United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 2015 *No. 11*

House of Representatives

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

PRAYER

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

Thank You, God, for giving us another day.

Even before the first word is spoken this day, O Lord, guide our minds, thoughts, hearts, and desires. Breathe into the Members of this House a new spirit. Shape this Congress and our world according to Your design that all might fulfill Your holy will.

Bless the Members of this assembly with attentive hearts and open minds, that through the diversity of ideas they may sort out what is best for our Nation.

May all speech in this assembly be deliberately free of all prejudice so that others might listen wholeheartedly. Then all dialogue will be mutually respectful, surprising even us with unity and justice.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BONAMICI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

FACTS REVEAL PRESIDENT'S JOB FAILURE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the President's State of the Union speech was a disconnect with the American people who live and feel the failures of his policies. That is why the voters clearly spoke to stop tax increases destroying jobs in favor of the Republican bipartisan legislation to create jobs.

Big Government fails. The real facts threatening the middle class are: $869.3 billion total taxes in ObamaCare, according to the Congressional Budget Office; 5.5 million Americans who have fallen into poverty since Obama became President, U.S. Census Bureau; 401,000 construction jobs lost since Obama became President, Bureau of Labor Statistics; $2,484 decline in the median household income since Obama became President, U.S. Census Bureau.

Again, the President should stop, change course, and work with Republicans for legislation that promotes small business jobs.

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

Welcome, right to life marchers, to Washington today.

CONGRESS SHOULD FOCUS ON AMERICA'S TOP PRIORITIES

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, just the night before last the President addressed this body and laid out an agenda that we all might not agree with certain elements, but there are elements that we could certainly act upon.

We could take up an infrastructure bill. We could take up legislation that would assure every young person the ability to go to community college. We could take up the big questions that the American people expect us to address that are important to growing our economy. But we are not doing that.

Instead, this morning, the leadership will present to this body legislation that will again seek to curtail the health care rights of women, not because you have some expectation that it will become law, but I believe because it is just another attempt to pander to the more extreme voices of the base.

The President and others have called to us to elevate the dialogue in Congress and elevate our aspirations for our country.

We have legislation before us that would put limitations on the choices that women have and even deny access to abortion services to save the life of a mother. This is the wrong direction. We need to reject it.

LAVONIA POLICE OFFICERS OF THE YEAR

(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, I am honored today to rise in recognition of three police officers from the Lavonia, Georgia, Police Department.

Officers Harold McCroskey, Brandon Brown, and Blake Andrews are selfless public servants who have committed

their lives to protect ours. The Lavonia Police Department named Officers McCroskey, Andrews, and Brown their 2014 Officers of the Year.

Our corner of northeast Georgia is safe and peaceful thanks in part to the service of these three brave officers. On behalf of my family, Franklin County, and the Ninth Congressional District of Georgia, I offer my gratitude and respect.

The entire department deserves recognition in Congress because Chief Bruce Carlisle and his squad are proud, patriotic Americans. Not only do they keep their local community safe, but they give to charity. This month, they started a scholarship fund in honor of their friend Deputy Steven LaCruz, who died in pursuit of a traffic violator.

As the son of a Georgia State trooper, I am honored by their sacrifice, inspired by their courage, and remain committed to working on their behalf here in Congress.

CONGRESS SHOULD HELP WOMEN AND FAMILIES

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, in 1973, 42 years ago, the Supreme Court ruled in Roe v. Wade that women have the right to safe and legal abortion.

I remember the days before that landmark decision. Mr. Speaker, over the centuries it has been clear, when abortion is illegal, it does not go away but is very unsafe.

On this anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we should commit to reducing unwanted pregnancies. We should commit to making family planning services more available.

To help women and families, we should be passing the Paycheck Fairness Act for equal pay and a robust infrastructure plan for jobs across this country.

To help women and families, let's stop trying to take away women's rights. Let's protect their health care. Let's pass the Women's Health Protection Act and say ''no'' to unconstitutional attempts to restrict the right of women to safe and legal abortion.

I AM DISAPPOINTED BUT HOPEFUL

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today sad and disappointed.

I am sad and disappointed that in a nation as great as this, lives of so many of our unborn children are ended through abortion.

I am disappointed that we have not moved past this blot on our Nation's history and forward into respecting the dignity of all humans, born and unborn.

I am disappointed that so many of my colleagues here continue to ignore the science that shows over and over the self-evident life in the womb.

Even so, I am more hopeful than ever before there is good news to celebrate. Abortion numbers are down, as are teen pregnancies. States have passed record numbers of laws to protect women's health and the lives of the unborn.

Today on The National Mall, I look forward to seeing the thousands of teenagers and young adults marching hand in hand to the Supreme Court. Their generation is our hope to bring about a culture of life.

LET'S KEEP OUR MARITIME INDUSTRY STRONG

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on Congress to oppose efforts that would undermine our domestic maritime industry and workforce.

Ninety-five years ago, Congress recognized the critical importance of maintaining a strong domestic maritime fleet by passing the Merchant Marine Act, also known as the Jones Act.

Congress is now considering unraveling a law that has played a key role in ensuring the development of a robust shipyard industrial base that supports our national economy, our military, and our homeland security.

The Jones Act has also guaranteed that the United States has highly trained and skilled mariners who can be called into service during times of national emergency so America can build ships for America.

We saw how commercial vessels flying the American flag played a major role in providing the mariners needed to operate sealift vessels activated from reserve status in support of Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom.

This is about American jobs. In 2012, the maritime industry employed more than 57,000 workers and supported $15.2 billion in gross business income in Washington State alone. In the Pacific Northwest, we understand the importance of the Jones Act.

Why would Congress kill good American jobs?

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that Congress will reject efforts to undermine the Jones Act and I will continue working with my colleagues to show our strong support for our country's domestic maritime industry and its workers.

MAKING LNG EXPORTS EASIER BY CUTTING RED TAPE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, too often good ideas get lost in bureaucratic red tape. Today we have the opportunity to start cutting that tape away.

H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, requires a timely decision to be made on liquefied natural gas projects around the country, projects that have been held back by unnecessary regulations.

This bill streamlines the review process, getting these projects off of paper and in place, and once these projects start, countless economic opportunities will begin as well.

More jobs, decreased dependency on foreign oil, and a modernized energy sector are waiting. All we need to do is cut the tape and let these opportunities flourish.

This is a commonsense economic step towards a healthier economy. I am proud to support H.R. 161 and the energizing opportunities that come with its passage.

POLITICIANS SHOULDN'T MAKE MEDICAL DECISIONS FOR WOMEN

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, if you thought the 114th Congress would be different, think again. If you thought Republicans were ready to put partisan politics behind them, think again. If you thought they had finally ended their war on women, think again.

Last night, thanks to Republican women and their supporters, the Republicans abandoned their effort to pass a 20-week abortion ban even for women who were victims of rape or incest.

But instead of respecting women this morning, the Republicans are coming back to the floor again, this time attempting to deny women access to their constitutionally protected right to safe and legal abortions by restricting coverage to abortions—including in private plans purchased with women's private dollars.

This is harmful to women and continues to ignore the American people, who believe that women and their doctors should make important medical decisions, not politicians.

Roe v. Wade wasn't the beginning of women having abortions. It was the end of women dying from abortions.

REMEMBERING STEVE J. BRATKA

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the loss of a dear friend, Steve Bratka, past president of the Tarrrant County Stonewall Democrats.

Mr. Bratka was studying at the University of Nebraska, where he developed a passion to work in the railroad industry.

Over 40 years, Mr. Bratka held several leadership positions and was promoted into the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers in 1975.

In 1991, Steve relocated to Fort Worth, where he served as vice chairman until he retired.

He was very engaged in the community. As one of the founding members of the Texas Stonewall Democrats, Mr. Bratka inspired colleagues to run for local positions to improve our community.

Mr. Bratka left his mark on Fort Worth by standing up for those who had no voice and mentoring dozens of local chairmen to help them become qualified representatives.

Mr. Bratka is survived by his husband, Tim; sister, Connie Benjamin; brother, Lex Bratka, and his wife, Patty Burwell; four nieces; and eight great-nieces and -nephews.

Mr. Bratka's leadership and legacy in the Fort Worth community will be celebrated this Saturday at the Southside Preservation Hall.

Mr. Bratka was a great guy to everyone who knew him, and everyone is sad for his loss but remember him fondly for just being a great person.

□ 0915

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2015

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 42 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 42

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions. 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 Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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

Ms. FOXX. 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 42 provides for a closed rule allowing consideration of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Since 1973, at least 52 million children's lives have been tragically taken by abortion in the United States. It is unconscionable that in America, where we fight for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we tolerate this systematic extermination of an entire generation of the most vulnerable among us.

In the midst of that darkness, there has been one area of consensus, Mr. Speaker: protecting taxpayers from paying for a practice they sincerely oppose. Since 1976, the Hyde amendment, which prohibits the Federal funding of abortions, has been included in relevant appropriations bills. Each year it has been consistently renewed and supported by congressional majorities and Presidents of both parties.

NARAL, an abortion advocacy group, has suggested that prohibiting public funds for abortion reduces abortion rates by roughly 50 percent. That means that half of the women who would have otherwise had a publicly funded abortion end up carrying their baby to term.

In 1993, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that the Hyde amendment prevented as many as 675,000 abortions every single year. That means that millions of Americans are alive today because of the Hyde amendment. After 38 years, it is time for this lifesaving amendment to become permanent law.

When Barack Obama was elected in 2008, a myriad of long-established laws, including the Hyde amendment, created a mostly uniform policy that Federal programs did not pay for abortion or subsidize health plans that included coverage of abortion, with only narrow exceptions.

Unfortunately, ObamaCare destroyed that longstanding policy, bypassing the Hyde amendment restriction and paving the way for publicly funded abortions. The President's health care law authorized massive Federal subsidies to assist millions of Americans to purchase private health plans that will cover abortions on demand. In other words, Mr. Speaker, hard-earned taxpayer dollars are now being used to pay for elective abortions. This is simply unacceptable.

H.R. 7 will codify the principles of the Hyde amendment on a permanent, governmentwide basis, which means that it will apply to longstanding Federal health programs such as Medicaid, SCHIP, and Federal employees' health benefits, as well as to new programs created by ObamaCare.

H.R. 7 prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortions. It does so by, one, prohibiting all Federal funding for abortions; two, prohibiting Federal subsidies for ACA health care plans that include coverage for abortion; three, prohibiting the use of Federal facilities for abortion; and four, prohibiting Federal employees from performing abortions.

This commonsense measure, which restores a longstanding bipartisan agreement, protects the unborn and prevents taxpayers from being forced to fund thousands of abortions.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote to respect our Nation's consensus on abortion funding and affirm life by voting in favor of this rule and H.R. 7.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, down the hall in the old House Chamber stands Clio, Muse of History. Perched atop the room, she is riding the Chariot of Time. She has watched silently over the proceedings of this House since 1807. And in the folio that rests in the crook of her arm, she records every move, large and small, for the benefit of all generations, past, present, and future. What she is recording today is, I am certain, a disappointment.

The proceedings playing out before us today show a blatant, overt disrespect for the time-honored rules of this House, first written by Thomas Jefferson in 1801.

The bill that was supposed to come to the floor today, a bill that would have stripped women of their right to constitutionally protected medical care, was so odious and destructive that some of the women of the Republican Conference rebelled against it. It was based on unsound and fictitious science and caused such a meltdown in the Republican Conference that the House majority pulled it from the floor for fear that it wouldn't pass. But something had to be done because visitors were coming to town for the 42nd anniversary of the landmark Supreme Court decision Roe v. Wade.

On this day, there are floods of visitors here in the Nation's Capital to fight against that ruling, to protest that decision, and to raise their clarion call against a woman's right to choose.

In this current Congress, this bill was not brought to us under regular order—as not many are. It had no committee action. It had no hearings, no markup, no witnesses testified in favor or against it, and it came out of the Rules Committee and to the floor today under a closed rule.

One of the ever-ready alternatives came to us late last night, and it is even worse than the one it replaced. It seems that the majority has an endless supply of bills attacking women's health. Can't pass this one? Grab another. Can't pass that one? Just take the next one. Their insistence on attacking women's health seemingly knows no bounds.

Because this bill has not seen any committee action in the current Congress, no one has been able to read it or to weigh in on it or amend it, and some of us would like a clarification on the sordid history of this bill.

In the earliest version of this bill, which was in the 112th Congress, there was a phrase that lit a firestorm across the Nation. It was ''forcible rape.'' The bill was, indeed, the one that would have required women to prove that

their rape was ''forcible'' so it could be categorized as ''legitimate.'' Has nothing been learned here?

The next iteration of the bill, in the 113th Congress, included a provision—and listen to this, America—that would have required the IRS to audit women who had had abortions to ensure that the pregnancy that they terminated had been the result of rape or incest.

This extreme legislation, which is a dust-covered holdover from the last Congress, was originally sponsored by a man, originated from a subcommittee composed of 13 men, and was passed out of the Judiciary Committee with the votes of 21 Republican men. Remember those pictures, America, all of those men sitting there deciding what women's health would be about? It is a perfect illustration of a problem we have had for a long time, that men in blue suits and red ties determine what women can and should do when it comes to their own health or bodies.

This bill is absolutely a solution in search of a problem. As Ms. FOXX pointed out, all this is taken care of. There is no tax money for abortions. The bill in its current form would permanently prohibit low-income women, civil servants, District of Columbia residents, and military women from accessing a full range of reproductive services by codifying the Hyde amendment, which unfortunately already requires no taxpayer funds be spent on abortions except in very limited services. It has been this way for decades. Congress should be repealing these unfair and discriminatory bans, not doubling down on them.

Are these provisions still in the current bill text before us? We have had no chance to check, and it has been awhile since we have seen this bill.

This display is a messaging opportunity and another attempt to dismantle the Affordable Care Act. This bill not only threatens women who buy their insurance on public exchanges with Federal tax credits but also threatens women who use their own private money to pay for their health insurance on the exchanges. Experts tell us this would jeopardize the availability of abortion coverage for all women, no matter where they buy their insurance.

When the House considered this bill in the previous Congress, it was attempt number 49. Today, it is attempt number 55. That is right, ladies and gentlemen, 55 votes the majority has held in this Chamber to take health care away from their own constituents. The House majority has wasted nearly $80 million of taxpayer money to destroy the Affordable Care Act.

Infrastructure money, anyone?

Time and again, we see the House majority turn their backs on the people they represent and force an extreme agenda, one filled with poison pills that would take our country backward, backward to a time when women died from back-alley abortions; backward to a time of women in desperate circumstances seeking illegal procedures performed by strangers with dirty hands in unspeakable conditions; backward to a time when medical choices were not the choice of the woman, but of the public; backward to a time when women who ''got themselves into trouble'' by getting pregnant could not work and could not go to school.

These choices are personal. They are not public. A woman's actions regarding her own reproductive health should include anyone she deems appropriate, not politicians in Washington or State capitals scoring political points off her health care.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, as my colleague knows, this legislation is identical to H.R. 7, which passed the House last Congress after moving through regular order, including a full committee markup.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of the strongest champions of life in this House.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and for her leadership, and for reminding us that this bill passed the House last year in identical form. The only thing changed are the dates, because obviously they had to be updated. It is a 12-page bill which can be very quickly read by any Member. And the only reason we have to be here is because the Senate wouldn't provide a vote on it. So the Senate just shelved it, and we are now bringing it back up on the floor.

Madam Speaker, because abortion dismembers, decapitates, or chemically poisons unborn children to death—the part of abortion that my friends on the other side of this issue have a keen reluctance to not look at and to avoid, abortion methods—we know we will soon have the pain-capable legislation on the floor, and it will come to the floor. We know that children suffer excruciating pain from dismemberment. Piece by piece, a child is literally pulled apart—arms, legs, torso, and decapitation. That is the reality of abortion, Madam Speaker.

Because of all of this, Americans have consistently demanded—and now in ever-growing numbers—that public funds not pay for abortion. I would point out to my colleagues that yesterday the Marist Poll found that 68 percent of Americans oppose taxpayer funding for abortions, and that includes 69 percent of women; 71 percent of the next generation, the millennials, oppose taxpayer funding for abortion.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 will save lives. We know the Hyde amendment has probably saved at least 1 million lives, children who are on soccer fields today or in school, perhaps even getting married, people who live because the Hyde amendment has been in effect since the 1970s. Over a million children are alive because of that restriction of abortion from Medicaid funding.

□ 0930

H.R. 7 seeks to accomplish three goals. It makes the Hyde amendment and other current funding prohibitions permanent, so they don't have to be included in the annual appropriations bills. It ensures that the Affordable Care Act faithfully conforms with the Hyde amendment, as promised by the President.

It provides full disclosure, transparency, and prominent display of the extent to which any health insurance plan on the exchange funds abortion. Now, that is all being done stealthily, hidden from the consumer. They have no idea when they are buying a plan that the plan is paying for abortion on demand.

Let me remind my colleagues that in the runup to passage of the Affordable Care Act, Americans were assured by President Obama himself, right there at the podium, and he said in September of 2009 that ''under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortion.'' That is the President's word.

He also said on March 24, 2010, in order to get a number of pro-life Democrats, he gave them his word and wrote that the Affordable Care Act ''maintains current Hyde amendment restrictions governing abortion policy and extends those restrictions to newly created health insurance exchanges.'' Nothing, Madam Speaker, could be further from the truth.

We asked the General Accountability Office last year to look into how many of these plans were paying for abortion. They came back and said well over 1,000 insurance plans on the exchange were funding abortion on demand, completely contrary to what our President told us would be the case in a speech to all of us in 2009 and then in an executive order that he issued.

Agree or disagree on the abortion issue, but let's always be truthful. President Obama told us funding wouldn't be in there, yet it is.

There is also problems with transparency. Senator Ben Nelson, in order to procure his vote, said there has to be two payments for abortion if it is included when the bill is on the Senate side.

He said: ''If you are receiving Federal assistance to buy insurance and if that plan has any abortion coverage, the insurance company must bill you separately, and you must pay separately from your own personal funds—perhaps a credit card transaction, your separate personal check, or automatic withdrawal from your bank account—for that abortion coverage. Now, let me say that again. You have to write two checks: one for the basic policy and one for the additional coverage for abortion.''

That is not being implemented either, so the premium is all rolled into one. Again, conscientious pro-life Americans who do not want to be complicit in the wounding of women and the killing of babies are paying for

abortion, and many of them don't even know it.

I hope that Members will vote for the rule, and to those who think that there will be no debate and vote on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, that will come to the floor; and, again, you defend dismemberment abortions at 20 weeks, 21 weeks, 23 weeks, where the child suffers excruciating pain.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say there is no scientific evidence at all. As a matter of fact, gynecologists have all written to us—and we have their statements—that there is no way of fetal pain at 20 weeks.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD, as a woman and as a Member of Congress and a citizen of the United States, that the House should vote for bigger paychecks, and they should vote for better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend for a moment.

The Chair would advise Members that although a unanimous consent request to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple, declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the pending measure, embellishments beyond that standard constitute debate and can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

The Chair will entertain as many requests to insert as may be necessary to accommodate Members, but the Chair also must ask Members to cooperate by confining such remarks to the proper form.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Chair is correct, and we will do that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) to speak as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

H.R. 7 is yet another direct attack on women and their families. It creates sweeping new restrictions on abortion coverage for women who purchase insurance under the Affordable Care Act, with no meaningful exception to protect a woman's health, and experts predict that it could cause many insurers to limit women's health options in their plans altogether.

This bill injects ideology into personal medical decisions and puts politicians, rather than doctors, in charge of women's health care. Instead of this extreme legislation, Congress should address the real challenges facing women and families today.

At a time when 42 million women are either living in poverty or on the brink of it, Congress must do more to help. We should be focused on expanding access to child care, providing workers with paid sick leave, and ensuring women equal pay for equal work. This bill does none of these. It fails women and their families.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on both the rule and H.R. 7.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Dr. BABIN.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. It is plain wrong to use America's hard-earned tax dollars to pay for abortions.

On September 9, 2009, President Obama told the joint session of Congress:

One more misunderstanding I want to clear up—under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortions,

and Federal conscience laws will remain in place.

Those of us in the pro-life community knew that this was simply not the case, and last September, the Government Accountability Office confirmed that, under ObamaCare, abortions are being paid for with taxpayer funds by more than 1,000 ObamaCare exchange plans across the country.

Our bill ends taxpayer funding for abortion, fulfilling one of the promises that this President has broken. Let's pass this bill and end the largest expansion of taxpayer-funded abortion in American history.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

I, too, rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

Today, on the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we should be celebrating it, not dismantling it. I heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about pain.

Well, do you want to know about pain? Think back in horror to the perils for our mothers, our daughters, and our sisters in the days before the Supreme Court ruled that women have a constitutional right to make our own personal health care decisions.

Back then, our country faced a public health crisis as women were maimed, made sterile, and lost their lives as a result of self-inflicted or illegal abortions. I remember finding a friend who was near death as a result of a back alley procedure.

Since Roe v. Wade, State after State, including Florida, my home State, has passed onerous laws criminalizing doctors, requiring unnecessary tests, and other insidious obstructions to prevent access to abortion.

Today, Congress again piles on to the damage hurting the poorest of our citizens.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Here is a much better way to make lives better for our children, and that is to allow their mothers to live full, productive lives; and instead of this bill, pass the Women's Health Protection Act to ensure that no matter where a woman lives, she has access to the resources needed to make her own health care decisions.

We cannot and will not go back.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan, Dr. BENISHEK.

Mr. BENISHEK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rights of the unborn and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule.

I, along with many in northern Michigan, believe that life inside the womb is just as precious as life outside the womb and must be protected. Both unborn and born children have a right to life.

The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act will ensure that taxpayer dollars are not used to subsidize a practice that so many of my constituents cannot condone. Your hard-earned tax dollars should not be used to pay for abortions.

