll Call #240: YES

Roll Call #241: YES

Roll Call #242: YES

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2410, THE ''GENERATING RENEWAL, OPPORTUNITY, AND WORK WITH ACCELERATED MOBILITY, EFFICIENCY, AND REBUILDING OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT AMERICA ACT'' (GROW AMERICA ACT)

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I, along with many of my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, are introducing H.R. 2410, the ''Generating Renewal, Opportunity, and Work with Accelerated Mobility, Efficiency, and Rebuilding of Infrastructure and Communities throughout America Act'' (GROW AMERICA Act).

This legislation represents the Administration's six-year surface reauthorization proposal. We introduce this legislation by request, as it is the policy work of the Administration. By introducing it, we are putting our stamp of approval on the vision that this proposal offers—robust funding levels in a long-term bill to provide sustainable solutions to our Nation's infrastructure crisis.

Today, the House voted on a two-month short-term extension of highway, transit, and highway safety programs. Congress has had 10 months since the enactment of the last extension in July 2014 to produce a long-term bill, or at least to make significant progress in identifying sustainable revenues to shore up the Highway Trust Fund. The Republican Leadership has produced neither. The Committee on Ways and Means could not so much as hold a hearing on this topic in the past 10 months.

It is no surprise, therefore, that this House cannot come to agreement on $11 billion in offsets to keep surface transportation programs afloat through the end of this year, which would provide certainty to the construction industry and its workers during their busiest season. Here we are, in the middle of another construction season, and Congress is unable—or unwilling—to consider more than a short-term patch.

We can't kick the can down the road anymore. There is no road left. The revenues we collect are insufficient to meet our needs. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the shortfall in the Highway Trust Fund is $172 billion over the next 10 years just to maintain current funding levels. If Congress passes a six-year bill, the gap is $92 billion.

This gap only accounts for status quo funding. Finding an additional $92 billion will not provide enough funds to make substantial improvements to our infrastructure or address the ballooning backlog in highway, bridge, and transit state of good repair. It does not provide new investments in freight.

H.R. 2410 goes beyond the status quo and will move our Nation into the 21st century. The bill provides a total of $478 billion over six years, a 45 percent increase for highways, bridges, public transportation, highway safety, and rail programs. Over six years, the GROW AMERICA Act makes significant investments in:

Highways—provides $317 billion for programs under the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), an increase of 29 percent over current levels.

Freight—dedicates $18 billion for a new dedicated multi-modal freight program.

Transit—provides $115 billion for programs under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), an increase of 76 percent over current levels, and significantly boosts New Starts funding.

Rail—provides $28.6 billion for programs under the Federal Rail Administration (FRA).

Safety—provides $6 billion for vehicle safety programs under the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), $4.7 billion for truck and bus safety programs under the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), and $16 billion for the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP).

Competitive Grants—provides $7.5 billion for TIGER grants and $6 billion for TIFIA that could support $60 billion in loans.

Research and Innovation—provides $3.4 billion to leverage research and innovation to move people and goods more safely and efficiently, while minimizing impacts on the environment.

Federal lands—provides $150 million for a Nationally Significant Federal Lands and Tribal Projects program, to address project needs on Federal lands.

In addition to these critical investments in the Nation's intermodal surface transportation network, H.R. 2410 also includes a number of important policy provisions that ensure that surface transportation investments create good paying American jobs. These include tightening Buy America loopholes, funding workforce development, allowing local hire, and strengthening wage and hour laws for truck and bus drivers.

There are provisions in this proposal that I do not support, and may give some of my colleagues pause. Specifically, I strongly oppose eliminating the prohibition on tolling of existing free Interstate highways for reconstruction of an existing facility. The proposal also extends the deadline for Positive Train Control implementation. Given last week's tragic Amtrak crash, Congress should be coming together to find ways to fund expedited PTC implementation, not pushing the compliance date farther into the future. Other provisions, such as Buy America waivers for rail rolling stock, and elimination of statutory hours of service provisions for rail workers, also cause concern.

Nevertheless, the Administration's bill provides a great starting point—an opportunity for this Congress to come together to significantly increase infrastructure investment over the long term. I look forward to working in a bipartisan manner with Chairman SHUSTER and our colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure as we develop new surface transportation legislation.

IN HONOR OF ISSAC ROBINSON, JR. ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE WEST PALM BEACH CITY COMMISSION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to rise today to recognize my good friend, Mr. Issac ''Ike'' Robinson, Jr., on the occasion of his retirement from the West Palm Beach City Commission for District 2. Ike served with distinction as City Commissioner since 1999. He additionally served as President of the Commission from 2001–2002 and from 2006–2007. During his tenure on the Commission, he was on several key committees including the Small Business Advisory Committee and the Education Advisory Committee. His work led him to represent the City as a member and President of the Palm Beach County League of Cities. Ike eventually served as a member of the Florida League of Cities, meanwhile serving on the Governor's Taskforce for the Eradication of Methamphetamine Drug Labs. On a national level, Ike served on the National League of Cities and the National Black Caucus of elected officials.

A U.S. Army Veteran, husband to his wife Ernestine, and proud father and grandfather, Ike has dedicated his life to serving the West Palm Beach community with excellence. He also served and retired after 30 years in the Palm Beach County School District, and served 6 years with the West Palm Beach Police department as a Case Manager and a Crisis Counselor.

His dedication to the City of West Palm Beach is undeniable when looking and recognizing his contributions as an elected official and upstanding citizen. His service on the Commission for 16 years has earned him a record position as the longest serving commissioner in the history of West Palm Beach, and no doubt a legacy to be proud of. I am grateful for his honorable work, and wish Ike the best of luck and good health in the next journey in his life.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I am honored to congratulate Mr. Issac ''Ike'' Robinson on his retirement and for his years of service to the West Palm Beach community.