I served as a doctor for 30 years in northern Michigan, and I have had the awesome gift of witnessing the miracle of new life in the delivery room. I have also been blessed with the experience as a father and a grandfather, and I know how life-changing this event can be.

I want to commend the pro-life grassroots efforts led by passionate advocates in our local communities. Thank you for the hard work that you do to educate our communities on the value of life.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

□ 0945

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, despite the misleading title of this bill, the fact is that there is no Federal taxpayer funding of abortion right now except in very limited circumstances.

H.R. 7 would for the first time place restrictions on how women with private insurance can spend private dollars in purchasing health care. It would also likely result in the loss of access to comprehensive health care for millions of women who work for small businesses or who will be purchasing insurance in the Health Insurance Marketplaces. Politicians are not medical experts and should not be dictating health care decisions for women.

House Republicans are scrambling this morning to consider the rule for H.R. 7 at the last minute because it became clear that the overly restrictive and unconstitutional 20-week abortion ban would fail a floor vote. Why? Because Americans support comprehensive health care for all women. House Republicans should be bringing up bills to strengthen the economy, to guarantee women equal pay for equal work, to raise the minimum wage, to make child care affordable, and not limit a woman's access to health services in a desperate attempt to relitigate a very divisive issue.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, codifies many longstanding pro-life protections that have been passed under both Republican- and Democrat-controlled Congresses. The majority of taxpayers oppose Federal funding for abortion, as demonstrated in poll after poll:

A recent Marist poll showed that 58 percent of respondents oppose or strongly oppose using any tax dollars for abortions;

During the ObamaCare debate, a 2010 Zogby/O'Leary poll found that 76 percent of Americans said that Federal funds should never pay for an abortion or should pay only to save the life of the mother;

A January 2010 Quinnipiac University poll showed that 67 percent of respondents opposed the Federal funding of abortion;

An April 2011 CNN poll showed that 61 percent of respondents opposed public funding for abortion;

A November 2009 Washington Post poll showed that 61 percent of respondents opposed government subsidies for health insurance that include abortion;

A September 2009 International Communications Research poll showed that 67 percent of respondents opposed any measure that would ''require people to pay for abortion coverage with their Federal taxes.''

In other words, Madam Speaker, the American people do not want the government spending their hard-earned tax dollars to destroy innocent human life—period.

Like most taxpayers, employers also prefer plans that preclude abortion coverage. According to the insurance industry's trade association, ''Most insurers offer plans that include abortion coverage, but most employers choose not to offer it as part of their benefits packages.''

Even Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI has voted numerous times to prohibit taxpayer funding for abortion in the District of Columbia. President Obama voted against the taxpayer funding of abortion in the District of Columbia twice when he was in the Senate, and since being elected, he has signed appropriations legislation into law that prohibits this funding.

As you can see, Madam Speaker, opposition to taxpayer funding for abortion is bipartisan, bicameral, and is supported by the majority of the American people. It is time to restore the status quo on the government funding of abortion and make this widely supported policy permanent across the Federal Government. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and H.R. 7.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I will comment on the demerits of this terrible bill in the debate on the bill. I want to comment now on how this bill got before us.

This is, I think, the fifth bill we have considered in this Congress. Not one of those bills went through committee. Not one of those bills had a markup, a hearing, an opportunity for people to amend the bills in committee, and now the bills come to the floor for an hour

of debate with no opportunity to offer amendments. This is hardly the transparency and the due process that the GOP leaders promised us.

This bill is even worse because this bill was not on the calendar until late last night. Yesterday, when the Republican anti-choice women rebelled at the terrible rape provisions of the bill we were supposed to debate today and when they found they couldn't pass a bill today on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, they brought another off-the-shelf bill, which is a terrible bill, with no hearing in committee, no debate in committee, no markup, no opportunity to offer amendments, no vote in committee, no opportunity to offer amendments on the floor.

This is not the way you run or should run the House of Representatives of the United States. It is a shameful procedure for a shameful bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I just want to remind my colleagues that H.R. 7 passed last year. It passed with an overwhelming majority. It is the same bill. It went through regular order. Hearings and a markup were held, and the legislation came through regular order in the House of Representatives. The problem has been the Senate, which has refused to take up this bill for well over a year, so we are back to take up a bill that has already been approved by the House in regular order.

Let me remind my colleagues as well that, next week, we will be taking up a number of bills that will combat human trafficking. Madam Speaker, I am the prime sponsor of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, Americans' landmark law to combat the hideous crime of sex trafficking and labor trafficking.

We have a number of important antihuman trafficking bills that passed the House but sat over on the Senate side for a year or more—some of them—including two of mine, and we are talking about bringing those bills up next week. Regular order was followed last year on those bills—just like H.R. 7. Those bills languished on the Senate side. Surely, we can come together to combat human trafficking. The flaw in the process was the Senate and its former leadership unwillingness to vote on House-passed legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. DEGETTE. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, I am going to state this as simply as I can. There is no public funding for abortion. Whether you like it or not, the Hyde amendment, which has been the law of this land for decades now, says there is no public funding for abortion. That has not changed. There is no public funding for abortion under the Affordable Care Act or any other government program.

This bill would vastly expand the current restrictions on a woman's right to get her own health care through her insurance, with her own private money, that she, her family, and her doctor think she needs. Let me say how this would work. Under H.R. 7, people who buy their insurance in exchanges—and their employers—now would not be able to spend their own private dollars to buy insurance that they need for themselves and their families.

This not only would be a radical expansion over current law, it would be a terrible wedge between patients and their doctors. I do not care how many polls there are that you might cite, because the vast majority of Americans think that a woman's private health care decisions should be made between herself, her family, and her doctor—certainly, not by politicians in Washington, D.C.

H.R. 7 is an idea that has been proposed time and again. It is not going anywhere. I am sure it will probably pass this House today, and it will go over to the other body, and it will die. If not, the President will veto it.

Here are my questions to my friends on the other side of the aisle: Why aren't we spending this week talking about how the women of America can get better paychecks? Why aren't we spending our time talking this week about how the women and men of America can get tax credits so that the children they do have can go to child care that is quality child care? Why aren't we spending our time this week talking about how women and men should be able to get paid the same amount for doing the very same job?

That is what I think this Congress should be spending its time doing, not passing these bills which are false statements about a woman's private decisions about her health care. I urge the body to defeat this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to say as forcefully as I can that there is nothing in H.R. 7 that restricts the private sale of plans that include abortion. There is nothing in H.R. 7 that restricts the private sale of plans that include abortion. Consistent with the Hyde amendment, the bill ensures that Federal dollars—wherever those Federal dollars come from—do not subsidize plans that cover abortion.

What is important to explain is that the Hyde amendment has only in the past applied to annual appropriations bills. As we have done our best to explain to the American people, ObamaCare is not subject to annual appropriations bills but is funded under mandatory spending. Therefore, Madam Speaker, it is important that we codify that no Federal funds can be used for abortions. That is what this bill does.

If our colleagues believe it is unnecessary, then they should have no problem voting for it because, then, it is not doing anything that violates what has been done in the past. However, this bill is necessary. Let me say again, Madam Speaker, that H.R. 7 simply codifies the longstanding bipartisan agreement that Federal taxpayer funding should not be used to destroy innocent life.

H.R. 7 does so by establishing a permanent, governmentwide prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion and abortion coverage, including cutting off taxpayer funding for plans that include abortion under ObamaCare;

It prevents funding for abortion in government programs like Medicaid, the Federal Health Benefits Program, and the Children's Health Insurance Program;

The bill also ensures that subsidies made available in the form of refundable tax credits under the ACA are prevented from flowing to plans that include abortion;

H.R. 7 also explicitly states that private individuals may purchase separate abortion coverage or plans that include abortion as long as no Federal subsidies are used to pay for the abortion coverage. Similarly, H.R. 7 explicitly states that insurance companies may offer abortion coverage as long as the coverage is not paid for by using taxpayer dollars.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you to my colleague from North Carolina for, once again, being such a strong defender of life.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for H.R. 7. I believe in the sanctity of human life and that life begins at conception and ends at death. My life's experiences as a mom, as a nurse, and as a Christian have helped me to form these core beliefs.

I have held the hands of newborn infants, and I have held the hands of elderly patients in the last moments of their lives. I have been blessed to have had such special moments, and because of them, I know that every life is precious and is a gift from God and that it is not for us to judge its worth.

Madam Speaker, the unborn need us to stand up for them and to be the voice that they do not have. I support this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

□ 1000

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that we have heard what is in this bill, but this bill was taken out of the used-bill freezer last night at 9 o'clock, against all the rules, and put on the floor today. We really don't know what is in this bill.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my friend from Rochester for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, if at first you don't succeed, try again. That is clearly what my Republican colleagues are doing this morning.

The bill Republicans initially attempted to bring to the floor today would have required women to go to the police before they could even address their own health care needs. They abandoned that first line of attack on women's health because it was too extreme, even for members of their own party. But they weren't going to let something like that stop them from pandering to the rightwing flank. Fortunately for the Republicans, they have a long list of bills that attack health care and women's access to care. So it is easy for them to just swap it out for another extremist effort. Their partisan base will be happy—but at the expense of the health of many women and families in our country.

This bill will have a serious impact on families' ability to make their own health care decisions. It will raise taxes on hardworking Americans just if they happen to choose a health care plan that this majority doesn't like. And for what? So my Republican colleagues can score cheap political points.

This is not what the American people want. They want an agenda that lifts people up. They want us to be working on legislation that creates jobs, boosts paychecks in this country, and strengthens our economy. This bill will do none of these things. It is nothing but a cynical attempt to put politics where it doesn't belong.

Vote ''no'' on this rule and vote ''no'' on this blatant political gambit.

I understand how embarrassing this may be to the Republicans because of the little snafu within their own caucus, but please put aside this petty politics. Let's get on to the real business of creating more jobs in this country and boosting a person's pay in this land. That is what the American people want and need.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her diligence and efforts on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I think we all are pleased to have so many of our constituents in town today who are supporting life and supporting that concept of life, liberty, and freedom.

It is such an honor today to come to the floor and talk about an issue that 68 percent of the American people agree on. Listening to my colleagues talking about how this is partisan and just for our base, I am glad that they think 68 percent of the American people are our base—because they do agree with us. Seventy-one percent of millennials agree with us on this issue. And the issue is simply this: there should not be taxpayer dollars used to pay for abortions.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has done a tremendous amount of work on this bill. I thank him for his diligence, his attention, and for working to get H.R. 7 in the right form, ready to move forward and to bring this issue into the light.

We have got three things we want to focus on in this bill. Number one, there is enormous bipartisan support—I would say near unanimous bipartisan support—for the Hyde amendment language. Title I of this bill is going to make that permanent.

Madam Speaker, what that means is no longer do we have to revote this over and over and over. The Hyde amendment language will be the applied standard.

Title II of this bill will apply that to ObamaCare.

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, what it will do is apply that to ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act.

Now the reason it is imperative, the President promised on numerous occasions, Madam Speaker, that there would be no taxpayer dollars, which become Federal funds, used for abortion. This was a big debate as we went through the Affordable Care Act.

What we have learned from not us but from the GAO is that we have in the marketplace 1,036 plans. We have over 1,000 plans that allow those dollars into those plans. What this bill will also do is bring transparency not only to the plans but to the money flow, so that hardworking American taxpayers who do not want their money used to pay for abortion—68 percent agree with us—will have clarity and certainty on the issue.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the distinguished ranking member.

Madam Speaker, I am totally puzzled. I came to the floor thinking that we were going to be focused on creating jobs, putting people to work, helping our young people go to college, and reducing student loan debts. Where is the regular procedure that my friends on the other side of the aisle were going to bring to the House? Where did this bill come from? Did it come from the committee process? No.

Let me make this very, very clear. I knew Henry Hyde. I worked with Henry Hyde. The Hyde amendment is the law of the land. There is no public money for abortion.

This is a radical bill that restricts women paying for private insurance with their own dollars. Millions of women would lose comprehensive health care. I just don't understand it.

As an appropriator, we still have not brought the Homeland Security bill to the floor. As a resident of New York, I am concerned by possible attacks.

Let's do our work. Let's move on.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. LOWEY. To my friends on the other side of the aisle, this bill just came to the floor without serious discussion and when there is no public money for abortion today as a result of the Hyde amendment.

I look forward to bringing a Homeland Security bill to the floor. As I began to say, as a New Yorker, I am concerned about potential threats to our country.

Let's get to work. Let's create jobs. Let's do the work that our citizens—our constituents—brought us here to do. I don't understand this bill. And in closing, there is no public money for abortion.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The passage of H.R. 7 will be welcome news for the majority of Americans who do not want their tax dollars paying for the grisly business of abortion. This bill will make existing policies like the Hyde amendment permanent and will rid ObamaCare of its massive expansion of public funding for abortion insurance plans.

The President repeatedly assured Americans that ObamaCare would ''maintain current Hyde amendment restrictions governing abortion policy and extend those restrictions to newly created health insurance exchanges.'' Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, that promise didn't pan out. It now joins ''if you like your plan, you can keep it'' in President Obama's panoply of broken promises.

Madam Speaker, today, hundreds of thousands of Americans are coming to Washington, D.C., to brave the cold and march for life. Participants hail from all 50 States, have various religions, and are from all different walks of life and ages. But the one thing they have in common is the shared dedication to protecting the unborn.

The March for Life gives a voice to the voiceless and sends a powerful message to the Representatives of the people assembled here in Congress. It is heartening that so many Americans of different backgrounds are willing to take a stand for life.

Madam Speaker, this is not a partisan issue and this is not a partisan bill. H.R. 7 reflects the bipartisan, bicameral agreement that our government should not be in the business of subsidizing abortions. This is not a radical idea. It is a commonsense proposal that codifies a longstanding compromise. Therefore, I again urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and H.R. 7.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlewoman from

the great State of New York for her extraordinary leadership on the Rules Committee and in so many areas for this country and our State.

I rise today in strong opposition to yet another closed rule. Despite all the lectures from Republicans about how creating jobs and growing the economy should be the number one top priority for this Congress, here we are instead once again hammering away at a woman's right to make her own choices, control her own body, and make choices about her own health care.

It is insulting to women, and it does not create one single job. But what it does do is put government between a physician and its patient. That is what it does. The other side says they want freedom and they want the government off their back. Yet on the most personal health care decisions for women, they are putting government between a woman and her doctor.

This bill will not grow our economy, but it will make permanent such discriminatory bans that target women in both the public and private health insurance market.

Republicans claim on their Web site—you can look it up and see it on their Web site—that they want to ''do something for the 8.7 million people in America who are still unemployed.'' It is time to focus on creating jobs and improving the economy for Americans, yet the first bill the Republican majority puts on the floor does not create one single job but discriminates, hurts, and insults women.

I urge a strong, strong ''no'' vote on this rule and on the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding and also for being very vigilant in protecting women, women's right to privacy, and alerting us as to the dangers in this very terrible rule and terrible bill.

Madam Speaker, first of all, once again, as I said yesterday, this is just downright wrong. This is a horrible bill. This takes away a woman's right to privacy. Again, I thought in our country we prided ourselves on the right to privacy.

Women have a right to determine their own health care decisions. They can make these decisions with whomever they deem appropriate. There is no way that Members of Congress should intervene, direct, or superimpose views and government policies on women's health care and women's right to privacy.

□ 1015

Once again, the Hyde amendment was passed, I believe it was—what—in the seventies. We should be providing access to women's health care so low-income women would have the same opportunities to determine their own health care decisions as other women who have the access, but Federal funds haven't been allowed for many, many years now.

I don't know why these bogus arguments are being made on this bill because we don't have Federal funding of abortions, and I think women know that and see this as a real sinister move to, once again, deny women their right to health care and their right to privacy.

Also, once again, we are seeing how another bill further undermines D.C.'s home rule. This bill prohibits the District of Columbia from using its own funds to provide abortions. Why would we do this?

D.C. has a right to determine how they want to provide health care for women and have their own ability to determine their own destiny; but, once again, for low-income women in Washington, D.C., they are under assault with this bill.

It is really a shame and disgrace that, once again, we have to get up here and debunk the argument that Federal funds are being used for abortions because they are not. Today, the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we should really be talking about expanding access to a full range of reproductive health services for everyone, including low-income women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional minute.

Ms. LEE. We should be talking about expanding reproductive health services for all women, including low-income women. We should be talking about pay equity. We should be talking about child care. We should be talking about paid family medical leave. We should be talking about creating jobs.

But rather than that, here we go, once again, trying to get in the middle of a woman's decision to move forward with her own life based on the decisions that she and her physician and her family members make.

The right to privacy, once again, is being undermined by this bill. You can't have a right to privacy and keep government out of your private life on one hand and, on the other hand, say government has got to interfere with your personal and private business.

Health care is too important for women. Women need to be able to make their own health care decisions, and this bill would do the exact opposite. It would move our country backwards. It would move women's health care backwards.

I hope that Members will vote ''no'' on this rule and ''no'' on the bill. We need to be expanding access to women's health care.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

While it is true that the Hyde amendment and its companion amendments have been renewed every year, recent implementation of the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, has ignored these restrictions. Rather than renewing various amendments each year, we should make the prohibition on Federal abortion funding permanent and governmentwide.

Additionally, provisions contained in the Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act have been included in H.R. 7. These provisions require the exchanges to prominently display, one, whether a plan provides for abortion coverage; and, two, if it does, the amount of the abortion surcharge that the consumer is required to pay.

Unfortunately, for most consumers, finding out if the plans on their State's exchange or the Federal marketplace covers abortion is nearly impossible because the information is not consistently available.

Knowing whether these plans cover abortion is absolutely critical to many consumers because plans that cover elective abortion are required by law to impose a mandatory monthly abortion surcharge.

These surcharges are not optional. Once you sign up for a plan with abortion coverage, you must pay the surcharge. This means that, potentially, many Americans who strongly oppose elective abortion could be unknowingly contributing to the practice financially.

Madam Speaker, that simply isn't right. H.R. 7 will stop funding for plans that cover elective abortion under ObamaCare and ensure that abortion coverage and the accompanying surcharge are made transparent to the American people.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and H.R. 7, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Let me first say something about the process that we are engaged in. We have heard just in the last few weeks—and even as we opened this Congress—the Speaker and others in the majority talk about how we will adhere to regular order and we will get back to the process of legislating the way it was intended to be conducted.

What happened to that? Why did we set that aside? What is the emergency that requires us to bring this highly ideological piece of legislation to the floor in just a few hours after it had been brought to the Rules Committee? What happened to the previous legislation that we were supposed to debate?

I mean, to me, this is a big problem, and it is one that I think begs the question of whether or not those offers of returning to the regular legislative process are sincere.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule for that reason, but also because this is yet just another ideological attack on the health care rights of women in this country who want—in some cases, we know that abortion services are already prohibited from being funded through Federal sources.

This is simply going so far as to say that women, with their own money, who seek to procure insurance coverage, can't seek that coverage if it includes these services. To me, it goes just far too far. It does not allow even exceptions for abortions that would be required to protect the health of the woman or serious medical concerns.

We can't continue to make this a political question and a political football. Forty-two years ago, this question was decided at the Supreme Court. It is a right that is protected.

Rather than continuing to just sort of pander to the base and satisfy the ideological extremists in our country, we ought to be thinking about the questions that people actually want us to take this precious time on the floor of the House to debate: How are we going to put America back to work? How are we going to rebuild our infrastructure? How are we going to make sure that kids who want to get a good college education the way the President outlined the other night are going to be able to afford that?

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I just want to say that it is clear some of our colleagues have not read the bill or have not listened to the debate. This bill does not prohibit women from purchasing abortion coverage with their own money.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I also want to thank Mr. SMITH and my colleagues and all who are in Washington, D.C., participating in the March for Life for their unwavering commitment and support to fight on behalf of those who have no voice.

Throughout my years in Congress, Madam Speaker, and as a devoted human rights advocate, I have fought tirelessly for the fundamental rights of the innocent unborn.

As pro-life Members of Congress, we have a commitment to stand up for life and to take the necessary steps to advance legislation to the floor, and that is exactly what the U.S. House of Representatives will be doing today.

While the vast majority of Americans can agree that we have a lot of work in front of us to reduce the number of abortions, few legislators have taken any meaningful action. In fact, pro-abortion Members of Congress have sought to eliminate Federal protections on the use of taxpayer funds for abortions, both here and abroad.

Federal funds should not be used to pay for abortions, Madam Speaker, and Congressman SMITH's bill would do exactly that by establishing a permanent prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion and abortion coverage. This will help save lives.

In addition, this bill also protects the conscience and religious views of millions of Americans. The vast majority of Americans also do not want their tax dollars to be used to pay for abortions. This bill would establish a permanent prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion.

For many years, the Hyde amendment and other Federal prohibitions on public funding for abortion have been enacted as appropriation riders, but they are not permanent, Madam Speaker. We need to get rid of this patchwork approach and enact H.R. 7 to ensure that Federal funds are not used to pay for abortions.

I look forward to working with Mr. SMITH and Ms. FOXX and others in favor of this bill and to continue working with my fellow pro-life colleagues in the House and the Senate to promote legislation that upholds the sanctity of innocent human life.

We have a responsibility to protect the unborn, and we must remain vigilant and continue to do what is right for all Americans.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding me time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we just heard that apparently none of us have read the bill. That is absolutely true. The bill, as I said, was dragged out of the ''used bill freezer'' at 9 last night.

If it is the same bill that we were talking about that has been through for several terms, it still has the idea of forcible rape being the only legitimate rape and that the IRS can audit to see if you were really raped when you had an abortion and to prove that—again, taking women back to the days when everybody said that they could not make decisions and that they had to be made for them.

If this is the same bill that was brought to us, as we pointed out, by a subcommittee of 13 men and voted through the House by a committee of 21 men, then we don't need to read it again, and my understanding is that this is the same bill. It was repugnant then, and it certainly is repugnant now.

On behalf of the men and women of the United States who feel that they have the right to make their own health decisions, I beg the House of Representatives to turn down all of this.

Now, we know that what they are doing, literally, is dismissive of not only 51 percent of the women population—we are the majority population, we women in the United States—but this is certainly, by any account, a misuse of the Chamber's attention, and we are talking taxpayer funds. Believe me, this is a misuse of taxpayer funds.

Now, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would allow us to strike the 3-day layover waiver, the waiver that was given by the Rules Committee to not do the 3-day layover, but to have something to do on the floor today.

With 23 months left of the 114th Congress, we should be able to run the House in the thoughtful manner that the rules of the House provide for.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Now, I am going to urge again for all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''no'' on the previous question, vote ''no'' on the rule and, by all means, ''no'' on the intrusive, deceptive bill that has been talked about here for 40 years.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, life is the most fundamental of all rights. It is sacred and God-given, but millions of babies have been robbed of that right in this, the freest country in the world. That is a tragedy beyond words and a betrayal of what we, as a nation, stand for.

One day, we hope it will be different. We hope life will cease to be valued on a sliding scale. We hope the era of elective abortions, ushered in by an unelected court, will be closed and collectively deemed one of the darkest chapters in American history, but until that day, it remains a solemn duty to stand up for life.

□ 1030

Regardless of the length of this journey, we will continue to speak for those who cannot, and we will continue to pray to the One who can change the hearts of those in desperation and those in power, who equally hold the lives of the innocent in their hands.

Madam Speaker, the commonsense measure before us restores an important, longstanding, bipartisan agreement that protects the unborn and prevents taxpayers from being forced to finance thousands of elective abortions. It reflects the will of the American people and is the product of what has historically been a bipartisan, bicameral consensus in Congress. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and H.R. 7.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 42 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

On page 1, line 4 of the resolution, insert the following after the word ''waived'': ''except those arising under clause 11 of rule XXI''.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on

the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

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

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

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 183, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—239

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)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
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 (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
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 (GA)
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
Schock
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 (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—183

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
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 (PA)
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
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 (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Carter (TX)
Duckworth
Forbes
Hastings
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Marchant
Nunnelee
Perlmutter
Smith (WA)
Young (AK)

□ 1056

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

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)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer

Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
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 (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Schock
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

NAYS—179

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
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 (PA)
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
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 (CA)
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Carter (TX)
Duckworth
Forbes
Hastings
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Lowenthal
Marchant
Nunnelee
Perlmutter
Smith (WA)
Speier

□ 1104

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.

Stated against:

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 43, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 42, I call up the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Pursuant to House Resolution 42, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7

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 ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2015''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY FUNDED ABORTIONS

Sec. 101. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions.

Sec. 102. Amendment to table of chapters.

TITLE II—APPLICATION UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Sec. 201. Clarifying application of prohibition to premium credits and cost-sharing reductions under ACA.

Sec. 202. Revision of notice requirements regarding disclosure of extent of health plan coverage of abortion and abortion premium surcharges.

TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY FUNDED ABORTIONS

SEC. 101. PROHIBITING TAXPAYER FUNDED ABORTIONS.

Title 1, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 4—PROHIBITING TAXPAYER FUNDED ABORTIONS

''301. Prohibition on funding for abortions.
''302. Prohibition on funding for health benefits plans that cover abortion.
''303. Limitation on Federal facilities and employees.
''304. Construction relating to separate coverage.
''305. Construction relating to the use of non-Federal funds for health coverage.
''306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws.
''307. Construction relating to complications arising from abortion.
''308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother.
''309. Application to District of Columbia.

"§ 301. Prohibition on funding for abortions

''No funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be expended for any abortion.

"§ 302. Prohibition on funding for health benefits plans that cover abortion

''None of the funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be expended for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

"§ 303. Limitation on Federal facilities and employees

''No health care service furnished—

''(1) by or in a health care facility owned or operated by the Federal Government; or

''(2) by any physician or other individual employed by the Federal Government to provide health care services within the scope of the physician's or individual's employment,

may include abortion.

"§ 304. Construction relating to separate coverage

''Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as prohibiting any individual, entity, or State or locality from purchasing separate abortion coverage or health benefits coverage that includes abortion so long as such coverage is paid for entirely using only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a federally subsidized program, including a State's or locality's contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

"§ 305. Construction relating to the use of non-Federal funds for health coverage

''Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as restricting the ability of any non-Federal health benefits coverage provider from offering abortion coverage, or the ability of a State or locality to contract separately with such a provider for such coverage, so long as only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law are used and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a federally subsidized program, including a State's or locality's contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

"§ 306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws

''Nothing in this chapter shall repeal, amend, or have any effect on any other Federal law to the extent such law imposes any limitation on the use of funds for abortion or for health benefits coverage that includes

coverage of abortion, beyond the limitations set forth in this chapter.

''§ 307. Construction relating to complications arising from abortion

''Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to apply to the treatment of any infection, injury, disease, or disorder that has been caused by or exacerbated by the performance of an abortion. This rule of construction shall be applicable without regard to whether the abortion was performed in accord with Federal or State law, and without regard to whether funding for the abortion is permissible under section 308.

''§ 308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother

''The limitations established in sections 301, 302, and 303 shall not apply to an abortion—

''(1) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

''(2) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

''§ 309. Application to District of Columbia

''In this chapter:

''(1) Any reference to funds appropriated by Federal law shall be treated as including any amounts within the budget of the District of Columbia that have been approved by Act of Congress pursuant to section 446 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (or any applicable successor Federal law).

''(2) The term 'Federal Government' includes the government of the District of Columbia.''.

SEC. 102. AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CHAPTERS.

The table of chapters for title 1, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''4. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions ..... 301''.

TITLE II—APPLICATION UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

SEC. 201. CLARIFYING APPLICATION OF PROHIBITION TO PREMIUM CREDITS AND COST-SHARING REDUCTIONS UNDER ACA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DISALLOWANCE OF REFUNDABLE CREDIT AND COST-SHARING REDUCTIONS FOR COVERAGE UNDER QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN WHICH PROVIDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 36B(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or any health plan that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 307 or 308 of title 1, United States Code)''.

(B) OPTION TO PURCHASE OR OFFER SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Paragraph (3) of section 36B(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) SEPARATE ABORTION COVERAGE OR PLAN ALLOWED.—

''(i) OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as prohibiting any individual from purchasing separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a health plan that includes such abortions, so long as no credit is allowed under this section with respect to the premiums for such coverage or plan.

''(ii) OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall restrict any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a plan that includes such abortions, so long as premiums for such separate coverage or plan are not paid for with any amount attributable to the credit allowed under this section (or the amount of any advance payment of the credit under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act).''.

(2) DISALLOWANCE OF SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE CREDIT FOR PLAN WHICH INCLUDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—Subsection (h) of section 45R of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''Any term'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any term''; and

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

''(2) EXCLUSION OF HEALTH PLANS INCLUDING COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified health plan' does not include any health plan that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 307 or 308 of title 1, United States Code).

''(B) SEPARATE ABORTION COVERAGE OR PLAN ALLOWED.—

''(i) OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as prohibiting any employer from purchasing for its employees separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a health plan that includes such abortions, so long as no credit is allowed under this section with respect to the employer contributions for such coverage or plan.

''(ii) OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall restrict any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a plan that includes such abortions, so long as such separate coverage or plan is not paid for with any employer contribution eligible for the credit allowed under this section.''.

(3) CONFORMING ACA AMENDMENTS.—Section 1303(b) of Public Law 111–148 (42 U.S.C. 18023(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by striking paragraph (3), as amended by section 202(a); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

(b) APPLICATION TO MULTI-STATE PLANS.—Paragraph (6) of section 1334(a) of Public Law 111–148 (42 U.S.C. 18054(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(6) COVERAGE CONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL ABORTION POLICY.—In entering into contracts under this subsection, the Director shall ensure that no multi-State qualified health plan offered in an Exchange provides health benefits coverage for which the expenditure of Federal funds is prohibited under chapter 4 of title 1, United States Code.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2015, but only with respect to plan years beginning after such date, and the amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to plan years beginning after such date.

SEC. 202. REVISION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS REGARDING DISCLOSURE OF EXTENT OF HEALTH PLAN COVERAGE OF ABORTION AND ABORTION PREMIUM SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 1303(b) of Public Law 111–148 (42 U.S.C. 18023(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) RULES RELATING TO NOTICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The extent of coverage (if any) of services described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) or (1)(B)(ii) by a qualified health plan shall be disclosed to enrollees at the time of enrollment in the plan and shall be prominently displayed in any marketing or advertising materials, comparison tools, or summary of benefits and coverage explanation made available with respect to such plan by the issuer of the plan, by an Exchange, or by the Secretary, including information made available through an Internet portal or Exchange under sections 1311(c)(5) and 1311(d)(4)(C).

''(B) SEPARATE DISCLOSURE OF ABORTION SURCHARGES.—In the case of a qualified health plan that includes the services described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) and where the premium for the plan is disclosed, including in any marketing or advertising materials or any other information referred to in subparagraph (A), the surcharge described in paragraph (2)(B)(i)(II) that is attributable to such services shall also be disclosed and identified separately.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to materials, tools, or other information made available more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Madam 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. 7.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today in strong support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act, legislation that passed the House almost 1 year ago with bipartisan support.

This bill affirms what a majority of Americans believe, that no taxpayer dollars should be spent on abortions and abortion coverage.

H.R. 7 establishes a permanent governmentwide prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion. This bill is all the more necessary because of the President's health care law and its attack on this longstanding protection of taxpayer dollars.

The bill before us would simply codify the Hyde amendment, a longstanding provision that has ensured Federal dollars do not subsidize abortion over the past decade.

H.R. 7 also requires that information regarding abortion coverage as well as the amount of the abortion surcharge be displayed where consumers can easily identify which plans cover abortion. Consumers should have the right to know whether the plan they are selecting on an exchange includes abortion coverage.

While the Affordable Care Act included some notification provisions,

many of our constituents are simply unable to find out whether a plan is paying for abortions. In fact, this inability to find out whether exchange plans provide abortion coverage seems to extend to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as former Secretary Sebelius failed to uphold her commitment after testifying twice before the Energy and Commerce Committee, promising to provide the Congress and the American people a full list of exchange plans providing abortion coverage.

Today, over a year has passed and this commitment is still left unfulfilled. The self-appointed ''most transparent administration'' in history is simply unwilling or unable to comply with this request. In fact, it took the Government Accountability Office months to find out that taxpayer dollars went to pay for over 1,000 health insurance plans that included abortion.

Even though the Affordable Care Act required, through law, that separate payments be made to pay for the abortion surcharge, the GAO also found that none of the insurers they interviewed actually collected a separate payment.

In fact, the report reveals that the administration informed insurance issuers that they didn't need two separate payments. This bill is about protecting taxpayer dollars and protecting life. It also ensures we have at least some transparency under the President's health care law.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, I have good news for my friends on the other side of the aisle. There is no taxpayer funding for abortion. Let me say that again. There is no taxpayer funding for abortions. There hasn't been for many decades because of the Hyde amendment.

Under the Affordable Care Act, that prohibition did not change. Now, some of us might disagree with the Hyde amendment, but that is the law of the land, and it was a carefully constructed compromise under the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1115

This bill would be a vast expansion of the restriction of a woman's right to choose what type of insurance she can purchase with the consultation of her doctor and her husband because it would prevent women from purchasing insurance with their own money on the exchanges, and that would be a restriction on their rights. So I am going to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this ill-conceived piece of legislation, and let's talk about some things that really matter, like jobs, child care, and pay equity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today as a supporter and cosponsor of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. I was a cosponsor of this legislation in the previous two Congresses, and I continue to support it after hearing from my constituents time and time again that they do not want their tax dollars funding abortions. In fact, the majority of Americans and the vast majority of Kansans oppose their tax dollars being used towards abortion.

The specter of taxpayer-funded abortion has been exacerbated by the President's health care law, which offers subsidies to taxpayers in order to offset its high cost. These subsidized plans, bought through the health care exchanges, could allow for taxpayer-funded abortions to occur.

Without this crucial legislation, we will continue to have a patchwork of provisions regarding Federal funding. This creates confusion, blocks transparency, and opens up additional loopholes. Longstanding provisions are reestablished under H.R. 7, which would apply uniformly across Federal programs, including the President's destructive health care law.

I urge passage of this bipartisan bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my statement inserted in the RECORD of the House of Representatives that we should be considering bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD of the House of Representatives that we should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to all health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking my daughter's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should be voting on proposals that create jobs and accelerate economic growth. Instead, the only thing the Republicans have accelerated around here is their attacks on a woman's constitutional rights and health care.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises Members that although a unanimous consent request to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple, declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the pending measure, embellishments beyond that standard constitute debate and can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

The Chair will entertain as many requests to insert as may be necessary to accommodate Members, but the Chair also must ask Members to cooperate by confining such remarks to the proper form.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House, instead of attacking women's access to health care, should be voting on bigger paychecks and better infrastructure for our country.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House, instead of attacking women's access to health care, we should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of constantly attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that instead of attacking women's access to health care, this House should vote for bigger paychecks for women and better infrastructure for all.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of constantly attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that this House should be voting for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of these relentless attacks on women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the Democratic Caucus chairman, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that this House should start to concentrate finally on bigger paychecks for our people who are working and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to decent health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of yet another attack on women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Today, on the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, the majority is launching yet another attack on women's health and constitutionally protected right to choose whether to carry a pregnancy to term.

Most importantly, this bill will make it virtually impossible for a woman to obtain abortion services even when paid for with purely private, non-Federal funds. Through its novel tax penalty provisions, H.R. 7 departs radically from existing law, taking away women's existing health care and placing their health and lives at risk.

And despite the claims of its sponsors, H.R. 7 does not codify current law, and it is not about the regulation of Federal funds. There is no Federal funding of abortion due to the Hyde amendment, and the Affordable Care Act maintains that policy and law.

For more than 30 years, Congress has prohibited Federal funding of abortion except in cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother, through provisions like the Hyde amendment in annual appropriations bills. Nothing in the Affordable Care Act changes this.

Finally, H.R. 7 also eradicates the authority of the District of Columbia to make decisions about how appropriated funds are used for the health care of the District's citizens.

So what is H.R. 7 really about? Plain and simple, it is an assault on women's health and freedom. It permanently blocks abortion coverage for low-income women, civil servants, D.C. residents, and the military. No committee has considered this legislation. Text was not even available until last night, when the Rules Committee met in a so-called emergency meeting. But the only emergency was the majority didn't have the votes to pass another mean-spirited, anti-choice bill so they are rushing to the floor with this bill in time for the anniversary of Roe v. Wade.

Isn't it time to stop playing politics with women's lives and start governing? Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose this egregious bill.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today because I believe all human life is worth protecting. Each one is worth saving and deserves respect and protection.

For years now, pro-life Americans have been forced to watch as their tax dollars subsidize abortion procedures that they are morally opposed to. The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion legislation prohibits taxpayer funding of elective abortions no matter where in

the Federal system these may occur. This principle is supported by a majority of Americans. In fact, 56 percent of Americans are opposed to taxpayer funding of abortions.

Later today, I will join half a million people who believe that life is a gift at the annual March for Life rally, the largest ongoing march in American history. We have a responsibility, as the elected body representing our constituents, to protect the most vulnerable among us and ensure that women facing unwanted pregnancies do not face judgment or condemnation but have positive support structures and access to health care to help them through their pregnancies. This bill is an important step in the right direction to protecting life.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I would just ask my colleagues on the other side to please give me an example where Federal taxpayer dollars have been used to pay for an abortion, except with the Hyde amendment exceptions.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the ranking Democrat on the Constitution Subcommittee.

□ 1130

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I, too, am against this bill for I am for a woman's right to choice. This bill is the second bill that has been brought in the last few days to show the Republican side's intent to repeal Roe v. Wade. That is what they would like to do: repeal Roe v. Wade.

What is most important is to understand the theater that this bill has shown that the majority party has made this historic hallowed hall of Congress today.

Today is the March for Life, lots of pro-lifers here. They wanted to give them something, so they scheduled a bill—we could be legislating on jobs, on minimum wage, on infrastructure. They wanted to give them something, so they came with a bill called ''fetal pain'' to get around the viability requirements of the Supreme Court.

Their caucus found that bill too extreme to get the votes—even their caucus. Now, the leadership wouldn't listen to the Democrats of the Rules Committee, and it wouldn't listen to the Democrats on the floor, and they didn't have the good sense to realize it would make them look as they are: antiwoman and out-of-step with reality.

It took some women and maybe a few men—but mostly women—in their caucus to finally go ''no,'' so they brought up a retread of a bill. That was a retread too, but they brought up another one, a substitute bill, because they had to have something to give as a gift for the March for Life pro-life caucus.

This is theater. This is drama. That is what this has become. A woman's right should not be theater; it shouldn't be drama. A woman's right should be preserved. If any case, if there is any question about them, it should go through regular process, go through committees.

Let the Members know about the bill with notice, not have, within 72 hours, a bill brought to this floor. Regular order has been destroyed because of theater and messaging, and that is what you are going to see for the next 2 years.

The American people will be very disappointed in this Congress because it has become the theater of the absurd.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, however stark Americans' difference of opinion can be on the matter of abortion generally, there has been long, bipartisan agreement that Federal taxpayer funds should not be used to destroy innocent life.

The Hyde amendment, named for its chief sponsor, former House Judiciary Committee chairman Henry Hyde, has prohibited the Federal funding of abortions since 1976 when it passed a House and Senate that were composed overwhelmingly of Democrat Members.

It has been renewed each appropriations cycle with few changes for over 37 years, supported by Congresses, supported by both parties and Presidents from both parties. It is probably the most bipartisan pro-life proposal sustained over a longer period of time than any other. It is time the Hyde amendment was codified in the United States Code.

H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, sponsored by Representative CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, would do just that. It would codify the two core principles of the Hyde amendment throughout the operations of the Federal Government: namely, a ban on Federal funding for abortions and a ban on the use of Federal funds for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

As hundreds of thousands of people from across the country come to Washington to express their love of unborn children at the annual March for Life, it is a marvelous time to reflect on what could be accomplished if the bill we consider today were enacted into law.

During the time the Hyde amendment has been in place, probably millions and millions of innocent children and their mothers have been spared the horrors of abortion. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the Hyde amendment has led to as many as 675,000 fewer abortions each year. Let that sink in for a few precious moments.

The policy we will be discussing today has likely given America the gift of millions more children and, consequently, millions more mothers, millions more fathers, millions more lifetimes, and trillions more loving gestures and other human gifts in all their diverse forms—what a stunningly wondrous legacy and the bill before us today would continue that legacy permanently.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this vitally important legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the distinguished ranking member of Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, today is a sad day for this institution. Late last night, when Republicans failed to garner the votes for one extreme antiwomen bill, they flipped a switch and turned to another antiwomen bill.

This attempt to restrict women's access to abortion care is an unprecedented, radical assault on women's health care. Tens of thousands of women and their families will be harmed by this policy.

The bill's sponsors claim that this bill simply codifies the Hyde amendment, and that is inaccurate. This bill takes unprecedented steps far beyond the Hyde amendment.

This bill places restrictions on how women with private insurance can spend private dollars in purchasing health insurance, but the bill doesn't stop there. It also prohibits Washington, D.C., from using its own Medicaid funds to make health care coverage decisions.

The goal behind this bill is to effectively get rid of all comprehensive health care coverage in this country. Anti-choice Republicans want to turn back the clock on women's rights.

It is critical that we protect the right of every woman to make her own personal and private health care decisions. Women, in consultation with their doctors, should remain in control of these choices and not Congress.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 7.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the pro-life leader in the House of Representatives for many years.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman PITTS so very much.

Madam Speaker, on September 9, 2009, President Obama stood 6 feet from where I stand now, right at that podium, and told lawmakers and the American public in a specially called joint session of Congress on health care reform that ''under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortion.''

In an eleventh hour ploy to garner a remnant of pro-life congressional Democrats—and they were convinced, and they were deceived—needed for passage of ObamaCare legislation, the President issued an executive order on March 24, 2010, and it said, in pertinent part: ''The act maintains current Hyde amendment restrictions governing abortion policy and extends those restrictions to newly-created health insurance exchanges.'' That is absolutely, I say to my friends, untrue.

Despite an appalling degree of nontransparency, we finally asked the Government Accountability Office to look into it. Last September, they came back and said 1,036 ObamaCare exchange plans covered abortion on demand. GAO also found that a separate billing of the abortion surcharge required by the act is not being enforced by the administration, and the abortion funding premium, again, in 2015 is being illegally rolled into the total plan costs.

Health care consumers are, therefore, unaware when they buy their health insurance whether or not they are paying for abortion on demand. If the Hyde amendment had been applied to ObamaCare, the number of ObamaCare plans covering abortion on demand would be zero.

At its core—I believe my colleagues should know this by now, some don't on this side of the aisle and some on that do—the Hyde amendment has two indisputable parts. It prohibits direct funding for abortion and funding for any insurance plan that includes abortion, except in the cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother.

ObamaCare violates the Hyde amendment by funding insurance plans that pay for abortion on demand. H.R. 7 seeks to accomplish three goals: make the Hyde amendment and other current abortion funding prohibitions current—and that includes the D.C. rider permanent; ensure that the Affordable Care Act faithfully conforms with the Hyde amendment, as promised by the President of the United States; and provide full disclosure, transparency, and prominent display of the extent to which any health insurance plan funds abortion on the exchanges.

Last January, the House passed H.R. 7 by a vote of 227–188. It languished in the Senate for a year—never took it up. This is the same bill. It has been through regular order. Hearings have been held, as well as markup.

The American people, Madam Speaker, strongly oppose taxpayer funding for abortion. The Marist poll that was just released yesterday found that 68 percent of all respondents oppose using taxpayer funding for abortion, and a whopping 69 percent of women are against taxpayer funding for abortion, and 71 percent of the millennials are against taxpayer funding for abortion.

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend.