CONGRATULATING ANTHONY BRUTTO

HON. DAVID B. McKINLEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Mr. Anthony Brutto, a 94-year-old West Virginia University Class of 2015 graduate. A passionate designer and craftsman from a young age, Mr. Brutto began his collegiate career in 1939 seeking an engineering degree.

In 1942, his studies came to an abrupt halt when he was drafted into the Army Air Corps, where he served for three and a half years. He was primarily stationed in Venice, Florida and worked on the P39 and P49 bombers. After the war, family demands and changing careers kept him from completing his degree.

Mr. Brutto never lost his passion for education, however, and he received his bachelor's degree this past weekend during WVU's Commencement.

At a time when more young people are questioning the value of a college degree, it is encouraging to witness his perseverance in attaining a degree. Young West Virginians should follow in his footsteps and equip themselves for a lifetime of prosperity, no matter what setbacks come their way. As Mr. Brutto

eloquently said, ''The great thing about education is they can't take it away from you.''

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER HIV/AIDS AWARENESS DAY

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced a resolution to honor the memory of the Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders we have lost to AIDS, and to recognize those whom are still living with HIV/AIDS the United States. The resolution supports the goals and ideals of National Asian and Pacific Islander HIV/AIDS Awareness Day and its observance, and it draws attention to the stigma and disparities that hinder proper treatment and prevention within these communities.

Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders comprise more than 50 different ethnic subgroups, speaking more than 100 languages and dialects. This resolution recognizes the importance of providing access to culturally- and linguistically-competent services, especially HIV testing. According to an analysis of data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders were the only racial/ethnic groups with a statistically significant increase in new HIV diagnoses. The CDC estimates that 36 percent of the HIV diagnoses among these communities progress to AIDS in less than 12 months. Additionally, the CDC estimates among people living with HIV/AIDS, 22 percent of Asian Americans and 27 percent of Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders are unaware they are infected with HIV.

Yet, with increasing rates of infection, they continue to have the lowest rates of access to HIV-testing services. Although there are a number of factors that contribute to increasing rates of infections, stigma and discrimination associated with an HIV/AIDS has proved to be a leading factor in low testing rates and increased risk-taking behaviors.

The observance of National Asian and Pacific Islander HIV/AIDS Awareness Day was established by the Banyan Tree Project, and began as a national campaign to raise awareness of the impact of the HIV/AIDS-related stigma and how it contributes to lower testing rates and greater risk-taking behaviors. Additionally, the work continues with the Asian and Pacific Islander American Health Forum who have worked nationally for more than 20 years, including in my home district of Guam, in helping to strengthen community-based organizations and programs responding to HIV/AIDS among Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in addressing this need and advancing the larger cause of reducing HIV/AIDS-related stigmas and disparities in access to HIV prevention, testing and treatment. I thank my colleagues, Representatives JUDY CHU, RAÚL GRIJALVA, MIKE HONDA, BARBARA LEE, TED LIEU, ALAN LOWENTHAL, JIM MCDERMOTT, PEDRO PIERLUISI, AMATA RADEWAGEN, CHARLES RANGEL, ADAM SCHIFF, ADAM SMITH, and MARK TAKANO for their support as original cosponsors of this resolution.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT RELIEF ACT

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Student Loan Debt Relief Act. This legislation relieves a potential tax burden that may be imposed on student loan borrowers that use income-based repayment and income-contingent repayment programs.

This bill eliminates a tax penalty on student loan borrowers. After 20–25 years of payments on the income-based repayment or income-contingent repayment plans, student loan borrowers can have their outstanding debt balance forgiven. However, under current law, the amount forgiven is considered income payable immediately.

Programs such as the income based repayment program have helped in a small way to ensure that students can continue to pursue their dreams and get on with their lives while they responsibly pay off their student debt.

It also makes students the promise that if they hold up their end of the bargain for twenty to twenty-five years they will have their remaining debt forgiven.

Slamming students and families with a massive tax bill after they have played by the rules is just wrong. This bill is yet another step toward leveling the playing field for a generation students being devastated by the growing student loan crisis in this country.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WEST CALDWELL PUBLIC LIBRARY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the West Caldwell Public Library, located in the Township of West Caldwell, New Jersey as it celebrates its 100th Anniversary.

The West Caldwell Public Library, founded by the request of Julia H. Potwin, is an important piece of communal life in the Township of West Caldwell. Families, friends, and students gather at the Library to conduct research, enjoy literary works, and socialize. The Library, located on the first floor of the West Caldwell Municipal Building, is at the center of West Caldwell life, and offers a myriad of books, catalogs, and reference materials. The Library holds an important public function in serving the community through literary means, and is enjoyed by many.

Originally known as the Julia H. Potwin Memorial Library, this library was created by the request of Julia Potwin, the daughter of Nathaniel S. Crane. Although Julia never saw the construction of the Library, she requested in her will that a library be built. She issued specific instructions as to how it should look and function, and also left her extensive book collection to the Library. Julia sought to create a library that served a more integral role in her community. According to the Library's President of the Board of Trustees, her ideas were not common views of what a library should be. Julia wanted her library to be more personal than average libraries, as evident by her request for the Library to include a living room and a place for the caretaker to sleep.

The West Caldwell Public Library currently offers a variety of programs for adults, which include Friday afternoon movies, concerts, dramatic presentations, book discussions, and a Summer Reading program. These activities represent the Library's mission of upholding principles of intellectual freedom and the public's 'right to know.' Included within the Library's collection are 40,000 book titles, 200 magazines and periodicals, and a large selection of DVDs and CDs.

As part of its success in functioning as a communal gathering place for West Caldwell residents, the Library holds a teen advisory group, family story time, sing and dance events, and seminars on Social Security. The Library continues Julia Potwin's idiosyncratic vision of what a library should be by functioning as more than just a place to check out books.