We live in an age of ultrasound imaging, the ultimate window to the womb and the child, that precious child, who resides there. We are in the midst of a fetal health care revolution, an explosion of benign interventions designed to diagnose, treat, and cure the precious lives of these children.

Abortion is antithetical to that. It dismembers, chemically poisons, shots to the heart, to stop the heart from beating. As you know—and I know my friend from New York is next to speak—at testimony before your committee, Dr. Levatino said—and he is an abortionist—he said the baby can be in any position in the uterus.

You just reach in with a Sopher clamp and grasp whatever you can. You pull out an arm, he went on to say. You pull out and reach in again and again, and you tear out the spine, intestine, heart, and lungs.

These are gruesome procedures. That is what abortion is all about: the dismemberment and chemical poisoning of children.

H.R. 7 will save lives. There is no doubt about that. The Hyde amendment—I remember when Henry Hyde was told that 1 million, maybe even more than 1 million children have survived because of the Hyde amendment.

Tears came down his face, knowing that those kids are now in the world, going to school, having their own families, playing soccer, and doing other great things.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that they should direct their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

The name of the bill is a lie. There is now no taxpayer funding for abortions. I wish there were. The right of a woman to decide whether to become pregnant, to decide to continue her pregnancy, or even to make the difficult decision to terminate her pregnancy is protected by the Constitution.

The Supreme Court has determined that neither Congress nor a State may place an undue burden on that right. Denial of Medicaid or other government funding that would be available for other medical procedures should be considered an undue burden, but that is not the law, unfortunately. Taxpayer funding of abortion is prohibited by the Hyde amendment.

This bill goes far beyond that. This bill for the first time ever denies tax deductions and credits for women who use their own money to pay for abortions or to purchase insurance that covers abortions. In so doing, the Republican majority increases taxes for women and families.

This bill for the first time denies the itemized medical tax deduction that is otherwise available for medical expenses if the medical expense is for an abortion.

This bill for the first time treats as taxable income any distribution from a flexible spending account or health savings account that is used to pay for abortion expenses.

This bill for the first time denies small employers the ability to use tax credits to help them to provide health coverage for their employees if that coverage includes abortion.

This bill also denies income-eligible women the use of premium tax credits available under the Affordable Care Act if the insurance coverage they select includes abortion coverage.

In first opposing and then voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act 50 times, my Republican colleagues have complained that government should not meddle in the private insurance market or in private health care choices, but this legislation obviously is designed to do just that.

It seems that many Republicans believe in freedom, provided no one uses that freedom in the way they do not approve. That is a strange understanding of freedom.

Even more stunning, this bill increases taxes on families, businesses, and the self-employed if they spend their own money—let me repeat that—their own money on abortion coverage or services, and this tax increase is being championed by Republicans, all of whom have taken a pledge not to raise taxes on individuals or businesses.

The intent of the bill is clear. It is to end insurance coverage for abortions for all women, whether or not they obtain their insurance on an exchange, and even if they use their own money to purchase the insurance.

□ 1145

My colleagues in the majority believe that, if you like your insurance coverage, you should get to keep it unless it is for choices that they don't like. Then they have no qualms about taking your insurance coverage away. That is the intended and likely result of this bill.

Currently, the vast majority of insurance policies cover abortion services, but insurance companies will likely respond to the tax penalties this bill imposes by dropping the coverage of abortions from all of their plans. This will have a significant effect on all women, not just on lower income women, who have long felt the brunt of Federal restrictions on their health care choices.

H.R. 7 is a radical departure from the current tax treatment of medical expenses and insurance coverage, and it is neither justifiable nor necessary to prevent the Federal funding of abortion. It is a frontal assault on the liberty and dignity of all American women. It should be roundly rejected.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, the Hyde language does not apply to ObamaCare. There is not one sentence in this 2,700-page bill. Read the bill. It applies to Medicaid and to annually appropriated programs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTS. I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, one of the things that people seem to forget here is that ObamaCare

both authorizes and appropriates the money so that it is outside the purview of the HHS appropriations bill. That is why this legislation is needed. The President promised he would apply the Hyde amendment, but he has not.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), another champion of life.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I rise in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

Madam Speaker, we know from science that everyone's life begins at conception. The right to life is Godgiven and is described in our Declaration of Independence as ''unalienable,'' which means something that cannot be taken away. I defend, Madam Speaker, the right to life of everyone in this country and of everyone in this Chamber, even of those opposed to this legislation.

This bill helps promote a culture of life. It reflects the overwhelming opinion held by Americans that taxpayer dollars should not be used to pay for abortion. It also holds President Obama accountable for another one of his broken promises, when he assured us that his health care law would not allow taxpayer funds to be used for abortion.

We know, Madam Speaker, from a September 15, 2014, GAO report on health insurance exchanges that tax dollars are paying for more than 1,000 ObamaCare plans that cover elective abortions. This bill stops that. I insert the GAO report into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the U.S. Government Accountability Office, Sept. 15, 2014]

CONGRESSIONAL REQUESTERS—HEALTH INSURANCE EXCHANGES: COVERAGE OF NON-EXCEPTED ABORTION SERVICES BY QUALIFIED HEALTH PLANS

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) requires the establishment in all states of health insurance exchanges—marketplaces where eligible individuals may compare and select among insurance plans offered by participating private issuers of health coverage. PPACA requires the insurance plans offered under an exchange, known as qualified health plans (QHP), to provide a package of essential health benefits—including coverage for specific service categories, such as ambulatory care, prescription drugs, and hospitalization. In addition to these categories states may require or restrict coverage of other benefits by QHPs. Consistent with federal and state law, QHPs may cover other benefits, such as abortion services.

PPACA prohibits the use of federal funds made available to offset the cost of QHP coverage—that is, income-based tax credits and subsidies—to pay for ''non-excepted abortion services,'' which, based on the law applicable to the 2014 benefit year, are abortion services performed except where the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest, or the life of the pregnant woman would be endangered unless an abortion is performed. While QHPs may cover non-excepted abortion services, PPACA places requirements on the provision of such coverage. These include the requirement to estimate the cost of coverage of such services, at an amount of no less than $1 per enrollee, per month, and to collect from each enrollee an amount equal to the actuarial value of the coverage—segregated from any other premium amounts collected by the QHP—to be used to pay for the costs associated with providing non-excepted abortion services. In addition, PPACA directed the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to contract with issuers to offer at least two multi-state QHPs in each state, at least one of which does not cover non-excepted abortion services.

There are 23 states with laws restricting the circumstances under which QHPs may provide non-excepted abortion services as a covered benefit in 2014, and 28 states with no such laws. Among the 23 states with restrictions, 17 have laws that do not permit the coverage of non-excepted abortion services by QHPs, and 6 states permit the coverage of non-excepted abortion services only in limited circumstances, such as to prevent substantial and irreversible impairment of a pregnant woman's major bodily function.

You asked that we provide a list of QHPs that do and that do not cover abortion services and for additional information on issues related to that coverage. This report describes whether non-excepted abortion services are covered by QHPs within the 28 states with no laws restricting such coverage for the 2014 benefit year, and provides additional information—such as the scope and the cost of non-excepted abortion services coverage—for selected QHPs that cover such services.

To obtain the information we present here, we contacted every state to determine whether states had laws restricting the circumstances under which abortion services may be provided as a covered benefit by QHPs in 2014. Based on our review of those laws and relevant federal laws and regulations, we determined that 23 states have laws restricting the circumstances under which non-excepted abortion services may be provided as a covered benefit by QHPs for the 2014 benefit year. In order to report on whether non-excepted abortion services are covered by QHPs within the 28 states with no laws restricting such coverage in 2014, we obtained data on QHPs' coverage of non-excepted abortion services from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the agency responsible for overseeing the establishment of health insurance exchanges; private issuers of QHPs; state departments of insurance and state exchange organizations; and from officials at OPM. While these data sources have different characteristics and limitations, we have determined that, when taken together, they are reliable for the purpose of indentifying which QHPs do and which do not provide non-excepted abortion services coverage in 2014 within the 28 states with no laws restricting such coverage. To provide additional information regarding non-excepted abortion services for selected QHPs that cover such services, we interviewed and collected documentation from a non-probability sample of 18 issuers about the QHPs they offer in 10 states. Our criteria for selecting these issuers included states with no laws restricting non-excepted abortion services coverage organized by CMS region, state uninsured population, and number of issuers covering non-excepted abortion services. These 18 issuers accounted for nearly one-quarter of QHPs that covered non-excepted abortion services and were offered within the 28 states.

We conducted our work from February 2014 to September 2014 in accordance with all sections of GAO's Quality Assurance Framework that are relevant to our objectives. The framework requires that we plan and perform the engagement to obtain sufficient and appropriate evidence to meet our stated objectives and to discuss any limitations in our work. We believe that the information and data obtained, and the analysis conducted, provide a reasonable basis for any findings and conclusions in this product.

RESULTS

1. Which QHPs participating in health insurance exchanges provide non-excepted abortion services as a covered benefit, and which do not?

Within the 28 states with no laws restricting the circumstances under which QHPs may provide non-excepted abortion services as a covered benefit in 2014:

—in 5 states (Connecticut, Hawaii, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Vermont), all QHPs cover non-excepted abortion services;

—in 15 states (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Texas, and Washington), some QHPs cover non-excepted abortion services; and

—in 8 states (Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, West Virginia, and Wyoming), no QHPs cover non-excepted abortion services.

Nationally, 1,036 QHPs in these 28 states cover non-excepted abortion services and 1,062 QHPs do not.

2. For selected QHPs, what is the scope of the non-excepted abortion services benefits that are provided?

Of the 18 issuers offering QHPs that cover non-excepted abortion services from which we obtained information, all but three issuers indicated that the benefit is not subject to any restrictions, limitations, or exclusions. One issuer told us that it only covers services for a ''therapeutic abortion,'' which a health care provider determines to be medically necessary. Two issuers that offered QHPs in New York indicated that, consistent with requirements set by the state-based exchange, they impose a limit of one non-excepted abortion treatment per year. However, one of these two issuers indicated they also offer QHPs that were not subject to this restriction. All 18 issuers also indicated that their abortion services benefit is subject to the same requirements as other benefits, such as enrollee out-of-pocket costs—including deductibles, copayments, and coinsurance—and prior authorization, all of which can vary depending on the location where the service is provided. For example, issuers indicated that if this service is provided in an outpatient setting—which one issuer noted is the typical location—enrollees are not required to request prior authorization, similar to any other service performed in an outpatient setting. Additionally, if performed in an inpatient setting, the service would require prior authorization, similar to any other service performed in such a setting. Issuers indicated that this benefit is described in member materials where other covered benefits are listed.

3. For selected QHPs, how do issuers estimate the cost of non-excepted abortion services coverage, what is this cost, and how are enrollees billed for this coverage?

To estimate the cost of covering non-excepted abortion services, issuers we contacted indicated that they generally reviewed historical costs for these procedures, similar to the approach used to estimate the actuarial value of the premium attributable to the cost of other covered benefits. All but one of the issuers from which we obtained information estimated the cost of the coverage of non-excepted abortion services to be less than $1 per enrollee, per month. For example, officials from one issuer told us that their actuaries estimated that the cost for non-excepted abortion services ranged between 10 cents and 20 cents per enrollee, per

month, calculated across multiple states, while officials with another issuer said that the cost for these services ranged from 10 cents to 70 cents per enrollee, per month. All but two of the issuers that estimated the cost to be less than $1 indicated they rounded the amount up to comply with PPACA's requirement that the cost of such coverage be estimated at no less than $1 per enrollee, per month. The other two issuers noted that they did not round up the amount to the statutory minimum of $1 and, therefore, were not using this statutory minimum as a basis for determining premium amounts to collect from enrollees for non-excepted abortion services. The highest cost estimated by the issuers we interviewed was $1.10 per enrollee, per month. For several of the issuers we contacted, the premium amount associated with non-excepted abortion services coverage was reported to also be $1; however, for other issuers the premium amount varied from the cost issuers estimated for this coverage. For example, the issuer that estimated the cost of coverage of non-excepted abortion services at $1.10 per enrollee, per month, indicated that when adjusted to a paid cost based upon plan design and administrative expenses, the premium amount collected from enrollees ranged from 51 cents to $1.46, depending on the specific QHP.

Fifteen issuers and the Washington Health Benefit Exchange—which bills enrollees on behalf of issuers offering QHPs in the state-based exchange, including for 2 of the 18 issuers from which we obtained information—did not itemize the premium amount associated with non-excepted abortion services coverage on enrollees' bills nor indicate that they send a separate bill for that premium amount. Officials from the remaining issuer from which we obtained information told us that their bills indicate that there is a $1 charge ''for coverage of services for which member subsidies may not be used.''

4. For selected QHPs, how are consumers shopping for QHPs able to determine whether non-excepted abortion services are covered?

PPACA does not establish any requirements on whether or how information about non-excepted abortion services should be made available to consumers before they enroll in QHPs, though six of the issuers we contacted indicated that they made available such information about coverage for abortion services—which they stated includes both excepted and non-excepted abortion services—to consumers shopping for QHPs. These issuers indicated that there are various ways consumers may determine if their QHPs provide coverage for abortion services before they enroll. For example, issuers said that QHP materials—such as their summary of benefits and coverage or member policies, such as the Evidence of Coverage document—indicate that abortion services are covered, and these materials are available to consumers shopping for QHPs through the issuer's website or through the exchange's website. Specifically, officials with one issuer informed us that their Evidence of Coverage document, which provides details about the features of their QHPs, was available through the state-based exchange and the benefit—''voluntary termination of pregnancy''—is identified in that document under ''Family Planning Services.'' Eleven issuers indicated that consumers shopping for QHPs do not have access to such information; some of these issuers indicated that consumers would need to call the issuer directly before enrolling to determine whether a QHP provides coverage for abortion services.

PPACA requires that QHP issuers providing non-excepted abortion services coverage notify enrollees at the time of enrollment that those services are covered. While most issuers from which we collected information indicated they were notifying enrollees that abortion services were provided as a covered benefit, four issuers indicated they were not disclosing this information to enrollees. Officials with two of these four issuers told us they had only recently become aware of this requirement, and were in the process of updating their enrollee materials to come into compliance with the notification requirement. Officials with the other two issuers, both of which offered QHPs in the same state, told us that they are not providing enrollees with notification of the coverage of non-excepted abortion services at the time of enrollment. These officials said that they use model plan materials developed by the state that do not specifically indicate that non-excepted abortion services are a covered benefit, and that such information would only be provided upon enrollee request.

Mr. ROTHFUS. As hundreds of thousands march today on the anniversary of the Roe v. Wade decision, I urge my colleagues to join me in committing to defend the sanctity of life and vote ''yes'' on this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the distinguished senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlewoman for her courage.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today, refusing to surrender on behalf of millions of women of all economic backgrounds, races, ethnicities, and religions who rely upon the Supreme Court of the United States, which, under the Ninth Amendment, has indicated that Roe v. Wade—the right to choose—is a viable and important law of the land. How can we undermine the Constitution in its premise and its articulation?

Today, very quickly, let me say that I know there are millions who are here to disagree with me. I respect that disagreement, but I am saddened that we would take advantage of this day to misrepresent the law and pass a law that will do damage to millions of Americans.

This is the face of Republican women, who, in essence, decided that H.R. 36 was too extreme. Even Republican men said that they could not vote on a bill that caused or asked women to report a rape before they would be able to benefit from an abortion. How sad, in the trauma of rape, that you must require someone to go to the police department before she could get assistance. That bill was pulled. That extreme bill was pulled.

In order not to leave us without dramatics, we come again to do what is hurting millions of women in Texas—where they cannot even get health services because of the laws passed in Texas, which completely shut down good health care clinics that deal in abortion and other women's services for health care—with this dastardly law about requiring those clinics to be within a certain milage of hospitals, with their never having any problem before.

Now we come with another masquerade in H.R. 7, which prohibits Federal funds from being used for any health benefits coverage which includes the coverage of abortion, making permanent already existing Federal policies, prohibiting the inclusion of abortion in any health care service furnished by Federal or the District of Columbia health care—again, interfering with the women in the District of Columbia—and prohibiting individuals from receiving refundable Federal tax credits—individuals interfering with private health insurance.

Madam Speaker, this is a bad bill, and I ask my colleagues to vote against it. It undermines the Constitution and the Ninth Amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise again in strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 7, the so-called ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act,'' and the underlying bill.

I oppose this bill because it is unnecessary, puts the lives of women at risk, interferes with women's constitutionally guaranteed right of privacy, and diverts our attention from the real problems facing the American people.

A more accurate short title for this bill would be the ''Violating the Rights of Women Act of 2015''!

Instead of resuming their annual War on Women, our colleagues across the aisle should be working with Democrats to build upon the ''Middle-Class Economics'' championed by the Obama Administration that have succeeded in ending the economic meltdown it inherited in 2009 and revived the economy to the point where today we have the highest rate of growth and lowest rate of unemployment since the boom years of the Clinton Administration.

We could and should instead be voting to raise the minimum wage to $10.10 per hour so that people who work hard and play by the rules do not have raise their families in poverty.

A far better use of our time would be to provide help to unemployed job-hunters by making access to community college affordable to every person looking to make a new start in life.

Instead of voting to abridge the constitutional rights of women for the umpteenth time, we should bring to the floor for a first vote comprehensive immigration reform legislation or legislations repairing the harm to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by the Supreme Court's decision in Shelby County v. Holder.

Madam Speaker, the one thing we should not be doing is debating irresponsible ''messaging bills'' that abridge the rights of women and have absolutely no chance of overriding a presidential veto.

The version of H.R. 7 before us now is as bad today as it was when the House Republican leadership insisted on bringing it to a vote a year ago.

The other draconian provisions of that terrible bill are retained in H.R. 7, which would:

1. Prohibit federal funds from being used for any health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion. (Thus making permanent existing federal policies.)

2. Prohibit the inclusion of abortion in any health care service furnished by a federal or District of Columbia health care facility or by any physician or other individual employed by the federal government or the District.

3. Apply such prohibitions to District of Columbia funds.

4. Prohibit individuals from receiving a refundable federal tax credit, or any cost-sharing reductions, for purchasing a qualified health plan that includes coverage for abortions.

5. Prohibit small employers from receiving the small-employer health insurance credit provided by the health care law if the health plans or benefits that are purchased provide abortion coverage.

If H.R. 7 were enacted, millions of families and small businesses with private health insurance plans that offer abortion coverage would be faced with tax increases, making the cost of health care insurance even more expensive.

Under the Affordable Care Act, insurers are able to offer abortion coverage and receive federal offsets for premiums as long as enrollees pay for the abortion coverage from separate, private funds.

If enacted, H.R. 7 would deny federal subsidies or credits to private health insurance plans that offer abortion coverage even if that coverage is paid for from private funds.

This would inevitably lead to private health insurance companies dropping abortion coverage leaving millions of women without access to affordable, comprehensive health care.

Currently, 87% of private insurance health care plans offered through employers cover abortion.

If H.R. 7 were to become law, consumer options for private health insurance plans would be unnecessarily restricted and the tax burden on these policy holders would increase significantly.

H.R. 7 would also deny tax credits to small businesses that offer their employees insurance plans that cover abortion, which would have a significant impact on millions of families across the nation who would no longer be able to take advantage of existing tax credits and deductions for the cost of their health care.

For example, small businesses that offer health plans that cover abortions would no longer be eligible for the Small Business Health Tax Credit—potentially worth 35%–50% of the cost of their premiums—threatening 4 million small businesses.

Self-employed Americans who are able to deduct the cost of their comprehensive health insurance from their taxable income will also be denied similar tax credits and face higher taxes.

H.R. 7 would also undermine the District of Columbia's home rule by restricting its use of funds for abortion care to low-income women.

The Hyde Amendment stipulates that no taxpayer dollars are to be used for abortion care, and has narrow exceptions for rape, incest, and health complications that arise from pregnancy which put the mother's life in danger.

H.R. 7 would restrict women's access to reproductive health care even further by narrowing the already stringent requirements set forth in the Hyde Amendment.

When the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, the President issued an Executive Order to ''ensure that Federal funds are not used for abortion services.''

This version of H.R. 7 goes far beyond the safeguards established under the Affordable Care Act, and sets a dangerous precedent for the future of women's reproductive health in this country because it includes two new provisions that were added at the nth hour but have never received a hearing or a mark-up.

These new provisions would (1) ban abortion coverage in multi-state health plans available under the ACA; and (2) mandate that health plans mislead consumers about abortion coverage by requiring all plans in the health-insurance exchanges that include abortion coverage to display that fact prominently in all advertising, marketing materials, or information from the insurer but interestingly, does not require the same disclosure from plans that do not cover abortion.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 would also force health plans to mislead consumers about the law's treatment of abortion.

As a concession to anti-choice lawmakers, the ACA requires insurance plans participating in the new health system to segregate monies used for abortion services from all other funds.

In order to aid in identifying these funds and simplify the process of segregating general premium dollars from those used to cover abortion services, the ACA requires that health plans estimate the cost of abortion coverage at no less than $1 per enrollee per month.

H.R. 7 would require plans covering abortion to misrepresent this practice as an ''abortion surcharge,'' which is to be disclosed and identified as a portion of the consumer's premium.

By describing abortion coverage in this way, H.R. 7 makes it look as though it is an added, extra cost, available only at an additional fee, when in fact it is not.

Taken together, the provisions in H.R. 7 have the effect, and possibly the intent, of arbitrarily infringing women's reproductive freedoms and pose a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in Roe v. Wade.

Madam Speaker, one of the most detestable aspects of this bill is that it would curb access to care for women in the most desperate of circumstances.

Women like Danielle Deaver, who was 22 weeks pregnant when her water broke. Tests showed that Danielle had suffered anhydramnios, a premature rupture of the membranes before the fetus has achieved viability.

This condition meant that the fetus likely would be born with a shortening of muscle tissue that results in the inability to move limbs. In addition, Danielle's fetus likely would suffer deformities to the face and head, and the lungs were unlikely to develop beyond the 22-week point.