To celebrate 100 successful years of offering the public a center for learning, the West Caldwell Public Library has planned several events, with the incorporation of the slogan ''Celebrate the Past, Create the Future.'' Among these events is a concert titled ''100 Years of American Music,'' featuring the Jane Stuart Ensemble as well as a reading from Julia Potwin's personal diary. Both of these events encompass the Library's constant dedication to acknowledging the past while also cultivating the future.

I commend the members and Board of Trustees of the West Caldwell Public Library, especially Library Manager Karen Kelly, for their dedication to serving the people of West Caldwell. The Library is a special place for all and will continue to function as a public forum for learning.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the West Caldwell Public Library as it celebrates its 100th Anniversary.

INTRODUCTION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY RESOLUTION FOR THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN BUSINESS OWNERS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution with my friend and colleague MARSHA BLACKBURN to honor the National Association of Women Business Owners (NAWBO) on its 40th anniversary in 2015.

Since it was established in 1975, NAWBO has allowed women entrepreneurs to collaborate and grow their businesses through 60 chapters across the country. With over 5,000 members representing a wide range of industries, NAWBO pushes for positive change to our business climate and public policy to help women entrepreneurs succeed in the American economy.

I am so pleased to have worked with Rep. BLACKBURN on this resolution, and hope that all of our colleagues will join us to celebrate NAWBO on its 40th anniversary.

IN HONOR OF DETECTIVE RICHARD P. DEVOE, SR.

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Detective Richard P. DeVoe, in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the City of Boston, and to commend him for 45 years of dedicated service with the Boston Police Department.

The son of Catherine and Walter DeVoe, Richie was born on April 10, 1950, in Dorchester, Massachusetts. He attended elementary school in Dorchester, and then went on to the Grover Cleveland Middle School. Richie then attended South Boston High School, graduating in 1970. Subsequently, he attended Curry College in Milton, MA, graduating Magna Cum Laude in 2002.

Upon his graduation from South Boston High School, Richie went to work at the Boston Police Department. From 1970–1974, he was assigned to the cadet program, Badge #188. From there, he became a police dispatcher from 1974–1979. He served as a patrolman, Badge #2893, from 1979–1987, and then worked as a detective, Badge #550, from 1987–2015.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to his assigned duties, Richie took on several important responsibilities within the Boston Police Department: he is a director of the Boston Police Relief Association, serving as president in 1993. On May 1, 2015, Richie was appointed Chairman of the Memorial Committee. Further, Richie has been part of the Boston Police Stress Unit since 1998, and he travelled to Ground Zero in New York City in September, 2001, in order to assist the New York City Police Department in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks.

Richie also serves as a vice-president of the South Boston Citizens Association, and he is a member of the Tynan Community Board. He is also a member of the South Boston Historical Society and the Boston Police Emerald Society.

Richie has had the good fortune to be married to Patricia for 39 years. They are the proud parents of three children: Richard, Jr., Suzanne, and Kristy. They are grandparents to Liam, Sophie, Lance, and Michael.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to take the floor of the House today to join with Richard P. DeVoe's family, friends, and contemporaries to thank him for his remarkable service to the City of Boston.

IN RECOGNITION OF JUAN BATISTA VICINI, A DOMINICAN HERO

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life and legacy of Juan Batista Vicini, a dedicated leader, a reliable ally, and a longstanding friend who passed away on April 28, 2015. We have truly experienced a great loss not only to the Dominican Republic, but also to the international community. He was loved, respected tremendously, and we will certainly miss his spirit of leadership and strength.

Mr. Vicini was born in Genoa, Italy and became the so-called first Dominican mogul after receiving a degree in Chemical Engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Before his death, Mr. Vicini had led the Vicini family business for over 50 years. As Vicini Assets Management's third generation leader, Mr. Vicini laid the groundwork to transform the family company into the most important assets administrator in the Caribbean and Central America.

Mr. Vicini, the Vicini family and I all worked together on the issue of multi-lateral government investment in Haiti and the Dominican Republic. We also worked on trade in relation to the Haitian Hemispheric Opportunity for Partnership Encouragement Act of 2006 (HOPE) and the Haiti Economic Lift Program Act (HELP), signed into law by President Barack Obama in 2010. These two Acts expanded and extended existing apparel trade opportunities for Haiti, which is important as their economy continues to bounce back from the earthquake several years ago.

I have the great honor to serve a congressional district with one of the nation's largest Dominican populations. From Washington Heights to Inwood, Dominicans continue to improve our neighborhoods, with their vibrant cultural and economic contributions every day.

Mr. Vicini embodied the bright Dominican culture and enriched the lives of everyone he knew. During my visit to the Dominican Republic last year, I was very pleased to be able to visit Vicini Assets Management and see the results of Mr. Vicini's decades-long success. While the world lost a great businessman and leader, I am confident that his children will carry on his legacy for years to come.

GROW AMERICA ACT INTRODUCTION

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Grow America Act, introduced today by Congressman PETER DEFAZIO. As we prepare to vote on yet another short-term extension, it is important to reiterate the kind of investment our nation needs to build a 21st century transportation system. We cannot continue kicking the can down the road as our nation's infrastructure continues to deteriorate.

It is also clear that we cannot keep flat-funding infrastructure. The American Society of Civil Engineers has given our nation's infrastructure a D+ grade—we need significant new investment to repair structurally-deficient bridges, upgrade transit systems, and rebuild roads. The Grow America Act will increase funding for these critical needs.

While I do not agree with all the policy provisions in this Act, and believe there are some important ideas that are not included, I am proud to add my name as a cosponsor to support critical investment in transportation. I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass a long-term, comprehensive bill this summer.

RECOGNIZING WARREN N. JACKSON FOR HIS HONORABLE SERVICE TO THE NATION IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND FOR HIS PATRIOTISM AND VALOR THEREIN

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the United States House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Mr. Warren N. Jackson, for his honorable service in the United States Army.

Mr. Warren N. Jackson served the nation honorably in the United States Army, 3758th Quartermaster Truck Company throughout World War II and retired from the 41st Artillery, serving from 1944 through 1966. On this date, at the age of 92, Mr. Jackson traveled from his home in Flint, Michigan to Washington, D.C. in order to tour and pay homage at the World War II Memorial. To that effect, Mr. Jackson pays honor to the war to which he was a witness and remembers those known and unknown lost throughout the war. Therefore, he encourages all Americans to cherish and honor the sacrifice borne by our men and women in uniform from all theaters and eras.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Mr. Warren Jackson for his service and unyielding commitment to the nation.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes:

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I ask that the following exchange of letters be submitted during consideration of H.R. 1735:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the Committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology takes this action only with the

understanding that the Committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I write concerning H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, as amended. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the committee report on H.R. 1735 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Ways and Means has a valid jurisdictional claim to a provision in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Ways and Means is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

MARSHALL HIGH SCHOOL TRACK AND FIELD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Marshall High School boys track and field team for winning the University Interscholastic League (UIL) 5A state track and field championship.

There was no stopping these Marshall Buffalos on their way to winning. The relay team of Cederian Lynch, Amere Lattin, Kendall Sheffield and Shamon Ehiemua set a 5A state record in the 800-meter relay and claimed the state title in the 1,600-meter relay. Individually, Sheffield repeated his win in the 110-meter hurdles and Ehiemua won in the 200-meter dash. The Buffalos dominated the competition. These young men are gifted athletes, and we are excited to see all they accomplish on and off the track.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations on your state championship. Thank you for bringing the gold to Fort Bend County.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes:

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I ask that the following exchange of letters be submitted during consideration of H.R. 1735:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. That bill, as ordered reported, contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Natural Resources Committee, including those noted in addendum A.

In the interest of permitting you to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this very important bill, I am willing to waive this committee's right to a sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that the Natural Resources Committee does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you urge the Speaker to name members of the Natural Resources committee to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1735 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you and your staff have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees, and congratulations on this significant achievement.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman.

Addendum A:

PROVISIONS

TITLE	SECTION #—NAME
6	Section 601—Extension of Authority to Provide Temporary Increase in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing Under Certain Circumstances
6	Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces
6	Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals
6	Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities
6	Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays
6	Section 631—Full Participation for Members of the Uniformed Services in Thrift Savings Plan
6	Section 632—Modernized Retirement System for Members of the Uniformed Services
6	Section 633—Continuation Pay for Full TSP Members with 12 Years of Service
6	Section 634—Effective Date and Implementation
10	Section 1083—Navy Support of Ocean Research Advisory Panel
28	Section 2841—Withdrawal and Reservation of Public Land, Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California
28	Section 2851—Renaming Site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, Ohio
28	Section 2852—Extension of Authority for General Francis Marion establishment of Commemorative Work in Honor of Brigadier
28	Section 2862—Protection and Recovery of Greater Sage Grouse

AMENDMENTS

Mark	Log	Sponsor	Description
RDY	089	Bishop	Provision would permanently extend the land withdrawals for certain military reservations.
RDY	092	Wilson	Amend existing law to allow an agency to object to the inclusion of certain property on the National Register or its designation as a National Historic Landmark for reasons of national security.
ROY	324	Knight	The provision would add a new section to title 10, United States code to provide for the conservation needs of the Southern Sea Otter while continuing the protections for military readiness activities at important offshore islands in the Southern California Bight.
MLP	181r2	Takai	This amendment would prohibit per diem allowance reductions for civilian employees on TDY.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business pursuant to Rule X(q) of the House of Representatives.

In the interest of permitting the Committee on Armed Services to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive the right of the Committee on Small Business to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Small Business does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X(q) jurisdiction, including future bills that the Committee on Armed Services will consider. I request that you urge the Speaker to appoint members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1735 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this issue and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,
STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Small Business has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Small Business is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3009–S3088

Measures Introduced: Twenty-two bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1368–1389, and S. Res. 180–182. **Pages S3059–60**

Measures Reported:

S. 1376, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 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. (S. Rept. No. 114–49) **Page S3058**

Measures Passed:

Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act: Senate passed H.R. 2252, to clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014. **Page S3014**

National Schizencephaly Awareness Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 181, designating May 19, 2015, as ''National Schizencephaly Awareness Day''. **Page S3088**

Department of Defense Laboratory Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 182, expressing the sense of the Senate that Defense laboratories have been, and continue to be, on the cutting edge of scientific and technological advancement and supporting the designation of May 14, 2015, as the ''Department of Defense Laboratory Day''. **Page S3088**

Measures Considered:

Ensuring Tax Exempt Organizations the Right to Appeal Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S3015–24, S3024–53**

Pending:

Hatch Amendment No. 1221, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S3015**

Hatch (for Flake) Amendment No. 1243 (to Amendment No. 1221), to strike the extension of the trade adjustment assistance program. **Page S3015**

Hatch (for Inhofe/Coons) Modified Amendment No. 1312 (to Amendment No. 1221), to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to require the development of a plan for each sub-Saharan African country for negotiating and entering into free trade agreements. **Pages S3015, S3026–30**

Hatch (for McCain) Amendment No. 1226 (to Amendment No. 1221), to repeal a duplicative inspection and grading program. **Pages S3015, S3017–22**

Stabenow (for Portman) Amendment No. 1299 (to Amendment No. 1221), to make it a principal negotiating objective of the United States to address currency manipulation in trade agreements. **Pages S3015, S3022–24, S3052–53**

Brown Amendment No. 1251 (to Amendment No. 1221), to require the approval of Congress before additional countries may join the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement. **Pages S3015, S3024–25, S3052**

Wyden (for Shaheen) Amendment No. 1227 (to Amendment No. 1221), to make trade agreements work for small businesses. **Pages S3015, S3017**