There was less than a 10% chance that, if born, Danielle's baby would be able to breathe on its own and only a 2% chance the baby would be able to eat on its own.

H.R. 7 hurts women like Vikki Stella, a diabetic, who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival. Because of Vildri's diabetes, her doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vildd than an abortion.

Every pregnancy is different. No politician knows, or has the right to assume he knows, what is best for a woman and her family.

These are decisions that properly must be left to women to make, in consultation with their partners, doctors, and their God.

H.R. 7 lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother.

H.R. 7 is an unconstitutional infringement on the right to privacy, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in a long line of cases going back to Griswold v. Connecticut in 1965 and Roe v. Wade decided in 1973.

In Roe v. Wade, the Court held that a state could not prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability.

While many factors go into determining fetal viability, the consensus of the medical community is that viability is acknowledged as not occurring prior to 24 weeks gestation.

Supreme Court precedents make it clear that neither Congress nor a state legislature can declare any one element—''be it weeks of gestation or fetal weight or any other single factor—as the determinant'' of viability. Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 388–89 (1979).

The constitutionally protected right to privacy encompasses the right of women to choose to terminate a pregnancy before viability, and even later where continuing to term poses a threat to her health and safety.

This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate.

The bill before us threatens this hard won right for women and must be defeated.

I urge all members to join me in opposing the rule and the underlying bill. H.R. 7 should be pulled off of this floor!

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 36, the ''Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.'' In the last Congress, I opposed this irresponsible and reckless legislation.

I opposed the bill, which arbitrarily bans a woman from exercising her constitutionally protect right to choose to terminate a pregnancy after 20 weeks, last year for the same reasons I do now. This purely partisan and divisive legislation:

1. Unduly burdens a woman's right to terminate a pregnancy and thus puts their lives at risk;

2. Does not contain exceptions for the health of the mother;

3. As introduced and considered in the Judiciary Committee, unfairly targeted the District of Columbia; and

4. Infringes upon women's right to privacy, which is guaranteed and protected by the U.S. Constitution.

Madam Speaker, in 2010, Nebraska passed a law banning abortion care after 20 weeks. Since then 10 more red states—Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, and Oklahoma—have enacted similar bans. None of these laws has an adequate health exception. Only one provides an exception for cases of rape or incest.

H.R. 36 seeks to take the misguided and mean-spirited policy of these states and make it the law of the land. In so doing, the bill poses a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in Roe v. Wade.

Madam Speaker, one of the most detestable aspects of this bill is that it would curb access to care for women in the most desperate of circumstances. It is these women who receive the 1.5 percent of abortions that occur after 20 weeks.

Women like Danielle Deaver, who was 22 weeks pregnant when her water broke. Tests showed that Danielle had suffered anhydramnios, a premature rupture of the membranes before the fetus has achieved viability. This condition meant that the fetus likely would be born with a shortening of muscle tissue that results in the inability to move limbs.

In addition, Danielle's fetus likely would suffer deformities to the face and head, and the lungs were unlikely to develop beyond the 22-week point. There was less than a 10% chance that, if born, Danielle's baby would be able to breathe on its own and only a 2% chance the baby would be able to eat on its own. Danielle and her husband decided to terminate the pregnancy but could not because of the Nebraska ban. Danielle had no recourse but to endure the pain and suffering that followed. Eight days later, Danielle gave birth to a daughter, Elizabeth, who died 15 minutes later.

H.R. 36 hurts women like Vikki Stella, a diabetic, who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival. Because of Vikki's diabetes, her doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vikki than an abortion. Because Vikki was able to terminate the pregnancy, she was protected from the immediate and serious medical risks to her health and her ability to have children in the future was preserved.

Madam Speaker, every pregnancy is different. No politician knows, or has the right to assume he knows, what is best for a woman and her family. These are decisions that properly must be left to women to make, in consultation with their partners, doctors, and their God.

That is why the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the nation's leading medical experts on women's health, strongly opposes 20- week bans, citing the threat these laws pose to women's health.

Madam Speaker, I also strongly oppose H.R. 36 because it lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother. In fact, the majority Republicans rejected an amendment offered by our colleague, Congressman NADLER, which would have added a ''health of the mother'' exception to the bill.

Madam Speaker, this may come as news to some in this body, but each year approximately 25,000 women in the United States become pregnant as a result of rape. And about a third (30%) of these rapes involved women under age 18!

Madam Speaker, last and most important, I oppose H.R. 36 because it is an unconstitutional infringement on the right to privacy, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in a long line of cases going back to Griswold v. Connecticut in 1965 and Roe v. Wade decided in 1973. In Roe v. Wade, the Court held that a state could prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability. While many factors go into determining fetal viability, the consensus of the medical community is that viability is acknowledged as not occurring prior to 24 weeks gestation.

Late Wednesday night because of how absurd H.R. 36 was—it was pulled from the floor.

By prohibiting nearly all abortions beginning at ''the probable post-fertilization age'' of 20 weeks, H.R. 36 violates this clear and long standing constitutional rule.

In striking down Texas's pre-viability abortion prohibitions, the Supreme Court stated in Roe v. Wade:

> With respect to the State's important and legitimate interest in potential life, the 'compelling' point is at viability. This is so because the fetus then presumably has the capability of meaningful life outside the mother's womb. State regulation protective of fetal life after viability thus has both logical and biological justification. If the State is interested in protecting fetal life after viability, it may go as far as to proscribe abortion during that period, except when it is necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother.

Supreme Court precedents make it clear that neither Congress nor a state legislature can declare any one element—''be it weeks of gestation or fetal weight or any other single factor—as the determinant'' of viability. Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 388–89 (1979). NOT can the government restrict a woman's autonomy by arbitrarily setting the number of weeks gestation so low as to effectively prohibit access to abortion services as is the case with the bill before us.

If this bill ever were to become law, it would not survive a constitutional challenge even to its facial validity. A similar 20-week provision enacted by the Utah legislature was struck down years ago as unconstitutional by the United States Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit because it ''unduly burden[ed] a woman's right to choose to abort a nonviable fetus.'' Jane L. v. Bangerter, 102 F.3d 1112, 1118 (10th Cir. 1996). And just last month, the Ninth Circuit struck down a 20 week ban on the ground that the U.S. Supreme Court has been ''unalterably clear'' that ''a woman has a constitutional right to choose to terminate her pregnancy before the fetus is viable.'' Isaacson v. Horne, F.3d, No. 12–16670, 2013 WL 2160171, at *1 (9th Cir. May 21, 2013).

Madam Speaker, the constitutionally protected right to privacy encompasses the right of women to choose to terminate a pregnancy before viability, and even later where continuing to term poses a threat to her health and safety.

This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, STEVE CHABOT, another pro-life champion and the principal sponsor of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, a little while ago, a number of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle came down and made, I believe, the ludicrous allegation that this bill is somehow an attack on women's health care, and, therefore, we ought to be spending time on the infrastructure and on a whole range of issues.

If you want to talk about an attack on women's health care, it is called ''ObamaCare.'' It is an attack on the health care of women and men and children in this country—deductibles up, premiums up, the quality of health care down. Most of the folks who came down to the mike—I can't say all of them. I think probably all of them if they were here—voted for ObamaCare, and the American people are having to live with the results of that. Now, that is an attack on the health care of American women.

This legislation simply says that there ought not to be taxpayer dollars going to pay for abortions in this country, that one person shouldn't have to pay for the abortion of another person whether it is on moral grounds, conscience, or one's religion. You shouldn't make one person pay for another person's abortion. It is pretty simple, and the American people overwhelmingly agree with that point of view. That is what this legislation is about. It is in ObamaCare as well. It is the same thing. Through insurance or otherwise, you shouldn't force one person to pay for another person's abortion because one is opposed to it.

Today happens to be a day that is important to me. It is the day I was born. It is my birthday. It also happens to be the date that, I would say, the infamous decision of Roe v. Wade came down. My birthday was in 1953, and this was in 1973 that Roe came down. On this day, I can't help but think of those millions and millions and millions of Americans who do not exist today because of that decision.

This, obviously, is related to that, but it is mostly about the choice that a person has to make; and if she makes that choice, should somebody else have to pay for it? The law says ''no.'' I agree with the law. Support this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, once again, women's rights are being attacked on the floor of the House. A decision about health that should be made by a woman and her doctor is, instead, being made by politicians with an agenda. Despite their claims of acting for the sake of women's health, this draconian bill would deny women access to medical care and drive out abortion coverage from private health plans once and for all.

What would be the effect?

Women would be denied access to abortion, especially low-income and minority women who are buying health insurance through the marketplace. For some, they will be sent back to the

days before Roe v. Wade, when women who were desperate for help were driven to unlicensed doctors and unsanitary conditions, often suffering infections, hemorrhages, and, at times, death.

We should not be in the business of endangering women's health and safety. This is why, yesterday, I introduced the Women's Health Protection Act. It would prevent States from restricting access to abortion if they cannot demonstrate an actual benefit to women's health. Personal medical decisions belong solely to the people they impact and to the medical professionals they trust. We must oppose this bill.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee, DIANE BLACK, another pro-life spokesperson.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, today is a somber occasion. On this 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court's tragic decision in Roe v. Wade, our hearts ache for the 56 million unborn lives that have been lost due to this shameful practice of abortion.

But, today, there is hope because we have an opportunity to make a difference by passing the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This commonsense, compassionate legislation will protect Americans' conscience rights by ensuring that their hard-earned tax dollars are not used to fund the destruction of a human life.

As a mother, a grandmother, and a nurse for over 40 years, this measure is especially meaningful to me. During my years in the health care industry, I saw the joy in young parents' eyes when they met their newborn children for the very first time; I held the hands of grieving spouses and children as they said their final good-byes to loved ones; and, sadly, I witnessed a young woman lose her life due to the effects of a botched abortion.

These experiences informed my view that all life is a precious gift from God, and I pray that, in time, this truth will be reflected in our Nation's laws; but, until then, can't we at least do this much?

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion, and I thank the sponsor for his work on this deeply important legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, a bill falsely advertised as pro-family and supporting American values.

If they actually care about defending the values of our Nation and of the well-being of American families, I ask my colleagues across the aisle to offer legislation that reflects the priorities of American families instead of debating a bill that the Republican leadership just threw on the calendar at the last minute because their original abortion bill was too extreme, even for them.

Today, we should be discussing ways to ensure every woman can put food on the table by raising the minimum wage, like 29 States have done, and by passing equal pay for women. We should be discussing how to ensure that every person who dreams of a higher education has access to it by working with President Obama on his community college proposal. We should be discussing legislation to allow 43 million workers to take time off when they are sick and to make sure parents can take time off with their new babies.

These are the family-centered priorities that reflect our values as a nation, and these are, certainly, the challenges that my constituents in south Florida sent me here to tackle. Instead, we are debating a bill with an underlying principle that has already been codified.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that a regressive policy of banning taxpayer funding for abortion, which only serves to punish our Nation's poor and most vulnerable women, already exists. As the President said Tuesday night, while we may not agree on choice, we can at least agree that the best people to make these decisions for women are not politicians. Building on the zeal to interfere in the health decisions of women, this bill goes even further by tying a woman's health options to her income.

A strong majority of Americans agree, including 62 percent who identify as Republicans, that abortion is the wrong issue for Congress to be spending its time on. I agree with them. When my colleagues are prepared to work on legislation that truly addresses the concerns of the American people, we stand ready to work with them.

Listen to your Members who sounded the alarm bell on the original bill that was pulled off this floor, and get your priorities straight.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, Mr. KEVIN MCCARTHY, our distinguished majority leader in this Congress.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, we are here today, taking a step forward towards a simple goal—to save innocent lives from abortion and to make sure no woman ever has to make that decision to end the life of her child. We all know that this is more than just some debate or social disagreement. These are human beings we are talking about.

□ 1200

This is about pregnant mothers facing hardship and tough choices. It is about a culture of telling people that human life is expendable. But most importantly, this is about human beings—more than 56 million children since Roe v. Wade—who have been denied a chance to live. We are here today for them, to make sure every person has the most fundamental right of all: the right to life.

Today, on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade and during the March for Life, the House will vote on a bill to stop all Federal funding from being used to pay for abortion. At the very least, the American people should never be forced to pay for abortions or abortion coverage with their tax dollars.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the hundreds of thousands of people out on The Mall right now by voting for this bill. Stand up and commit to creating an America that values every life, especially the lives of innocents who cannot stand up for themselves.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) for yielding and for her advocacy and work on this issue.

Today, on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, which changed history for women in America by allowing them to control their own bodies, I rise against the effort to roll back these rights.

Though we have come a long way in the last 42 years, some politicians want to undo this progress and restrict access to critical medical procedures women may need. Why have we been debating whether the government should seize control over women's health decisions when the American people want us to work together to create good-paying jobs, balance the budget, and raise the minimum wage? Instead, this Chamber is wasting time with a divisive argument about whether the government should jeopardize a woman's access to medically necessary procedures.

Politicians are not medical experts, and we should not deny a woman the ability to make her own decisions with those she trusts the most. I ask my colleagues to focus on the economy instead of spending time on bills that divide this House and this country.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on this very, very important issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of life. Today is a very joyous and hopeful day on what is a very sad anniversary. Today is the 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court decision Roe v. Wade. Hundreds of thousands of pro-life advocates from across the country, and many from my own hometown of St. Louis, Missouri, will be on The Mall as we march in honor of the over 56 million precious angels we have lost over the last 42 years.

Madam Speaker, I believe in the sanctity of life, I believe that life begins at conception, and that every life is a gift.

There is an area where most Americans agree and where elected officials should all come together, and that is on the Federal funding of abortion. The majority of Americans do not want their hard-earned tax dollars going to pay for abortions, and Congress has consistently worked together over the years by attaching the Hyde amendment to appropriations bills to prevent taxpayer funds from going towards abortions.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor and support H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act. There is no more appropriate day than today to consider such important legislation.

This bill does exactly what the name implies. It permanently ensures that no taxpayer dollars go to pay for abortion or abortion coverage. This bill codifies the Hyde amendment and also addresses taxpayer funding for abortion that, unfortunately, the Hyde amendment does not cover.

For example, ObamaCare expressly allows funding for plans that include abortion through taxpayer subsidies. During the health care debate, the President assured the American people that no Federal dollars would be used to fund abortions under ObamaCare. It was yet again another broken promise.

However, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act not only prevents taxpayer funding for abortion under ObamaCare, it also requires transparency to ensure the consumers are fully informed about which plans on the exchanges contain abortion coverage and surcharges.

Madam Speaker, throughout my life I have worked to draw attention to the pro-life movement—to change hearts and minds and to approach this issue with love and compassion. I will continue to work throughout my time in Congress towards the day when abortion is not only illegal but abortion is unthinkable.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, I want to first say to the other side of the aisle that I am grateful that some members of your caucus recognized that indeed extremism on this issue has got to come to an end and that you took steps to roll back the ridiculous bill that you had intended to bring up today but didn't have the votes for because they spoke up. And I am grateful to them.

In some respects, you look around this room and you think, Is this a Chamber of Congress or is this a doctor's office? We might as well have stethoscopes, stirrups, and speculums here because that is what you are doing. You are trying to come between a woman and her physician.

There is a lot of hoopla today because this is the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, and this is a messaging bill, so we are here messaging. Roe v. Wade was a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States of America, and when each of us became Members of this body this month, we swore that we would uphold the Constitution of the United States. But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle spend hours and hours wringing hands, trying to somehow find ways to undo constitutional decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court.

So we are here having yet another debate when American women in this country are far more interested in equal pay for equal work, paid sick leave, a child care tax credit that has some resemblance to what reality is in this country. But rather, we will continue to act like doctors here.

And I might add there are even some hypocrites on the other side of the aisle who have counseled their own girlfriends to have abortions. It is legal, Members. We have a right to maintain this legality.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), another eloquent pro-life force.

Mr. LAMALFA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today, I am glad to be a Californian who is in favor of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Indeed, we have heard some interesting debate on this today, deflecting issues like higher pay or building more infrastructure, which we desperately need in California, as well as the water supply, and even entering the word ''child care'' in when we are talking about paying for abortions. Interesting. Even words like ''access.'' Well, abortion has been certainly accessible for 42 years, millions of times.

The central point is, Are the taxpayers going to be compelled to pay for it? Are the American people out there—those 68 percent, in the latest poll—going to be compelled to pay for something?

Jefferson said:

> To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.

People who are pro-life, as well as many that are pro-choice, might agree with the idea that abortion should be available—on the pro-choice side. But many, many disagree, a supermajority. The number of people who disagree with this would override a veto in these two Houses in the Capitol.

Yet what we are finding in my own State of California is an interpretation of ObamaCare—which is one of those job-killing, non-infrastructure building items that is hurting our economy in California and in this country—where we are being compelled, whether you are a church or religious charity, employer or individual, to have included in your insurance plans these provisions paying for abortions.

Where is the freedom in that? Where is the conscientious objection to that? Where is the freedom of expression that I hear a lot from the other side of the aisle—until recent years? Our First Amendment?

This bureaucratic mandate, which includes their opinion on what it would be under ObamaCare, largely done quietly, in the middle of the night, out of the public eye, is now being put on Californians. We need to send the message back that Californians should not be compelled to have to provide this in their coverage.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I feel compelled to point out, after listening to the debate and the hyperbole, the passionate thoughts of what a high priority this is for the Republican leadership to bring this bill to the floor—such a high priority that they didn't think about it until late last night. They didn't bring it to committee. They rushed it to the floor without having even thought of this legislation until late last night. Such a high priority. We know, the American people know, this is political theater.

In listening to the debate, it is also quite revealing in listening to some of the comments made that this is not about taxpayer funding for the health care choices that American women legally have and the Constitution supports and that the Supreme Court clarified 42 years ago, but it is about preventing women from making that choice in the first place. That is a choice that ought to be made by women, by themselves, in consultation with their health care provider, and not by Members of Congress.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, might I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Is there any way to make an anti-women, anti-health, anti-choice bill worse? Sure there is. Add a provision that keeps a local jurisdiction—the District of Columbia—from spending its own local funds on abortion services for poor women, exactly as 17 States of the Union do. Americans will ask: How on Earth can you do that in this country? Laughably—by declaring the District of Columbia government to be a virtual Federal agency.

This bill hurts millions of women across the country who have a constitutional right to make choices about

their own health. It compounds that discrimination by violating the oldest American principle—local control of local funds.

The Senate has repeatedly rejected this bill, and I expect them to have the good sense to repeat that rejection.

□ 1215

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today on the 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This vital bill establishes that no taxpayer funds be used for abortion, including plans that cover abortion under the President's health care law.

These restrictions will save lives. According to the research by the Guttmacher Institute, policies that cut taxpayer funds towards abortion will actually prevent 25 percent or more of the abortions that would otherwise take place.

Furthermore, recent polling has demonstrated that the American public is widely opposed to taxpayer funds for abortion. According to a Marist poll released in January of this year, 68 percent of the respondents opposed taxpayer funds for abortion. A CNN poll from last year shows that 56 percent of respondents oppose public funding for abortion.

As a mother of four, I know personally how precious the gift of human life is and how important it is to honor that gift. As legislators, it is both our job and responsibility to protect the innocent lives of the unborn and to serve as a voice for those who do not yet have one.

Today, the U.S. House has a historic opportunity to put an end to the use of taxpayer funding for abortion. In drafting the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, Thomas Jefferson so wisely penned: ''To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions in which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical.''

Madam Speaker, I emphatically agree.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), one of our distinguished new Members.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, absolutely outrageous, that is what Republicans' attempt to repeal Roe v. Wade on its 42nd anniversary is, absolutely outrageous.

A blatant attack on women and their families, their first attempt, H.R. 36, failed because women of both parties spoke out to let our male Republican colleagues know they have gone too far.

The women of this House know that a woman cannot call herself free who does not own or control her own body. We are free, Madam Speaker.

Here we go again, H.R. 7, another attempt to attack women's rights. It especially impacts women of color—not on my watch.

Women of the House, let's do it again. Let's prevent this legislation from moving forward, and let's vote ''no.''

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

First of all, abortion is not health care. It is a brutal procedure that ends the lives of unborn children through suction, dismemberment, decapitation, or chemical poison. It is the most violent form of death known to mankind.

As Frederica Mathewes-Green, former chair of the Feminists for Life, said:

Abortion breaks a mother's heart.

She said:

There are always two victims in an abortion. One is the baby, and one is the mother; one is dead, one is wounded.

Madam Speaker, this human rights abuse should not be paid for or encouraged by government taxpayer money. The women in the Silent No More Awareness Campaign and the women in Operation Outcry point out that abortion not only takes the lives of the unborn child, it wounds all the mothers. We should keep this in mind.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank my good friend, DIANA, for her leadership on this issue and for so many other important issues and for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, despite the rhetoric we have heard from our Republican colleagues about their commitment to focusing, laserlike, on what the American people care about most—creating jobs and accelerating economic growth—the only thing that they have accelerated in this new Congress is their attacks on a woman's constitutional rights.

In just their first 7 days in office, our Republican colleagues have introduced six anti-choice bills and brought two of them to the floor for debate; so rather than focus on jobs, we have a bill that is not only an assault on women, it is pure political posturing that is guaranteed to be vetoed, even if it makes it through the Senate. The President has made that clear.

We need to focus on what the vast majority of the American people have asked us to do: create greater economic opportunity for all Americans.

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

The gentlelady said what the American people care about. Well, a Marist poll released this month found that 68 percent of the respondents oppose taxpayer funding for abortion. A February 2014 CNN poll showed that 56 percent of the respondents opposed public funding of abortion. A January 2010 Quinnipiac University poll showed 67 percent of the respondents opposed Federal funding of abortions.

A November 2009 Washington Post poll showed 61 percent of the respondents opposed government subsidies for health insurance that includes abortion. A September 2009 International Communications Research poll showed that 67 percent of respondents opposed measures that would require people to pay for abortion coverage with their Federal taxes.