Wyden (for Warren) Amendment No. 1327 (to Amendment No. 1221), to prohibit the application of the trade authorities procedures to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement that includes investor-state dispute settlement. **Pages S3015, S3025–26, S3031–33**

Hatch Modified Amendment No. 1411 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 1299), of a perfecting nature. **Pages S3052, S3053**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the Hatch Amendment No. 1221 to the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Thursday, May 21, 2015. **Page S3051**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of Hatch Amendment No. 1221 to the bill. **Pages S3051–52**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, May 20, 2015. Page S3088

Message from the President: Senate received the following message 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 13303 of May 22, 2003, with respect to the stabilization of Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–18) Page S3056

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

7 Army nominations in the rank of general.

10 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral. Page S3088

Messages from the House: Page S3056

Measures Referred: Page S3056

Executive Communications: Pages S3057–58

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S3058

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S3060–62

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S3062–71

Additional Statements: Pages S3054–56

Amendments Submitted: Pages S3071–87

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S3087–88

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:15 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 20, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3088.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies approved for full committee consideration an original bill entitled, "Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016".

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development approved for full committee consideration an original bill entitled, "Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2016".

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Jessie Hill Roberson, of Alabama, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Monica C. Regalbuto, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management), and 808 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE OVERSIGHT

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Congressional Budget Office, after receiving testimony from Keith Hall, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization, focusing on air traffic control modernization and reform, after receiving testimony from former Senator Byron Dorgan; Michael P. Huerta, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation; former Michigan Governor John Engler, Business Roundtable, Paul M. Rinaldi, National Air Traffic Controllers Association, and Ed Bolen, National Business Aviation Association, all of Washington, D.C.; and Jeffery A. Smisek, United Airlines, Chicago, Illinois, on behalf of Airlines for America.

ENERGY SUPPLY LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 562, to promote exploration for geothermal resources, S. 822, to expand geothermal production, S. 1026, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to repeal a provision prohibiting Federal agencies from procuring alternative fuels, S. 1057, to promote geothermal energy, S. 1058, to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, S. 1103, to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Clark Canyon Dam, S. 1104, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam, S. 1199, to authorize Federal agencies to provide alternative fuel to Federal employees on a reimbursable basis, S. 1215, to amend the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000 to provide for the development of methane hydrate as a commercially viable source of energy, S. 1222, to amend the

Federal Power Act to provide for reports relating to electric capacity resources of transmission organizations and the amendment of certain tariffs to address the procurement of electric capacity resources, S. 1224, to reconcile differing Federal approaches to condensate, S. 1226, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act and the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands to promote a greater domestic helium supply, to establish a Federal helium leasing program for public land, and to secure a helium supply for national defense and Federal researchers, S. 1236, to amend the Federal Power Act to modify certain requirements relating to trial-type hearings with respect to certain license applications before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, S. 1264, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a renewable electricity standard, S. 1270, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize hydroelectric production incentives and hydroelectric efficiency improvement incentives, S. 1271, to require the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations to prevent or minimize the venting and flaring of gas in oil and gas production operations in the United States, S. 1272, to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the effects of forward capacity auctions and other capacity mechanisms, S. 1276, to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to increase energy exploration and production on the outer Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico, S. 1278, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the conduct of certain lease sales in the Alaska outer Continental Shelf region, to make certain modifications to the North Slope Science Initiative, S. 1279, to provide for revenue sharing of qualified revenues from leases in the South Atlantic planning area, S. 1280, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish an annual production incentive fee with respect to Federal onshore and offshore land that is subject to a lease for production of oil or natural gas under which production is not occurring, S. 1282, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to consider the objective of improving the conversion, use, and storage of carbon dioxide produced from fossil fuels in carrying out research and development programs under that Act, S. 1283, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to repeal certain programs, to establish a coal technology program, S. 1285, to authorize the Secretary of Energy to enter into contracts to provide certain price stabilization support relating to electric generation units that use coal-based generation technology, S. 1294, to require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Agriculture to collaborate in promoting the development of efficient, economical, and environmentally sustainable thermally led wood energy systems, and S. 1304, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a pilot competitive grant program for the development of a skilled energy workforce, after receiving testimony from Abigail Ross Hopper, Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Department of the Interior; Susan N. Kelly, American Public Power Association, Arlington, Virginia; Randal S. Livingston, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Francisco, California; Franz A. Matzner, Natural Resources Defense Council, and Erik Milito, American Petroleum Institute, both of Washington, D.C.; and Brent J. Sheets, University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

FEDERAL WATER QUALITY PROTECTION ACT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife concluded a hearing to examine S. 1140, to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term ''waters of the United States'', after receiving testimony from Susan Metzger, Kansas Department of Agriculture Assistant Secretary, Manhattan; Patrick Parenteau, Vermont Law School Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic, Thetford Center; Andrew Lemley, New Belgium Brewing Company, Fort Collins, Colorado; Mark T. Pifher, Colorado Springs Utilities, Colorado Springs, Colorado, on behalf of the National Water Resources Association; and Robert J. Pierce, Wetland Training Institute, Inc., Poolesville, Maryland.

FOSTER CARE GROUP HOMES

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine how to safely reduce reliance on foster care group homes, after receiving testimony from Joo Yeun Chang, Associate Commissioner, Children's Bureau, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services; Jeremy Kohomban, The Children's Village, New York, New York; Matthew J. Reynell, Children Awaiting Parents, Rochester, New York; and Alexandra Morgan Gruber, Hamden, Connecticut.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Mileydi Guilarte, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank, Jennifer Ann Haverkamp, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, and Brian James Egan, of Maryland, to be Legal Adviser, both of the Department of

State, Marcia Denise Occomy, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank for a term of five years, and Sunil Sabharwal, of California, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of two years.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION OVERSIGHT

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, focusing on examining EEOC's enforcement and litigation programs, after receiving testimony from Jenny R. Yang, Chair, and P. David Lopez, General Counsel, both of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

LAW ENFORCEMENT BODY CAMERAS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism concluded a hearing to examine body cameras, focusing on whether technology can increase protection for law enforcement officers and the public, after receiving testimony from Senator Scott; Peter A. Weir, First Judicial District, Golden, Colorado, on behalf of the National District Attorneys Association; Lindsay Miller, Police Executive Research Forum, and Wade Henderson, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, both of Washington, D.C.; and Jarrod Bruder, South Carolina Sheriffs' Association, Columbia.

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: 57 public bills, H.R. 6, 2405–2460 and 5 resolutions, H. Res. 272, 275–278 were introduced. **Pages H3386–88**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3390–91**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 1119, to improve the efficiency of Federal research and development, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–121);

H.R. 874, to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–122);

H.R. 1156, to authorize the establishment of a body under the National Science and Technology Council to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation opportunities (H. Rept. 114–123);

H.R. 1158, to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–124);

H.R. 1162, to make technical changes to provisions authorizing prize competitions under the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–125);

H.R. 1561, to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–126);

H. Res. 273, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2262) to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 880) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 22, 2015, through May 29, 2015 (H. Rept. 114–127); and

H. Res. 274, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–128). **Page H3386**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bost to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3313**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:37 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H3317**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Gregory Goethals, S.J. Loyola High School, Los Angeles, California. **Page H3317**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Emmer wherein he resigned from the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Foreign Affairs. **Page H3317**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Meehan wherein he resigned from the Committee on Homeland Security. **Page H3318**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 272, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H3318**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on Monday, May 18th:

Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015: S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 420 yeas to 3 nays, Roll No. 244. **Pages H3329–30**

Unanimous Consent Agreement: Agreed by unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H.R. 2353 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule 20. **Page H3330**

Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 2353, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, by a recorded vote of 387 ayes to 35 noes with one answering "present", Roll No. 249. **Pages H3330–39, H3359–61**

Rejected the Esty motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 182 yeas to 241 nays, Roll No. 248. **Pages H3338–39, H3359–60**

H. Res. 271, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1806), (H.R. 2250), and (H.R. 2353), was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 242 yeas to 179 nays, Roll No. 243, after the previous question was ordered. **Pages H3321–29**

Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2016: The House passed H.R. 2250, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, by a yea-and-nay vote 357 yeas to 67 nays, Roll No. 247. **Pages H3339–59**

Agreed to:

Flores amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–120) that prohibits any funds for delivering printed copies of the Congressional Pictorial Directory; and **Pages H3354–55**

Ratcliffe amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–120) that zeros out $5,700,000 in funding for the Open World Leadership Center and applies the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 224 ayes to 199 noes, Roll No. 245). **Pages H3353–54, H3357–58**

Rejected:

Blackburn amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–120) that provides for a one percent across the board cut. Exempts Capitol Police, Architect of the Capitol, and the Sergeant at Arms (by a recorded vote of 172 ayes to 250 noes, Roll No. 246). **Pages H3356–57, H3358–59**

H. Res. 271, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1806), (H.R. 2250), and (H.R. 2353), was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 242 yeas to 179 nays, Roll No. 243, after the previous question was ordered. **Pages H3321–29**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

American Super Computing Leadership Act: H.R. 874, to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy; **Pages H3361–63**

Science Prize Competitions Act: H.R. 1162, amended, to make technical changes to provisions authorizing prize competitions under the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980; **Pages H3363–65**

Research and Development Efficiency Act: H.R. 1119, amended, to improve the efficiency of Federal research and development; **Pages H3365–66**

International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2015: H.R. 1156, amended, to authorize the establishment of a body under the National Science and Technology Council to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation opportunities; **Pages H3366–67**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "To authorize the establishment or designation of a working group under the National Science and Technology Council to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation opportunities.". **Page H3367**

Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015: H.R. 1561, amended, to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, and to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data; and **Pages H3367–73**

Department of Energy Laboratory Modernization and Technology Transfer Act of 2015: H.R. 1158, amended, to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, and facilitate public-private partnerships. **Pages H3373–77**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared with respect to the stabilization of Iraq is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2015—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 114–40). **Page H3339**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate by the Deputy Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on page H3321.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3329, H3329–30, H3357–58, H3358–59, H3359, H3359–60, and H3360–61. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ADDRESSING WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN FEDERAL CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education held a hearing entitled ''Addressing Waste, Fraud, and Abuse in Federal Child Nutrition Programs''. Testimony was heard from Kay E. Brown, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; Gil Harden, Assistant Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of Agriculture; Jessica Lucas-Judy, Acting Director, Forensic Audits and Investigating Service, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

DISCUSSION DRAFT ADDRESSING ENERGY RELIABILITY AND SECURITY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing entitled ''Discussion Draft Addressing Energy Reliability and Security''. Testimony was heard from Michael Bardee, Director, Office of Electric Reliability, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Consumer Product Safety Commission''. Testimony was heard from Elliot F. Kaye, Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission; Robert S. Adler, Commissioner, Consumer Product Safety Commission; Ann Marie Buerkle, Commissioner, Consumer Product Safety Commission; Joseph Mohorovic, Commissioner, Consumer Product Safety Commission; public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 6, the ''21st Century Cures Act''.

THE FUTURE OF HOUSING IN AMERICA: OVERSIGHT OF THE RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance held a hearing entitled ''The Future of Housing in America: Oversight of the Rural Housing Service''. Testimony was heard from Tony Hernandez, Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture; and Mathew Scire, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, Government Accountability Office.