We know what the American people care about.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I just have to end with what I started with. There is no Federal taxpayer funding for abortion. There has not been for many decades.

Some people, like me, think that this is an ill-conceived public policy, but it is the law of the land, it is the law of the land every year in the appropriations bill, and it is part of the compromise that was negotiated with the Affordable Care Act, so we need to keep that in mind as we talk about what this legislation does.

What this legislation will do is it will take away the ability of women in the exchanges to buy comprehensive health care insurance with their own money.

Now, I heard many speakers on the other side of the aisle today talk about their deep concerns about abortion and unwanted pregnancies. Well, I will tell you something: if you want to reduce unwanted pregnancies—which all of us in this room do—what you need to do is give women quality health insurance with robust family planning and a full range of health care services.

The Guttmacher Institute, in a 2010 study, showed, happily, that teen pregnancy in this country was at the lowest rate in over 30 years. Do you know why? Two reasons: number one, birth control for these teenagers; and, number two, comprehensive health insurance.

This Congress which has passed, over and over again, restrictions on birth control access—not just for teens, but for all women—and restrictions on comprehensive family planning is actually passing legislation that is going to stop this decrease in unwanted teen pregnancies.

It is an ill-conceived policy. It is a wrongheaded policy. If we want to stop unwanted pregnancies, the way to do it is to have comprehensive health insurance for all American women.

Now, the majority, at the last minute, pulled the bill with the egregious provisions on rape that would have required rape victims to affirmatively go to the police before they could raise the exception, but don't make any mistake about it, this bill is just as egregious as that bill.

The reason it is is because, in an unprecedented move, it stops American women and their families from being able to get comprehensive health insurance with their own money.

What would happen is it would open up a significant divide between the coverage that large employers would give to families and small employers and individuals.

Now, the other thing this does is it reopens the debate and the compromise that we had in the Affordable Care Act. The compromise we made in that bill was that there would be no public funding for abortion under the Affordable Care Act.

It was negotiated, it was agreed upon, and as the other side admitted, the President issued an executive order saying he would enforce the current law on that, and, in fact, that is what happened.

The act required two separate premium payments for women and their families who receive premium tax credits and choose coverage that includes abortion services. The act is clear in its language. No portion of premium tax credits may be used to pay for the portion of comprehensive health coverage that is purchased in the marketplaces that relates to abortion services.

The compromise was agreed upon by pro-life groups like the Catholic Health Association and everybody else, and now, this compromise is being thrown out the window.

Well, our opponents say there was a GAO report last September that said that insurance companies were not segregating the funds, so they say that that means, somehow, Federal dollars are being used to pay for abortions.

Well, after that GAO study came out, Madam Speaker, the HHS promulgated a new rule clarifying the agreement under the Affordable Care Act that the funds had to be segregated, and they promulgated this rule on Wednesday, November 26.

Madam Speaker, I will insert that proposed rule into the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

So this compromise is being honored by the administration.

Now, early in this debate, I asked my opponents to please give me one example where Federal taxpayer dollars have been used to pay for abortions. I haven't heard that example, and it is because it is not happening. This is a false issue that is being raised.

I would submit to everybody here: let's stop talking about this false issue just because there are a whole bunch of people in town who want us to pass some legislation; let's talk about some real issues.

We just received a Statement of Administration Policy from the White House. Not surprisingly, the administration has said that the President would veto this bill. The bill is likely dead on arrival in the Senate, but even if it did pass, it would be vetoed.

I have a suggestion for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: let's take up some issues that the women and families of America care about; let's take up the issue of how we are going to give women good jobs with comprehensive health insurance, so they can make their own decisions, along with their family and their doctor.

Let's talk about legislation that will allow women of America to get jobs that have equal pay for equal work to the men. Let's talk about a bill that will give tax credits for families who have to struggle every month to pay for child care for their little kids. Let's talk about that.

□ 1230

And finally, let's talk about parental leave, which virtually every other country in the world has, so that when families have children whom they love so much and want to take care of, they won't have to go back to work because their employer doesn't pay them for family leave. Let's talk about that because, Madam Speaker, that is what the women and families of America want us to talk about.

I urge us to reject this legislation. I urge a ''no'' vote.

g. Segregation of Funds for Abortion Services (§156.280)

Section 1303 of the Affordable Care Act and §156.280 specify accounting and other standards for issuers of QHPs through the Exchange in the individual market that cover abortion services for which public funding is prohibited (also referred to as non-excepted abortion services). The statute and regulations establish that unless otherwise prohibited by State law, a QHP issuer may elect to cover such services. If an issuer elects to cover such services under a QHP sold through the individual market Exchange, the issuer must take certain steps to ensure that no premium tax credit or cost-sharing reduction funds are used to pay claims for abortion services for which public funding may not be used.

We are providing guidance on an individual market Exchange issuer's responsibilities with respect to requirements related to QHP coverage of abortion services for which public funding is prohibited. HHS works with stakeholders, including States and issuers, to help them fully understand and follow the statutes and regulations governing the provision of health insurance coverage under a QHP through the Exchange. As is the case with many provisions in the Affordable Care Act, States and State insurance commissioners are the entities primarily responsible for implementing and enforcing the provisions in section 1303 of the Affordable Care Act related to individual market QHP coverage of nonexcepted abortion services. OPM may issue guidance related to these provisions for multi-State plan issuers.

Under section 1303(b)(2)(B) of the Affordable Care Act, as implemented in §156.280(e)(2)(i), individual market Exchange issuers must collect a separate payment from each enrollee, for an amount equal to the AV of the coverage for abortions for which public funding is prohibited. However, section 1303 of the Affordable Care Act and §156.280 do not specify the method an issuer must use to comply with the separate payment requirement. This provision may be satisfied in a number of ways. Several such ways include, but are not limited to: sending the enrollee a single monthly invoice or bill that separately itemizes the premium amount for nonexcepted abortion services; sending a separate monthly bill for these services; or sending the enrollee a notice at or soon after the time of enrollment that the monthly invoice or bill will include a separate charge for such services and specify the charge. Section 1303 of the Affordable Care Act permits, but does not require a QHP issuer to separately identify the premium for non-excepted abortion services on the monthly premium bill in order to comply with the separate payment requirement. A consumer may pay the premium for non-excepted abortion services and for all other services in a single transaction, with the issuer depositing the funds into the issuer's separate allocation accounts as required by section 1301(b)(2)(C) of the Affordable Care Act, as implemented in §156.280(e)(2)(ii) and §156.280(e)(3).

Section 1303(b)(2)(D) of the Affordable Care Act, as implemented in §156.280(e)(4), establishes requirements for individual market Exchange issuers with respect to how much they must charge each QHP enrollee for coverage of abortions for which public funding is prohibited. A QHP issuer must estimate the basic per enrollee, per month cost, determined on an average actuarial basis, for including coverage of non-excepted abortion services. In making this estimate, a QHP issuer may not estimate the basic cost of coverage for non-excepted abortion services to be less than one dollar per enrollee, per month. This means that an issuer must charge each QHP enrollee a minimum premium of one dollar per month for coverage of non-excepted abortion services.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 7—NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Rep. Smith, R–New Jersey, and 20 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 7. The legislation would intrude on women's reproductive freedom and access to health care; increase the financial burden on many Americans; unnecessarily restrict the private insurance choices that consumers have today; and restrict the District of Columbia's use of local funds, which undermines home rule. Longstanding Federal policy prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortions, except in cases of rape or incest, or when the life of the woman would be endangered. This prohibition is maintained in the Affordable Care Act and reinforced through the President's Executive Order 13535. H.R. 7 would go well beyond these safeguards by interfering with consumers' private health care choices. The Administration strongly opposes legislation that unnecessarily restricts women's reproductive freedoms and consumers' private insurance options.

If the President were presented with H.R. 7 his senior advisors would recommend that he veto this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again, on the so-called compromise, I offered the Hyde language in the committee, and we won in a bipartisan vote. Chairman Waxman recessed, changed the votes, stripped it out, and brought it to the floor without Hyde. I was involved in the negotiation.

I wrote the Stupak-Pitts amendment. I know what the compromise is with the so-called executive order. It is full of loopholes. The Hyde amendment does not apply to the Affordable Care Act.

I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), another pro-life champion.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, make no mistake about what this debate is about. H.R. 7 codifies that no taxpayer money would be given for abortions.

But the real debate on the floor today is about life. We are talking about life in the people's House, on the floor of the people's House. We are talking about a gift from God. We are talking about something that was so well put into our Declaration of Independence—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the first of those being life. I understand that there is a serious debate about that.

There are times that people say: Listen, we are not really ready right now for this child. But expectant mothers and unborn children have got to be protected. My goodness, in a nation that recoils at the news around the world, at the loss of life, and says this is horrible what is happening in Syria, this is horrible what is happening in the Mideast, this is horrible that this is happening, then we want to go there, and we want to rush to help people because there is a loss of life, and then in our own country we have turned a blind eye and a deaf ear to the loss of 56 million unborn children. These are lives that were lost that did not have to be lost.

I know there is a law that says they have the right to make that decision. It may be legal, but I don't think it is right.

As far as giving a gift to the 500,000 or so people that are in Washington today in the pro-life march, this is not a gift from the Republican Party to these people. This is a gift from our Creator, Himself, on reproduction. How we have demeaned this and reduced it down to a political discussion is absolutely abhorrent.

Never, never has this country ever turned its back on the most vulnerable.

I have been there for the birth of my four children. I have 10 grandchildren now. I have also held the hands of my mother, my father, and my sister as they died. There is nothing more precious than life. There is just nothing more precious than that.

I ask all my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 7 to answer the American people who say we do not want to fund abortion, to end this debate, and let's move forward.

Mr. PITTS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, this bill is simply outrageous. It was bad enough that the Majority brought to the floor H.R. 36 outside the regular order. But the Majority had to pull that bill when the women in their Conference informed their Leadership just how bad the bill was and that they could not vote for it. Undeterred at its 'war on women' the Majority pulled H.R. 36 and rushed to the floor an equally offensive bill, H.R. 7. This new bill, H.R. 7, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2015 is simply an attempt to substitute one anti-family bill for another. Timed to coincide with the annual pro-life march in Washington, this is a blatant attempt at pandering to their base.

During the last elections, the Republicans made quite a show of how they would run the Congress by regular order and make Congress work for the American people. However, we have had mere hours notice that this bill would even be brought to the floor. The bill was introduced yesterday and has already been fast tracked by the leadership to be on the floor this morning! Needless to say, there was NO committee debate and NO opportunity to amend the bill in any way. No one has even had a chance to read the bill. Who says those in Congress can't get things done quickly when they want to?

Supporters of the bill argue that it will simply codify the Hyde amendment and permanently prohibit taxpayer funding of abortion. However, we all know that is false. H.R. 7 is actually much more nefarious than that. It seeks to restrict women's reproductive rights and access to health care; increase healthcare premiums for many Americans and small businesses; and, limit the private insurance choices of consumers. It will almost certainly guarantee that insurance companies will no longer offer abortion coverage to consumers.

The Republicans in the House are continuing the mission to completely eliminate women's reproductive rights and their access to healthcare. As with the previous version of this bill, H.R. 7 is nothing more than a statement bill.

In addition, this bill also undermines the D.C. home rule. H.R. 7 prohibits D.C. from using its own Medicaid funds to provide abortion, language that is already included in the annual appropriations bill. This is despite the fact that 17 states currently use their own state funds to provide abortion.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 is the antithesis of Republicans stated goal of ''small government.'' How can the Majority be so hypocritical? The Republican Majority is using this bill to reach into the lives of millions of Americans and make their health care decisions for them.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, our Great Nation was founded upon the idea that ALL men are ''endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights.'' And the first right mentioned in our Declaration of Independence is that of Life. We must do all we can to uphold this most fundamental value.

Today is the anniversary of the tragic Roe v. Wade ruling. In response, thousands of people have come to Washington, DC to participate in the annual March for Life so that those who cannot speak for themselves do have a voice.

In solidarity, the House is also taking action to uphold our founding principles and protect our unborn by voting to reaffirm that no federal funding—including Obamacare subsidies—shall be used to pay for or subsidize abortions. At a time when our national debt is over $18 trillion, to allow any federal funding for abortions would be a breach in the trust that the American public has placed in us to be good stewards of taxpayers' dollars—but more importantly, to protect our unborn.

I have consistently cosponsored and voted for legislation that continues the prohibition on federal funding for abortions, and I fully support H.R. 7. I am dedicated to protecting the sanctity of human life, which begins at conception. While today's vote is crucial to protecting the unborn, we cannot rest. Therefore I look forward to joining millions of Americans as we continue the important work of fully protecting our God-given right to Life for ALL, including our most innocent.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, goundhog Day isn't for a couple more weeks, but you wouldn't know that from looking at the Republican majority's agenda these past few weeks. They've brought up one partisan bill after another that already proved unsuccessful in previous years.

Today, we are revisiting the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, which is misleading and redundant to say the least and represents yet another attempt by Republicans to restrict a woman's reproductive rights and access to lifesaving health services. In fact, it's their second attempt this week after they had to pull a controversial and unconstitutional 20-week (abortion) ban due to lack of support on their side of the aisle.

The contradiction between this narrow, ideological agenda and the message Republicans attempted to convey in their response to the President's State of the Union address this week—in which they claimed they would be ''working to change the direction in Washington'' and passing ''serious job-creation ideas''—is stark.

Aside from denying care to women in the most desperate of circumstances, this bill would go beyond the current Hyde Amendment to place restrictions on how women with private insurance can spend private dollars in purchasing health insurance. It is a prima facie infringement of women's constitutional rights.

Madam Speaker, as polarizing as these debates continue to be, I believe we should make decisions based on this country's founding principles of personal liberty that should always guide this body on the subject of women's reproductive health.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I join with women's rights advocates, health care stakeholders, and religious groups in opposing H.R. 7, the Unprecedented, Radical Assault on Women's Health Care Act. This piece of legislation is another attempt by politicians to control women's private health care choices.

As we emerge from one of the worst economic crises in our nation's history, Congressional leaders should focus on bills to increase Americans' paychecks, create jobs, improve education, and incentivize investment in America rather than jeopardize the health of American women and undermine longstanding Supreme Court precedence regarding women's reproductive health.

Politicians are not medical experts, yet this bill today allows politicians to control women's private health care decisions. Politics should not drive medical decisions.

I firmly believe that the American people wish to see their representatives focus on proactive policies that strengthen our economy and address their health care needs, such as by increasing access to affordable health care and reducing health disparities. Rather than imposing national restrictions on private medical decisions, policymakers should focus on keeping Americans healthy via comprehensive health care, healthy pregnancies, and healthy children. Rather than allowing the federal government to violate the basic constitutional

rights of women, we should increase our investment in research and development, help students afford and succeed in college, raise the minimum wage, strengthen our roads and bridges, and invest in our communities.

America needs policymakers who support our citizens, not who subordinate them. I cannot support this bill that allows politics to control women's medical choices, and I urge my colleagues to oppose.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Longstanding federal policy explicitly prohibits the use of federal funds for abortions, except for certain narrow circumstances of rape, incest, or severe health complications that threaten the life of the mother. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) maintains this ban and a federal appeals court confirmed that no federal dollars may be used to pay for abortion services under the law.

Far more sweeping in scope than the title implies, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act goes well beyond codifying the Hyde Amendment and protecting public funds. This bill intrudes on women's reproductive autonomy and access to health care, manipulates the tax code to put additional financial burdens on many women and small businesses, and unnecessarily restricts the private insurance choices available to consumers today.

The House of Representatives should be spending our time working to improve access to health care for all Americans, instead of deceptive legislation that interferes with a woman's ability to make personal, private medical decisions.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 42, 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. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. MOORE. Yes, Madam Speaker. I am opposed to it in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Moore moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE III—RULE OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 301. PROTECTING THE MEDICAL PRIVACY OF WOMEN, INCLUDING VICTIMS OF RAPE AND INCEST.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any party to violate, directly or indirectly, the medical privacy of any woman, including the victims of rape or incest, with respect to her choice or use of comprehensive health insurance coverage.

Mrs. BLACKBURN (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, and it will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If this amendment is adopted, the bill, as amended, will immediately proceed to final passage.

As the Clerk has indicated, Madam Speaker, this motion to recommit would merely protect the medical privacy of millions of women, including those women who are victims of rape and incest. It would ensure that nothing in H.R. 7, the underlying legislation, could be construed to allow any entity to violate the medical privacy of any woman, including these victims, when it comes to her choice of comprehensive health care services.

Madam Speaker, we have heard a great debate here today, and we have heard, Madam Speaker, the majority party insist that we need to codify the 1976 Hyde amendment prohibiting poor women from having abortions.

I can assure you that, as we have looked over the past 42 years here on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we have seen that low-income women—particularly women of color—have been disproportionately impacted by the very successful implementation of the Hyde amendment. Women have been forced to choose between food and shelter. They have been forced to choose between the best interests of their health, and they have given birth, on many occasions, even despite their poor health status, their poor economic status, or their poor emotional status to children who are poor.

We have heard data and statistics about the number of unborn persons as a result of abortion. We have not heard one single statistic about the number of children who are born in dire poverty only, Madam Speaker, to be humiliated in this Chamber over and over again, being called ''products of the culture of dependency,'' who are killed by cuts, death by 1,000 cuts—cuts to food stamps, cuts to WIC, cuts to Head Start, cuts to educational opportunity. Death by 1,000 cuts. We have not heard anyone on the other side speak about that misalignment.

But with this legislation, it is not enough to stop low-income women, poor women, particularly women of color—African Americans, Asians, Native American women, Latinas—it is not enough to prevent them from abortions. Some of them have become pregnant because of rape and incest and forced trafficking who have diabetes and other underlying health problems. That is not enough.

This legislation is so nefarious as to try to prevent the women who have been lucky enough to get a job in a small business, lucky enough to be able to afford to buy insurance and use their own money to buy insurance—they have been lucky enough to do that—to prevent them, by some extraneous nexus—supposedly health care-funded payments through the Affordable Care Act—from seeking this health care. This is really, really a backdoor approach to really trying to undermine the law of the land, Roe v. Wade.

Many women, Madam Speaker, know on a personal level the history of shame and stigma that come forward when they are trying to seek the best remedy for their life at that time, for whatever reason that they need to have an abortion.

I know personally, Madam Speaker, of young women who have been 13 years old and who have become victims of statutory rape, and the best solution for their lives at that time and for their health is an abortion because their life is truly in danger. This is the kind of bill that would prevent them from having that opportunity.

Madam Speaker, I hope that you will accept this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, and I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, we have heard a lot of charges and accusations that were made by some of my colleagues as they have chosen to describe the bill before us today, H.R. 7, so I want to be clear about what the bill before us does do and does accomplish.

This bill follows a longstanding principle, as my colleague said, going back to 1976, the principle that the American people and Members from both sides of the aisle in both Chambers of Congress have supported for decades, and that is taxpayer dollars should not be spent on abortions and abortion coverage. The vast majority of my colleagues voted for this exact same principle in countless appropriations bills, including a bill that we passed out of this Chamber last month. Yet today, some Members are fighting the widely shared belief that taxpayer dollars should not be used to take an innocent life.

The bill before us today also provides much-needed transparency regarding which health plans on the exchange pay for abortions. The Obama administration promised to provide Congress and the American people a list of plans in ObamaCare that covered abortion, yet they refused to live up to that promise. They forced Congress to act. And, indeed, the GAO has informed us that 1,036 plans include abortion coverage. There is no excuse—no excuse—to hide information about abortion coverage from the American people.

Madam Speaker, 68 percent, a vast majority of the American people believe there should be no taxpayer money used for abortion and abortion coverage.

HHS has forced Congress to act on this issue. The commonsense transparency requirement that is in H.R. 7 is needed, and it is supported by all Members. So that is what this bill is about, following an established bipartisan principle and providing transparency.

I urge my colleagues, each and every one, to vote to protect life, to vote to protect taxpayer dollars, and to promote transparency by rejecting the motion to recommit and supporting the underlying bill. I urge a ''no'' vote on the recommittal.

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. MOORE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 177, nays 240, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—177

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
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 (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—240

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)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
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 (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
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 (GA)
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
Schock
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—16

Carter (TX)
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Forbes
Green, Gene
Hastings
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Meeks
Nunnelee
Perlmutter
Rush
Smith (WA)

□ 1307

Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. GARRETT changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. FARR, KIND, BECERRA, and Mrs. CAPPS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

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. DEGETTE. Madam 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 242, noes 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

AYES—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)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows

Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Schock
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

NOES—179

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
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 (CA)
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Carter (TX)
Deutch
Duckworth
Forbes
Green, Gene
Hastings
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Marchant
Nunnelee
Perlmutter
Thompson (MS)

□ 1315

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 45, I regrettably missed the vote, but I fully support this crucial legislation to protect the unborn. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 45, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, January 22, 2015 I was not present to vote on H.R. 7, legislation intruding on women's reproductive freedom and access to health care. I wish the record to reflect my intentions had I been present to vote. Had I been present for roll call No. 45, I would have voted "no."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes for the week are expected around noon. On Thursday and Friday, no votes are expected.

The House will consider a number of bipartisan suspensions next week to combat human trafficking. A complete list will be announced at close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 351, authored by Representative BILL JOHNSON. This bipartisan bill will expedite liquefied natural gas exports to our allies. In order to boost our economy here at home and encourage global energy security, we must help clear the backlog of export applications currently pending at the Department of Energy, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio for sponsoring this important bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 399, the Secure Our Borders First Act, authored by Chairman MCCAUL, which requires the Department of Homeland Security to achieve operational control of our border. The bill also ensures that we are using the latest technologies to assist with border enforcement and takes the commonsense step of allowing greater access to the border region—specifically, Federal lands—to Customs and Border Patrol officers.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information. The last bill he says will be on the floor, I presume that it will be on the floor on Wednesday. Is that accurate?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes, that is accurate.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

As the gentleman knows, in the last Congress the Homeland Security Committee, chaired by Mr. MCCAUL, passed out of the committee a bipartisan bill that was supported—as a matter of fact, I think it was reported out by voice vote, and it was supported by Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON, as well as Republicans and Democrats from the committee.

As you know, so far this month in January we have spent time, frankly, recycling what we perceive to be partisan bills from the last Congress. Unfortunately, it appears that we are going to do the same thing next week, and I ask the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, we have a bipartisan bill that just months ago was supported by Democrats and Republicans, reported out of committee, not brought to the floor, unfortunately, but reported out of committee I think unanimously, or at least without voiced opposition, and now instead of taking that bill up, which we know has broad bipartisan support, we have a bill that is now going to be reported to the floor without going to committee, without being marked up—excuse me, it was marked up yesterday. I am corrected. It was filed and marked up within hours of one another, no considered judgment, no hearings. It may have been marked up, but no hearings, no notice to the public that the bill was pending, no opportunity for the public or Members to look at it. As I understand it, the committee was organized yesterday at 10 a.m., and this bill was considered at 2 p.m. or some time in that timeframe.

But my concern, Mr. Leader, is that we continue to go down the path of having bipartisan agreements worked out in committee, and now at the beginning of this Congress we are simply seeing partisan bill after partisan bill.

I understand that your side had a victory in the election and expanded your membership. However, the President, as he pointed out, is still in office, and in order to get something done—we are all for border security. That is why the committee reported out the bill in the last Congress. We had agreement on it. I lament the fact that we didn't bring the bipartisan bill, which would have gotten overwhelming support, in my opinion. Substituting that on Wednesday, where we are going to come in at

9 and go out at 12, we will have a rule on that, maybe the rule the day before. There will be a very short time to consider this.

We are bringing a partisan bill that is going to engender a lot of opposition on our side. It is going to be opposed by Mr. THOMPSON. It is so unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that having achieved bipartisan agreement on a priority item, that is, border security, that within hours yesterday we turned that into a partisan bill on which there is neither consensus nor widespread agreement.

I am sure the gentleman had the opportunity to hear a quote about the first 3 weeks of this session from one of his Republican Members, Mr. DENT, who talked about week one being, of course, the Speakership election.

Then week two, we got into a big fight over deporting children under DREAMers, which I thought we had a consensus on, but we got into a big fight about that.

And week three, we talked about rape and incest and, frankly, a partisan bill on a very, very important subject which did not have significant consideration and was substituted at 9 p.m. last night, no committee hearing, no committee input, no testimony available for that bill.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, we understand there are going to be differences between the Republican side and the Democratic side on issues, but repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, I hear the Speaker and the majority leader and others talk about a transparent Congress. I hear them talk about regular order and how they are going to return to that, and how they are going to have consideration of bills. The majority leader himself was quoted a number of times saying we are going to have 72 hours.

The bill that we just considered on this floor had less, frankly, than 12 hours before it was brought to this floor out of the Rules Committee. I would hope, Mr. Leader, that if you are going to go through with this border security bill—we will have an argument about it, and it will be largely a partisan vote on it. That is unfortunate, because we ought to be coming together, working together, creating consensus on making sure our borders are secure, as happened in the last Congress but is not repeated here.

□ 1330

I will be glad to yield to my friend.

I don't know whether this is going to be a closed rule or not. If I were betting, though, based upon the first 3 weeks of this session, I would bet it is going to be a closed rule or a structured rule with very, very few amendments, given the timeframe available to us.

I would say that we are very concerned on this side of the aisle, Mr. Leader, I will tell the Speaker that we are concerned about the closed processes that we are going through, the partisan processes that we are going through, and the lack of transparency and consideration that is being given to the bills that are coming to this floor.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I listened very closely to you, but I think we have two different experiences. I watched on the day of swearing in we had Hire More Heroes. Every single Member on both sides of the aisle voted for it. That was bipartisan.

I watched, Mr. Speaker, bringing up a bill from Mr. FITZPATRICK, where we had a bipartisan vote just a few months before, and the reason we brought it back—committees were not organized yet, we were just in—so we grabbed a bipartisan bill, but many Members on the other side of the aisle—and we had it on suspension—changed their vote just in a month before, but we were able to pass that, again, bipartisan.

Earlier, in asking me what would come to the floor next week, you heard me say 12 bipartisan bills on suspension that deal with human trafficking.

You bring up the border bill. It has been noticed for a week—remember, we have been here for 2 weeks—it has been marked up in committee where both sides late into the night got to debate, where Members on both sides of the aisle got to express their opinions and their amendments the way the system should work.

We have noticed that today, more than 72 hours of why it will go up on Wednesday and not Friday, both sides have their retreats. We already had ours. We left that Wednesday, yours going through there. So there has been more notice. There has been clear debate. There has been bipartisan bills here.

I have no problem or qualm with a difference of philosophical opinion. The problem I have is when we misstate what history has shown.

You asked me about the rule. Bringing up the bill, I will leave the type of the rule that will accompany the bill up to the Rules Committee and Chairman SESSIONS. I do expect, though, a robust debate and look forward to consideration participation on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. HOYER. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure I heard. Do you think it is going to come up on a closed rule or a structured rule? I am sorry. Did you mention that?

Mr. MCCARTHY. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I expect the type of rule—and I leave that up to the Rules Committee and Chairman SESSIONS—but I do expect to have debate from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would find it shocking if a bill ever came to this floor that precluded all debate. The gentleman is telling me it is going to come up and there will be time for debate. I don't know that I have ever been here where a bill came up that had no time for debate, so I assume that, Mr. Speaker, to be the case.

The question is: Will there be an opportunity for Members to offer amendments so that perhaps we can get back to the bipartisan bill that was reported out of the committee and leave the partisan parts of that bill for further discussion, debate, and amendment? We would like to have the opportunity to vote on such an amendment.

I ask my friend again, there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that I believe there will be time for debate. It won't be very much time, I presume, but I presume there will be time for debate.

But will there be time to offer alternative views and provisions to that bill as it is debated?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, committees have jurisdiction. The Rules Committee is where you decide what rules comes forward. Chairman SESSIONS and those in the Rules Committee will take that up. As soon as a decision is made, we will notify every Member of the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman—I don't know the answer, but I thank the gentleman for his observation.

I would observe, though, he mentioned a heroes bill. That was obviously overwhelmingly a bipartisan bill. You didn't hear me complain about that or anybody else complain about it.

Mr. MCCARTHY. If the gentleman will yield, I didn't even hear you bring it up when you say we weren't bipartisan.

Mr. HOYER. Right.

The Keystone bill, however, which I think is a very important issue, was made partisan. The 30- to 40-hour workweek was made partisan.

The Regulatory Accountability Act, as the gentleman mentioned—excuse me, the Financial Services—that bill was changed. It was changed without a hearing. It was changed without public testimony, as I had a personal discussion, Mr. Speaker, with the majority leader about the change that occurred from the House bill that was passed.

So that bill was made, again, a partisan piece of legislation. Unfortunately, it could have passed on suspension, I think, as it did the year before, had it not been changed.

On the pipeline permitting legislation, again, not a bipartisan bill. This bill that we just considered, obviously very partisan, but no hearings and a closed rule.

Again, very important issues brought up and, I would suggest to the gentleman, nontransparent. He mentioned the bill that was filed last Friday, the border security bill, which is coming up Wednesday. The committee organized at 10. This bill was passed sometime shortly after 2—or thereafter. Debate started at 2.

When we talk about transparency, when we talk about regular order, very frankly, on pieces of substantive legislation, regular order, I would suggest,

Mr. Speaker, to the majority leader, is not introducing a bill, then we are off for 3 days, coming back, and the day after organizing the committee without hearings, without any testimony, then passing the bill, and bringing it to the floor, when clearly it is a partisan difference.

We will move on, Mr. Leader. I know you are happy about that.

As the gentleman knows, after next week, we have two 4-day weeks scheduled in February prior to the President's Day recess.

Can the gentleman give me a sense of what legislation will be on the floor in February, again, Mr. Speaker, so that Members can have some knowledge of what might be brought to the floor, so that they can prepare and the public knows what legislation is going to be considered?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have made no decisions on February and notification yet, but as soon as we do, we will give ample time for all to know.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman and, again, would emphasize that the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, has made it clear in his statements, both in a book that he and two others coauthored prior to their taking the majority, but he has said numerous times since then about his commitment to transparency, openness, 72-hour rule, which has been 3-day rule—it used to be 72 hours, now 3 days.

Three days, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, can be 26 hours. That is the last hour of the third day and the first hour of the third day. I understand that, but that is not regular order. We have all breached that. We all understand that.

Having said that, this Congress has started with closed rules, no hearings, and anything but regular order. I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that the majority leader try to adhere to that.

As he has observed in the past, if we do that, I think we will have better legislation, greater participation by Members, and reflect better the voice of the American people.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, I want to thank the gentleman. If you quoted my book, I hope you bought it, so I thank you for that. Proceeds went to help the veterans.

I listened to what the gentleman said. As the gentleman knows, any new Congress, when you start, the committees are just beginning to organize. That is why, when we look to legislation, we look to those that the American public wanted.

You had brought up Keystone. Twenty-eight Members on your side of the aisle voted for it. I would consider that bipartisan. You have a large majority of Americans who want it and waited 5 years.

I know you bring up that we had a debate on the border, but we just now organized, and we were just now sworn in, but they have been debating this issue for quite some time.

It is our intention to run this House in a very open manner. I have been here when it has not been, and just as we said in our book, I think the American public wins when we go through regular order and we have greater transparency. I look forward to working with the gentleman as we progress throughout the term.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I don't want to be very cynical, but talk is fine. Performance—as Ronald Reagan said: ''Trust, but verify.'' We can read the talk, we can read the assertions, we can read the promises, but if it is not carried out, the American people are going to be—and continue to be, as they were when the gentleman appealed to them in his book—they are going to be cynical about our actions.

I think Mr. DENT observed it correctly. For the first 3 weeks, we have gone through a partisan practice. Hopefully, we can, Mr. Speaker, skew that in the future, give notice, make sure everybody has the opportunity to participate, make sure that we have the ideas from both parties and the American people, given opportunity to be expressed and, yes, to be included.

Next week, we will bring to the floor, as we have in the past, a bill that skews and abandons bipartisanship, which was achieved in the last Congress through the same committee for a partisan bill on which there will not be agreement. That is unfortunate for the security of our country. It is unfortunate for the due process of this institution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, January 26, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING THE MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and thank the thousands—tens of thousands—of Americans who traveled to Washington, D.C., to participate in today's March for Life.

They came here today to remember a somber occasion, the anniversary of the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision. It has been 42 years since that fateful decision, and while years have worn on, its impact on this country have not diminished.

Those who participated in the march today came from across the Nation, from every State—despite the cold and the weather—for one reason: the next generation of Americans depends on it.

Millions of Americans have been unable to pursue their dreams and defend their inalienable rights because of abortion. This is not justice. This is not freedom. I stand with those who march for life. I honor those who march for life.

This is my seventh March for Life since coming to Congress. Knowing that, I can promise that as long as the lives of innocent unborn children are at risk, there will be those who will make a stand against it.

HONORING WILLIAM KORTUM

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and memory of Bill Kortum, regarded by many as the father of the environmental movement in Sonoma County.

Bill grew up in a Sonoma County that was much more rural and undeveloped than today. By the early 1960s, he foresaw that a growing population could threaten the county's natural landscape, so he fought to protect the home he loved.

He was singularly responsible for instituting lasting environmental protections throughout Sonoma County and California, though he would never claim credit for them.

One of Bill's first victories was to prevent the development of PG&E's nuclear power plant at Bodega Head. He helped create the California Coastal Commission, which continues to guarantee public access to the coast today.

He established Sonoma County Conservation Action, helped create the Sonoma County Open Space District, and championed the Sonoma Land Trust and the SMART train.

Bill illustrates the incredible impact one person can have in making the world a better place. His legacy in Sonoma County and beyond will not soon be forgotten.

I extend my deepest condolences to his partner in much of this work, his dear wife Lucy, as well as his three children and grandchildren.

HONORING WINSTON CHURCHILL

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, January 24, marks the 50th anniversary of the death of Winston Churchill. Over the past half century, he has passed from memory into history, yet stands unchallenged as one of the greatest figures of modern times.

Born of an American mother and a British father, his life and career symbolized the fellowship of the English-speaking peoples.

Just outside this very Chamber, Mr. Speaker, stands an enduring tribute to the ''British Bulldog'' in the Freedom Foyer. The placement of Churchill's bust inside the U.S. Capitol serves as a testament to our special relationship with the United Kingdom and to the values our two nations have fought so dearly to defend: democracy and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit into the RECORD a touching account of Mr. Churchill's passing written by Celia Sandys, his granddaughter, and the only surviving member of the Churchill family present at his death.

MY GRANDFATHER'S FINAL DAYS

The Personal Account of Hon. Celia Sandys

His birthdays were always a big family occasion. The first one that I can remember clearly was his eightieth birthday in 1954 when there was a huge event in Westminster Hall. The purpose was for both Houses of Parliament to mark the day with tributes and the presentation of the portrait by Graham Sutherland, which had been commissioned as a gift for him.

The rumour was out that the image was less than flattering. I remember my parents discussing how he had disliked it when he had seen it two weeks earlier. He did, however, rise to the occasion and accepted it saying; ''It is a remarkable example of modern art.'' As usual he had chosen the perfect words. The portrait was never seen again!

Ten years later we celebrated his ninetieth birthday at Hyde Park Gate. He had left his beloved Chartwell for the last time the month before. As we raised our glasses of Pol Roger to toast him, the unspoken thought in everyone's mind was that the final meeting could not be long delayed.

Six weeks later, on 10 January 1965 he suffered a stroke, the effects of which worsened over the next few days.

On the evening of the 15th, I received a call from his personal secretary, Anthony Montague Browne, to tell me that my aunt Sarah was on her way from Rome. He said she would be arriving at Heathrow in the early hours of the morning and had asked if she could stay with me.

I remember driving like the wind to get to Heathrow in time and then having to run the gauntlet of a huge crowd of journalists before we could get out of the airport. The press had only heard of my grandfather's condition a few hours before and so were hungry for information.

We went straight to Hyde Park Gate and found Grandpapa sleeping peacefully with his cat Jock curled up beside him. I don't know if Jock ever left the bed, but every time I was there the cat lay curled up by his master.

It was clear that the inevitable was about to happen. We were all sad; for ourselves not for him. Anyone who had spent time with him during the last few years knew that he was ready to go.

During the next nine days we had two urgent calls to go to Hyde Park Gate when it seemed the end was near, but each time he rallied. Otherwise during this period we visited once or twice a day, as much for my grandmother as for him.

Initially we had to struggle to get through the crowds of press and concerned onlookers who filled the little cul-de-sac day and night. After a few days, in response to a request from my grandmother, the bystanders moved to the main road and our visits became much easier.

Early on the morning of the 24th of January we received what was clearly the final call from my aunt Mary. Sarah and I raced to Hyde Park Gate. There we joined my grandmother, Mary, my uncle Randolph and my cousin Winston.

Clementine sat holding Grandpapa's hand with his doctor, Lord Moran, sitting beside her; Randolph and Winston stood on the other side, while Sarah, Mary and I knelt at the foot of the bed. Also in the room were two nurses, whose work had finished, and Anthony Montague Browne.

No one made a sound except Grandpapa who breathed heavily and sighed. Then there was silence.

It seemed as though time stood still until Clementine asked Lord Moran, ''Has he gone?'' He nodded.

Seventy years to the day and almost to the minute since his father, Lord Randolph, had died, Winston Churchill had slipped imperceptibly away to meet his Maker.

We all sat down to a subdued breakfast and listened to the radio as the announcement of his death was broadcast to the world.

Some years earlier the Queen had decided that her first Prime Minister was to have a Lying-in-State and a State Funeral. The was the first time such an honour had been granted to a commoner since the funeral of the Duke of Wellington more than a century before.

Preparations for the ceremony had been given the code name ''Operation Hope Not'' and, in true British tradition, had been worked out to the last detail some years before.

More than 300,000 people queued in the freezing cold along the Embankment, across Lambeth Bridge, back along the Thames and across Westminster Bridge to file past the catafalque in Westminster Hall, the oldest surviving part of the Palace of Westminster where, my grandfather had spent so much of his working life.

The family were allowed to slip in by a side door and watch the extraordinary sight of so many who had come from near and far to bid farewell to the man for whom they felt love, respect and gratitude.

On the day of the funeral we gathered in Westminster Hall for the journey to St Paul's Cathedral.

The men of the family together with Anthony Montague Browne, who had served his master faithfully and lovingly to the end, walked behind the coffin, which was borne on a gun carriage.

The women rode in the Queen's carriages. My grandmother, Sarah and Mary were in the first carriage. My sister Edwina and I rode in the second. We had rugs and hot water bottles to keep us warm on a very cold day. We were so close to the crowds lining the streets that we could have touched them. The emotion in their faces I will never forget.

When we arrived at St Paul's, we all lined up for the procession up the aisle. The women of the family looked as though we were in uniform. Quite independently we were all wearing more or less identical black fox fur hats.

As the bearers struggled to carry the coffin up the steps and into the cathedral, it seemed they might be going to drop it. Apparently they had rehearsed but not with a lead-lined coffin! They made it and we all followed up the long aisle where the Queen and her family were waiting.

We were told that the Queen had said we should not curtsey to her so we filed into our seats opposite the Royal Family.

After the service we processed out and watched anxiously as the bearers carried the coffin down the steps, probably an even more difficult task.

As we got back into our carriages, the Queen and her family joined on the cathedral steps with monarchs, presidents, wartime colleagues and political allies to say goodbye to the man they had come to honour.

The carriages took us to Tower Pier where, after Grandpapa had been piped aboard, there was a seventeen-gun salute. We boarded the Port of London Authority's survey vessel, MV Havengore, for the journey to Waterloo Station. As we sailed off we could hear the band playing Rule Britannia.

The crane drivers on the quayside dipped the heads of their cranes in salute. This was the only unscripted part of the day and one of the most moving. The RAF flew overhead.

At Waterloo the coffin was placed in the guard's van with a military escort of the 4th Hussars on constant watch.

We sat down to have lunch and a glass of champagne, which we certainly needed, as the train moved off, pulled by the engine, which my then seven-year-old brother Julian had named ''Winston Churchill'' during the war.

Along the entire route from Waterloo to Long Hanborough, the railway was lined with people of all ages, some waving, some crying, some saluting, all of them silently saying goodbye to the man they admired. Finally we reached the small churchyard at Bladon, the burial place of Winston's parents and his brother Jack and within sight of Blenheim Palace where he had been born ninety years before.

The day immediately turned into a family affair, and we could say goodbye in private to the husband, father and grandfather who we all loved so much.

After the service we stood by the graveside as the bearers lowered the coffin into the grave. The silence was broken by a metallic clatter. Lying on the coffin were the shiny medals that had fallen off the coat of one of the bearers.

We were a sombre party on the train going back to London. When I got home I realized how strange the past weeks had been. It was as though I had been in a state of suspension but had now come down to earth.

Aunt Sarah and I watched the rerun of the day on television and wondered at all the events in which we had played a part.

□ 1345

SHADOWS OF CRISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been quite a week. There have been tragedies, and there have been wonderful events.

In having been to Nigeria this past year and in having met with family members of girls who were kidnapped because they went to Christian schools, there were three girls I met who had escaped after they had been kidnapped. The kidnapped girls, it was known, were being sexually abused and may have now been sold into sex trafficking, given as wives, and have been ordered to convert from Christianity to Islam or be killed. I know there are some in this town who think they are

being asked to convert to an Islam that doesn't exist as a religion, but to those girls who are being told they must convert to the religion of Islam or be killed, it does seem to be a religion.

In having grieved with others around the world who have been harmed or who have had family killed or harmed by radical Islam, it is tragic this week.

I will read a story from Breitbart:

According to the United Nations, ISIS—the Islamic State—is killing educated women following shari'a court sentences.

That is a problem. There is nothing wrong with religious people participating in government. Most of our Founders were very strong Christians. Around a third or so of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were actually ordained Christian servants. So that is a good thing, but when a religion also becomes the state, then this is the kind of thing you get, and it is tragic.

In an article by Edwin Mora, it says:

The U.N. warned on Tuesday that the Islamic State, known as ISIS, ISIL, or IS, is showing a ''monstrous disregard for human life'' in the areas it has conquered, which include swaths of Iraq and Syria.

This article points out:

Nevertheless, President Obama, during his State of the Union Address delivered Tuesday night, proclaimed that the United States ''is stopping ISIL's advance'' in Iraq and Syria. Just last week, The Daily Beast, citing an unnamed Pentagon official, reported that, despite U.S.-led airstrikes, ISIS is gaining ground in Syria.

The U.N. warned that the jihadist group is meting out ''cruel and inhuman punishments against men, women, and children'' through ''unlawful'' shari'a courts it has established in territory under its control.

The civilians falling victim to ISIS' wrath are accused of ''violating the group's extremist interpretations of Islamic shari'a law or for suspected disloyalty,'' said Ravina Shamdasani, spokesperson for the U.N. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

ISIS has killed fellow jihadists and local residents for violating the harsh version of Islamic law imposed on the areas it now controls.

''Educated, professional women, particularly women who had run as candidates in elections for public office, seem to be particularly at risk. In just the first 2 weeks of the year, reports indicated that three female lawyers were executed.''

It goes on:

''The ruthless murder of two men who were thrown off the top of a building after having been accused of homosexual acts by a so-called 'court' in Mosul is another terrible example of the kind of monstrous disregard for human life that characterized ISIL's reign of terror over areas of Iraq that were under the group's control.''

Look. I know, Mr. Speaker, that our President stood right here at the second level and told us ''the shadow of crisis has passed.'' Apparently, he is not getting the briefings, or maybe the briefings don't include just how bad the situation is around the world. Christians are being persecuted and are being killed in greater numbers than at any time in history since Jesus came. Jews are being subjected to anti-Semitic hate in many places, we are told, which has not been seen since before and during World War II.