PROTECTING CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE: HOW THE FINANCIAL SECTOR ADDRESSES CYBER THREATS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled ''Protecting Critical Infrastructure: How the Financial Sector Addresses Cyber Threats''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TRADE PROMOTION AGENCIES AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade held a hearing entitled ''Trade Promotion Agencies and U.S. Foreign Policy''. Testimony was heard from Fred P. Hochberg, Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank of the United States; Elizabeth L. Littlefield,

President and Chief Executive Officer, Overseas Private Investment Corporation; Leocadia I. Zak, Director, U.S. Trade and Development Agency; and public witnesses.

THE FUTURE OF U.S.-HUNGARY RELATIONS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats held a hearing entitled "The Future of U.S.-Hungary Relations". Testimony was heard from Hoyt Brian Yee, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, Department of State; and public witnesses.

EXAMINING DHS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DIRECTORATE'S ENGAGEMENT WITH ACADEMIA AND INDUSTRY

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies held a hearing entitled "Examining DHS Science and Technology Directorate's Engagement with Academia and Industry". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

POLICING STRATEGIES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Policing Strategies for the 21st Century". Testimony was heard from Sheriff David A. Clarke, Jr., Milwaukee County Sheriff's Office; Susan Lee Rahr, Executive Director, Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission, and Member of President Obama's Task Force on 21st Century Policing; and public witnesses.

ONGOING OVERSIGHT: MONITORING THE ACTIVITIES OF THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT'S CIVIL, TAX AND ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISIONS AND THE U.S. TRUSTEE PROGRAM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law held a hearing entitled "Ongoing Oversight: Monitoring the Activities of the Justice Department's Civil, Tax and Environment and Natural Resources Divisions and the U.S. Trustee Program". Testimony was heard from the following Department of Justice officials: Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division; John C. Cruden, Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division; Caroline D. Ciraolo, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Tax Division; Clifford J. White III, Director, U.S. Trustee Program; and public witnesses.

EMPOWERING STATE MANAGEMENT OF GREATER SAGE GROUSE

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Empowering State Management of Greater Sage Grouse". Testimony was heard from Kathleen Clarke, Director, Utah Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office, State of Utah; Dustin Miller, Administrator, Idaho Office of Species Conservation, State of Idaho; John Swartout, Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Governor John Hickenlooper, State of Colorado; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2395, the "Inspector General Reform Act of 2015"; H.R. 1777, the "Presidential Allowance Modernization Act"; H.R. 1831, the "Evidence-Based Policymaking Commission Act of 2015"; H.R. 451, the "Safe and Secure Federal Websites Act of 2015"; H.R. 1759, the "All Economic Regulations are Transparent (ALERT) Act of 2015"; H.R. 728, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office"; H.R. 891, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the "Floresville Veterans Post Office Building"; H.R. 1326, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office"; H.R. 1350, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building"; H.R. 1442, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Cornell Street in Kingston, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Robert H. Dietz Post Office Building"; H.R. 1524, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the "Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building". The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 1777, H.R. 1831, and H.R. 451. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 2395, H.R. 1759, H.R. 728, H.R. 891, H.R. 1326, H.R. 1350, H.R. 1442, and H.R. 1524.

AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2015; STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT; SPACE ACT OF 2015

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 880, the "American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2015"; H.R. 1335, the "Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act"; and H.R. 2262, the "SPACE Act of 2015". The committee granted, by a record vote of 9–4, a structured rule for H.R. 1335. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–16 and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, 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. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The Committee granted, by voice vote, a structured rule for H.R. 2262. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology or their respective designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–17 and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part A of the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part A of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Additionally, the rule granted a closed rule for H.R. 880. 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 the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the Rules Committee report, 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. In section 3, the rule provides that it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of May 21, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. In section 4, the rule provides that the Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Wednesday, May 27, 2015, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016. In section 5, the rule provides that on any legislative day during the period from May 22, 2015, through May 29, 2015: the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment. In section 6, the rule provides that the Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 5. Testimony was heard from Chairman Bishop of Utah, Chairman Ryan of Wisconsin, Chairman Smith of Texas, and Representatives Huffman, Young of Alaska, Graves of Louisiana, Jones, Austin Scott of Georgia, Crowley, and Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas.

IMPROVING CAPITAL ACCESS PROGRAMS WITHIN THE SBA

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access held a hearing entitled "Improving Capital Access Programs within the SBA". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST SEISMIC HAZARDS: PLANNING AND PREPARING FOR THE NEXT DISASTER

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled ''Pacific Northwest Seismic Hazards: Planning and Preparing for the Next Disaster''. Testimony was heard from Robert J. Fenton, Jr., Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Response and Recovery, Federal Emergency Management Agency; and public witnesses.

IMPROVING COMPETITION IN MEDICARE: REMOVING MORATORIA AND EXPANDING ACCESS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Improving Competition in Medicare: Removing Moratoria and Expanding Access''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D488)*

S. 665, to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received. Signed on May 19, 2015. (Public Law 114–12)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to receive a closed briefing on Syria, 11 a.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: business meeting to consider S. 1331, to help enhance commerce through improved seasonal forecasts, S. 1297, to update the Commercial Space Launch Act by amending title 51, United States Code, to promote competitiveness of the U.S. commercial space sector, S. 1326, to amend certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, S. 1040, to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the National Academy of Sciences to study the vehicle handling requirements proposed by the Commission for recreational off-highway vehicles and to prohibit the adoption of any such requirements until the completion of the study, S. 1359, to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, S. 806, to amend section 31306 of title 49, United States Code, to recognize hair as an alternative specimen for preemployment and random controlled substances testing of commercial motor vehicle drivers and for other purposes, S. 1315, to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions, S. 1334, to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, to amend the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 to implement the Antigua Convention, S. 1335, to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Tokyo on February 24, 2012, S. 1251, to implement the Amendment to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, as adopted by Lisbon, Portugal on September 28, 2007, S. 1336, to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Auckland on November 14, 2009, H.R. 1020, to define STEM education to include computer science, and to support existing STEM education programs at the National Science Foundation, H.R. 710, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and the nominations of Daniel R. Elliott III, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board for a term expiring December 31, 2018, Mario Cordero, of California, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 2019, and a routine list in the Coast Guard, 10:30 a.m., SR–253.

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard, to hold hearings to examine improvements and innovations in fishery management and data collection, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Management, and Regulatory Oversight, to hold an oversight hearing to examine scientific advisory panels and processes at the Environmental Protection Agency, including S. 543, to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine U.S. Cuban relations, focusing on the way forward, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Gregory T. Delawie, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kosovo, Ian C. Kelly, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to Georgia, Nancy Bikoff Pettit, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Latvia, Azita Raji, of California, to be Ambassador to the

Kingdom of Sweden, and Julieta Valls Noyes, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Croatia, all of the Department of State, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on exploring institutional risk-sharing, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management, to hold hearings to examine 21st century ideas for the 20th century Federal civil service, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold an oversight hearing to examine addressing the needs of Native communities through Indian Water Rights Settlements, 2:15 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution, to hold hearings to examine taking sexual assault seriously, focusing on the rape kit backlog and human rights, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine solutions to the hospital observation stay crisis, 2:15 p.m., SD–562.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2393, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes; and H.R. 2394, the ''National Forest Foundation Reauthorization Act of 2015'', 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Nutrition, hearing entitled ''Past, Present, and Future of SNAP: The World of Nutrition, Government Duplication and Unmet Needs'', 1:30 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense, markup on Defense Appropriations Bill, FY 2016, 9:30 a.m., H–140 Capitol. This markup will be closed.

Full Committee, markup on Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Bill for FY 2016, 10:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing entitled ''Reforming the Workers' Compensation Program for Federal Employees'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 6, the ''21st Century Cures Act'' (continued), 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn. Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, markup on a discussion draft of the ''FCC Process Reform Act of 2015''; a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to publish on its Internet website changes to the rules of the Commission not later than 24 hours after adoption; a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to publish on the website of the Commission documents to be voted on by the Commission; a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require identification and description on the website of the Federal Communications Commission of items to be decided on authority delegated by the Commission; a bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to submit to Congress a report on improving the participation of small businesses in the proceedings of the Commission; a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for a quarterly report on pending requests for action by the Federal Communications Commission and pending congressional investigations of the Commission; and a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for publication on the Internet website of the Federal Communications Commission of certain policies and procedures established by the chairman of the Commission, 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 432, the ''SBIC Advisers Relief Act of 2015''; H.R. 686, the ''Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2015''; H.R. 1334, the ''Holding Company Registration Threshold Equalization Act of 2015''; H.R. 1525, the ''Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act of 2015''; H.R. 1675, the ''Encouraging Employee Ownership Act of 2015''; H.R. 1723, the ''Small Company Simple Registration Act of 2015''; H.R. 1847, the ''Swap Data Repository and Clearinghouse Indemnification Correction Act of 2015''; H.R. 1965, the ''Small Company Disclosure Simplification Act''; H.R. 1975, the ''Securities and Exchange Commission Overpayment Credit Act''; H.R. 2064, the ''Improving Access to Capital for Emerging Growth Companies Act''; H.R. 2354, the ''Streamlining Excessive and Costly Regulations Review Act''; H.R. 2356, the ''Fair Access to Investment Research Act of 2015''; H.R. 2357, the ''Accelerating Access to Capital Act of 2015''; and a resolution to name a new Republican Member of the Committee to subcommittees, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled ''Egypt Two Years After Morsi: Part I'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn. Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, markup on H.R. 1853, to direct the President to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan in the International Criminal Police Organization, and for other purposes; and H. Res. 235, expressing deepest condolences to and solidarity with the people of Nepal following the devastating earthquake on April 25, 2015; hearing entitled ''Everest Trembled: Lessons Learned from the Nepal Earthquake Response'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''Developments in Rwanda'', 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1300, the ''First Responder Anthrax Preparedness Act''; H.R. 1615, the ''DHS FOIA Efficiency Act of 2015''; H.R. 1626, the ''DHS IT Duplication Reduction Act of 2015''; H.R. 1633, the ''DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015''; H.R. 1637, the ''Federally Funded Research and Development

Sunshine Act of 2015''; H.R. 1640, the ''Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015''; H.R. 1646, the ''Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act''; H.R. 1738, the ''Integrated Public Alert and Warning System Modernization Act of 2015''; H.R. 2200, the ''CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2015''; H.R. 2206, the ''SWIC Enhancement Act''; and H.R. 2390, the ''Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act'', 11 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, hearing on the United States Capitol Police, 2 p.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Federal Lands; and Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans, joint hearing on a discussion draft of a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes, 9:30 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on a discussion draft titled the ''National Energy Security Corridors Act'', 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans, hearing on the ''Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act'', 1:30 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''State Perspectives on the Status of Cooperating Agencies for the Office of Surface Mining's Stream Protection Rule'', 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled ''Advancing Commercial Weather Data: Collaborative Efforts to Improve Forecasts'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Across Town, Across Oceans: Expanding the Role of Small Business in Global Commerce'', 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2322, the ''Public Buildings Reform and Savings Act of 2015''; H.R. 2131, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the ''J. Waties Waring Judicial Center''; and two General Services Administration Resolutions, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways And Means, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing entitled ''Examining the Use of Administrative Actions in the Implementation of the Affordable Care Act'', 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 20

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 1314, Ensuring Tax Exempt Organizations the Right to Appeal Act. The filing deadline for first-degree amendments to the bill and to Hatch Amendment No. 1221 to the bill is at 1 p.m.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

10 a.m., Wednesday, May 20

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 880—American Research and Competitiveness Act (Subject to a Rule) and H.R. 1806—America COMPETES Reauthorization Act (Subject to a Rule).

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.