Now, in growing up reading and studying history, I couldn't imagine that there would ever come another day that we would see hate growing against Jewish people that could inspire another Holocaust. I just didn't think it would happen. So, when I had read about General Eisenhower's having soldiers bring people from the surrounding communities to help clean up the death camps, I thought: These are civilians in the community, and that may have been a little harsh if they had nothing to do with the death camps.

I had read that his reasoning was—and this was many years ago—that he wanted to make sure that nobody could ever proclaim that the death camps did not exist and that they were a figment of someone's imagination. He wanted to make sure that could not happen, so they were brought out to clean up. Yet, mere decades later, here we are at a time when there are radical Islamists calling for a new, greater Holocaust to kill Jewish people, calling for the complete wiping off the map of Israel, calling for the complete destruction of what they call the ''Great Satan''—the United States.

The shadow of crisis may have passed, but the mental image I got when I heard the President say ''the shadow of crisis has passed'' took me back to fifth grade. I was very small in elementary school, and there was one guy who could have been two grades ahead, but he had been held back. He was about two heads taller than I was. I was on the playground one day, and as a little kid, I saw Ray's shadow pass me. I turned around, and I got smashed in the face, and it made my nose bleed. That was the image I had when the President invoked the shadow of the crisis' passing. If the shadow of this crisis has passed, then we may be just about to get smacked in the face by these radical Islamists, and it will be a lot more than a bloody nose that ends up occurring.

This is a very desperate time in the world for millions of people. Since they, perhaps, weren't journalists—the nearly 2,000 or so Nigerians who were killed by radical Islamists—Boko Haram, in Nigeria, didn't quite get the attention I thought it should have as did the horrendous killings in Paris get the attention, as they absolutely should have.

Under Western civilization law—and it was true in the early days of this country, and it has been true, as far as I know, under every State's law. I know, absolutely, it is true under State law—when it comes to a physical assault, the law has been clear: provoking words are never a defense to a physical assault. In this country, under our law and under the law of every State, no matter what you say, it does not justify a physical attack. We have even had the President of the United States basically stand up before the U.N., stand up in front of media, stand up in front of crowds, and say that we need to be more careful.

But he goes beyond that.

He appears to attribute blame for an attack on the people being attacked to the point that he and those who work for him were asked to go out and tell the country before the 2012 election that a video was responsible for the deaths of four Americans who were serving their country in Benghazi, Libya. It turns out that that was not true at all. It turns out people knew that before that was trotted out.

According to the book written about the blood feud between the Clintons and the Obamas, there was a phone call from Hillary Clinton to her husband in which she was upset that the President was asking her to go out and say that the Benghazi attack was the result of a video. According to the book, she was advised that America wouldn't buy a lie like that. Ultimately, they decided, at least, not to have her go on the Sunday shows—again, according to the book—and that, gee, if she resigns, that might cost him the election, and Democrats would be upset about it, so they would never want to nominate her for President if she resigned and cost Obama the election in 2012.

That was according to the book as to why she didn't resign, but she didn't go on the Sunday shows. Susan Rice was sent out with that task to blame a video when it was very clear, when Chris Stevens called, saying that he was under attack, there was nothing about a video mentioned. When the warnings were being given by those who were aware of a buildup of radicals—and of potential problems even across the street—nothing was mentioned about a video because it wasn't about a video; but that would have been an inconvenient truth so close to the election.

Our heartbreaks collectively for these killings, and it is my hope and prayer—liberal women's groups here in the United States prefer the easy task of attacking conservatives and of creating allegations that, gee, there is some war on women when, actually, as I speak, there is a war on women going on in radical Islamist-held countries. There is a war on baby women going on around the world, and there are people who actually choose to abort babies because they are baby women.

□ 1400

There is a war on women, but it is not by conservatives in the country, who want them to have the best health care they can get, who want young girls to have the best care they can get, both in the womb and outside the womb. This isn't where the war on women is occurring.

Although there are still some vestiges of prejudice against women, we are very hopeful that since the President has made such a big issue about treating women equally, it won't

be too long before the White House will start treating women equally and giving them equal pay for equal work. So I am encouraged the President keeps bringing that up, hoping that will inure to the benefit of people working at the White House so they will eventually be paid what men in the White House are paid.

I really do hope that liberal women's groups that take the easy path—taking potshots at conservatives—will stand with us against radical Islam.

I asked mothers of girls who were kidnapped by Boko Haram in Nigeria: Did they attack this school because it was a school for girls? They said that apparently they didn't realize that it was only girls at the school because they did ask: Where are the boys? Because they wanted to bring them out and shoot them, as they did at other places. When they realized it was only girls, they took them to become slaves, sexually and otherwise, and to force them to convert. But the school wasn't attacked because it was a girls school, because they didn't know it was only for girls. They knew it was Christian.

There was also an attack on Christian women. And I would hope that even the most atheist of women in the United States and in Western civilized countries around the world would start standing up for the mistreatment of Christian women who are particularly being brutalized because of their faith and because of their sex, combined.

So, of the Presidents we have had since 9/11, the President failed to mention al Qaeda. And I can understand that, and I have to be a little defensive for the President here. He and the Vice President had been saying before the 2012 election that al Qaeda was on the run. In some cases, Osama bin Laden is dead, al Qaeda is on the run, and General Motors is alive.

Well, it turns out if al Qaeda is on the run, it is a run directly at us and our allies, our friends. And that is particularly true of Israel. They consider Israel the little Satan and us the great Satan, but we have no better friend in the Middle East than Israel.

Our President has been overheard on a microphone that picked him up basically casting aspersions on the character of Prime Minister Netanyahu. Fair people that I have known, if they ever got caught maligning someone inappropriately, they would go out of their way to show that it was inappropriate—I want to make it up, and I want to show that we are friends. We may have disagreements, but we are friends.

Of course, people have read about him treating Prime Minister Netanyahu so poorly when he came to the White House in prior years, having him sit around. One account said he was told: Just wait here. And when you have a change of position, let me know. I'm going to eat with my family.

The Prime Minister ended up leaving rather than sitting in his corner for a timeout, as the President wanted.

We haven't seen this President make clear to the world that Israel is our friend, as well as to its leader, the people, and the legislature they have elected. We haven't seen those kind of outreaches.

And then, we find out the President is upset that the Speaker of the House invited Prime Minister Netanyahu to come speak here on February 11. And perhaps that is yet another indication of the ignorance. And, Mr. Speaker and our Parliamentarian, it doesn't cast aspersions to be ignorant of something—we are all ignorant of things—but apparently there is a blind spot in the Constitution for the President on a number of things, and apparently one is how the legislature works, even though he has been in the Senate, because under the Constitution, we can't have anybody in the people's House come speak here who is not a Member of Congress, with one exception. Under the Constitution and Thomas Jefferson's Rules of the House, under which we have been operating since 1789—with modifications, but it has still been the rule, you can't come speak in the House Chamber officially unless you are invited by the House. You can't come speak to a joint session of Congress, both the House and Senate, unless both the House and the Senate invite you.

Now how do we know that the President doesn't really grasp that concept and is not aware of the constitutional and the rule ramifications in Congress? It has been a few years back, but the President decided, as I recall, that he was going to come lecture Congress on a jobs bill and tell us—I think it was 16 or so times—that we had to pass it right now, right away, failing to mention he didn't even have a bill.

Nevertheless, the President went out publicly and the statement was released that he was going to come to Congress and speak to Congress on a specific day at a specific time, and he had not even spoken to the Speaker of the House. Maybe he had talked to Majority Leader REID, but he hadn't talked to the Speaker of the House, and this is the House Chamber where the House actually has to vote to invite him. He didn't even bother to see what was convenient.

And as I recall, not only was there ignorance of the rules and the constitutional requirements, but there was also ignorance about the NFL, what is known as football here in the United States, and I believe it was the beginning of the season. The President had just announced he wanted to come to Congress. He demanded to come speak to us, in conflict with the beginning of the first football game of the season. I believe it was the first. It was a big night. After that was pointed out, he ended up coming and speaking earlier. But the point being, no President has ever picked a date, said, Here's when I'm coming to speak to the House, without understanding you can't come unless you are invited.

You are not even allowed to come give an oral State of the Union Address unless the House and Senate vote to invite you to speak to a joint session. That has been the rule since we began. Under the Constitution, it is not required that a State of the Union Address be orally given in a speech. There is a constitutional requirement for a State of the Union report to be given. But in the early years of our country, there were times when the President just sent a report. Here's my report on the state of the Union.

So the President has snubbed Congress, the rules, and the Constitution repeatedly, and then our Speaker is condemned by the White House for inviting a world leader to come speak here. Again, the President doesn't realize there is no requirement to check with the President. If it hasn't already occurred, we will have to have a unanimous consent or a vote to have the House approve the invitation of Prime Minister Netanyahu to come speak here. That has to happen, if it hasn't already.

So there is no requirement to check with the President. We don't even have to invite him over here to speak to do his State of the Union. And when the unanimous consent request is made, anybody here could object to the President coming. I am not aware of that ever happening. I don't anticipate that ever happening.

Interestingly, we have been reading—when I have been in Israel and talked to leaders over there, they talk about the massive pressure by the Obama administration to try to push Israel into getting rid of Prime Minister Netanyahu. Now we know what our President did to help support the removal of President Mubarak. We know that he went even further in Libya, after Qadhafi—after the 2003 invasion of Iraq—threw all of his weapons systems open to the United States and said, You tell me what I can keep, basically. And as some in Israel have advised, after Qadhafi's conversion experience in fear that the U.S. would invade Libya in 2003, he became more of a help in going after radical Islamic terrorists than almost anybody, except in Israel.

We have got friends around the world that are trying to help us with radical Islam, and even our friends in Egypt, a neighbor of Israel. As many of us feared, they had an election too quick after the so-called Arab Spring, which was more of an Arab nightmare for the Egyptian people. They had an election too soon. The most organized group was the radical Islamic Muslim Brotherhood.

It was not really a military coup, and that has offended the Egyptian people, as they have indicated, when news media or the White House have said it was a coup because you had the largest uprising in the history of the world occur in Egypt. It was demonstration after demonstration for the ages. It was 20 million, 30 million, 33 million,

came the reports of the uprising, of the around 90 million people in Egypt—massive. That would be like over 100 million people in America going to the streets and demanding the President be removed. It is hard to get a third of the United States just to go out and vote. They did more than that. They put themselves at risk and came to the streets and said, Enough is enough.

And the Coptic Christian Pope has told me of how touched he was to have moderate Muslims, secularists, and people of different faiths come and literally and figuratively join arms and march together to stop the brutality against Christianity and against Jews in Egypt.

That was extraordinary. And so much of our media missed it. I think our President never really understood that. Briefings must not have been adequate—or he missed them—but that was extraordinary. That was an event for the ages, the Egyptian people uprising in millions like no country had ever experienced in our entire history of mankind. Extraordinary. They are to be commended.

□ 1415

What happened?

Yeah, there were even a couple of Republican Senators, but you had the President, the White House, the State Department, people condemning Egypt for saying: We don't want radical Islam running our country.

I didn't realize, but the constitution—that as I understand this administration helped with—did not include a provision for impeachment. We didn't give them a peaceable way within the constitution to remove a leader once he acted outside the constitution, as Morsi was doing.

Now, because I have been told by a former CIA operative—I asked General al-Sisi while he was still general, before Morsi was elected: Did you have evidence that he was trying to have you killed? I was told by a former CIA operative that he did.

He was reluctant to respond, but he eventually responded: Yes, we did. He didn't even really need that because of the unconstitutional actions of President Morsi. Now, I have had friends of Israel that were saying: We want to give Morsi a chance because he is really working to bring peace to the Sinai.

Well, as we found out after the people arose and a peaceful revolution occurred—I thought about the Egyptian peaceable revolution as I watched the movie ''Selma.'' It is tragic that that ever came about and circumstances ever came to the point that we were treating, especially as a Christian, treating brothers and sisters like that.

Thank God for Martin Luther King, Jr. We honor him this week. What an example. People in Egypt know about Dr. King. The Pope, Coptic Christian Pope knows of Dr. King. He wanted a peaceful demonstration, and they were part of peaceful demonstration.

Unfortunately, radical Islam did not like being removed. They burned churches. They went after Christians. They went after Jews. It was so offensive to the moderate Muslims that make up most all of Egypt that they even voted, overwhelmingly, for a constitution that required the government to build back the churches that the Muslim Brotherhood burned down. That is historic for the ages.

We have this one country, 90 million, most Muslim. At one time, there may have been, as I understand, maybe 10 percent or more Christians, but radical Islam took over after the alleged Arab Spring that was anything but a spring. It is a place of hope with a very, very difficult road in front of them.

Some of the military leaders were asking Members of Congress that were visiting over there about the Apache helicopters and the tanks that have been frozen by President Obama's administration and the refusal, for so long, to provide them.

The military leaders are saying: Does your President not understand that we use those Apache helicopters to keep the Suez Canal open? Does he want a tragedy at the Suez Canal? Is that why he is not allowing us to have new Apaches that we need in order to keep the Suez Canal properly open and safe?

We use the Apache helicopters to go after the massive weapon buildup that occurred in the Sinai under Morsi, and the Sinai is an area with rapid, huge weapon buildup under Morsi that is a threat and was a threat to Israel, our ally.

Somebody in the administration needs to get out a memo to everyone else saying: Look, Israel really is our friend. Netanyahu has more in common in his government and what his government believes than any other government in the entire Middle East with us here in America. Maybe we ought to go easy on pushing for a new leader.

Well, it hasn't happened today. Here is an article. Not only, apparently, is the White House furious with our Speaker—heck, I have been mad with our Speaker. I am telling you, this is a good thing, Mr. Speaker, that has been done here in inviting the Prime Minister of Israel.

Here is an article, since the leader of our closest ally and friend in the Middle East, Israel, is coming, this article from NBCNews.com, Kristen Welker and Carrie Dann:

> President Barack Obama will not meet with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu when he visits the United Nations in March, his administration announced Thursday, citing a ''longstanding practice'' of avoiding appearances with heads of states in close proximity to their elections.

I guess he is glad that countries around the world don't have that same policy because he was sure running around before the election wanting to make appearances with them. I guess it would only be natural that foreign leaders would assume, since he did it before his election, that he would certainly not want to appear less than consistent.

They didn't use that excuse when the President gave Prime Minister Netanyahu a timeout. You wait here, I am going to go eat. Let me know when you have a change of mind.

I mean, that is what parents used to say to us. That is what some of us, as parents, have said: Until you are willing to act right, you go to your room.

For a President of the United States to do that to the leader of the country that is our best ally in the Middle East is really extraordinary, so I guess it shouldn't be a surprise that he wants him snubbed before his reelection; but I also think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we have him here to hear his side about what Iran is doing.

Some of us, in December, met with leading investigators at the IAEA in Vienna to talk about Iran's current status, as best they can figure out. I think it was the most candid meeting that we have had with representatives of the IAEA. I appreciate their honesty and forthrightness.

But Iran's centrifuges are still spinning. They are still enriching uranium. They are increasing the amount of uranium that they are enriching. Even though they are assuring the IAEA that they are not taking it any more—they are not taking it past 5 percent enrichment, people that know about the enrichment process know it is not that much of a step to go from 5 percent to 90 percent, have weapons-grade uranium that can be used for bombs.

I think my friend, Joel Rosenberg, in his all-too-realistic novel, previously depicted Iran as developing enough nuclear material to use—not just in one bomb, they wanted enough to use in several bombs, so that when they got to that point, in a secret facility that even the IAEA, U.S., others didn't know about, according to the novel, they were able to prepare nuclear weapons, multiple nuclear weapons at the same time and immediately ship them out in different directions, so that anyone trying to stop their nukes, once developed, would have to worry that if they attacked Iran to stop their nuclear weapons—they had several—that it would be unlikely they would get them all, and that would mean that nukes would probably show up in Israel and the United States.

It seems pretty realistic. That seems like a realistic consideration for Iran. They seem to be following that procedure, developing as much 5 percent enriched uranium, that we know of; but as even the experts can tell you, it is possible they have got a facility we didn't know about. They have surprised us before.

This is a tragic time in so many places in the world. The shadow of the crisis may have passed us, but too often, that means, now, the shadow is passed and the crisis is upon us.

It is time to stand up to radical Islam and to stand in Erbil and talk to Kurdish leaders—or outside Erbil, at the headquarters where they are able to watch things that are going on; hear

a Commander say: You have no idea how heartbreaking it is to see a vehicle, an American vehicle, up-armored vehicle that the United States produced that is in the Islamic State hands, that has now been made into a massive suicide bomb, comes at our Kurdish fighters, fighting heroically, but not having a single weapon that will stop an American up-armored vehicle as the vehicle comes, as they know it is going to explode, and it gets nearer and nearer, and they are frantic.

Everybody watching the video feed, everybody on the ground there knows they are not going to stop it because the United States has not provided the weapons to our friends that will stop the weapons, the U.S. weapons that are in the hands of our enemies. Then, ultimately, the suicide bomb of a U.S. up-armored vehicle takes out those valiant, heroic Kurdish fighters.

These are not people that threw down their weapons and ran, like so much of the Iraqi Army did. There are Iraqi officials that say: This is why we really needed a small American presence here, to give us the backbone, to tell us, ''Here is what you do. Yes, they are coming, but don't throw down your weapons. Go here. Go there.''

We needed that help, that coordination, the same kind of help and direction, coordination that our embedded Special Forces, Special Ops people gave to the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan in late 2001 and early 2002, when the Taliban was initially decimated, defeated before we added tens of thousands of troops and became occupiers.

It has worked. It worked in Afghanistan before we became occupiers. It has worked when we help people that want to defend themselves to defend themselves.

We have seen over and over these reports that, in Syria, this so-called vetted, moderate Free Syrian Army is joining forces with al Qaeda affiliates. This administration still thinks it is a good idea to send them weapons that they can use, ultimately, to go after our friends, the Kurds.

□ 1430

Turkey, our ally and friend, NATO partner, says we can't use their bases to fight the Islamic State. I have got friends in Turkey, leaders there I have met with. They don't like the idea of the Kurds being armed.

Well, I think it is time the administration should announce that we are not sending weapons to Baghdad so that they can send what can't stop the Islamic State to the Kurds. We are sending weapons directly to Erbil. We are sending them directly to the Kurds.

Okay. Turkey, we understand you don't like that idea. If you don't like it enough, you have a powerful enough military to stop and destroy the Islamic State by yourself if you want to. So we would much prefer Turkey take out the Islamic State by themselves. But as it appears, Turkey is becoming more radical in their legislation and activities. It explains, perhaps, why they will not allow us to use our bases and will not directly, themselves, fight the Islamic State.

Well, the Kurds are willing. They are doing it. They are fighting valiantly. Let's help them out directly, not through Baghdad, but directly.

Let's try to be friends with Israel. Let's try not to snub their leaders. I mean, since I have been in Congress, I have tried to be encouraging when I have met with other Israeli leaders. Before Netanyahu became the Prime Minister, we met with others. We encouraged them. I wasn't crazy about some of the things they were doing, but they were leaders of our friend Israel, and I wanted to be their friend. I wish that it were so with this administration.

Now, we had what was purported to be the State of the Union Address in here. We were told ''the shadow of crisis has passed.'' I don't know. I am finding that maybe the President, a few years ago when he came and told us, ''Pass my bill right away, right away, right away,'' maybe he didn't really know he didn't have a bill. But we kept trying for days to get a copy of his bill, and finally, after a week, there was no President's American Jobs Act.

Well, I went ahead and created one, and what it did was eliminate the biggest tariff that any country in the world puts on their own manufactured goods. It is called a corporate tax. It has to be passed on to consumers, which makes the price of the product or their services more expensive. Imagine the manufacturing jobs that would come flooding back to America if we even just reduced the corporate tax, this tariff that we are putting on our own goods.

And I have had reporters around Washington who don't really get it say: Well, how would you make up for the lost corporate taxes?

Those corporate taxes are paid by Americans. They are paid by the consumers. Any corporation that doesn't pass on that tax is not going to stay in business. So the consumers pay it. The American taxpayers pay it anyway.

But what would happen when you lower the corporate tax rate? Some of those massive manufacturing businesses—like the President's dear friends own that have moved over to China and other places—some of them have told a group of us that went over there: Well, the biggest reason we had to move is America had such a massive and now the highest corporate tax in the world. If you lower that like to China levels, 17 percent, we would be able to be back there.

Now, I loved hearing from leaders of industry in China that the best workers they have were American workers in the United States of America. Their best quality control is right here. Well, if we would lower the corporate tax, those jobs would come flooding back.

I loved hearing the President so pleased that we are becoming energy independent. Unfortunately, it is not due to anything the Federal Government is doing. His administration is doing whatever it can to slow down energy production of oil and gas that we are so reliant on, and production from Federal lands, under his watch, is down significantly.

So it is all the private sector that has done this, Sarah Palin and others saying, ''Drill, baby, drill.'' That has actually happened, and now we have got an abundance. It has brought down gasoline prices.

And what is the Democrat reaction to prices of gasoline going down? Well, that means we need to add some taxes to gasoline. Really?

I loved hearing the President say we need to do infrastructure, except, dadgummit, I remember him talking about that repeatedly when he first became President. That is why he said we had to have this massive $900 billion, because we are going to build infrastructure.

And what did he do? He got the $900 billion from a Democratic House and Senate, and only a fraction of it went to infrastructure. We were told it was going to go to shovel-ready jobs, and then we find out some years later, well, actually there was no such thing as the shovel-ready jobs. They did send it to companies like Solyndra and others that lived high off the hog for a while and then went broke. I am sure they are getting some other grant somewhere else.

Which brings us to another story, which was reported as a bombshell, a story by Richard Pollock, ''Bombshell: IRS Has Active Contract for Millions With Company HHS Fired Over Botched Healthcare.gov'' Web site.

Wow. Well, no wonder the President wants more money. He is still doing deals for millions of dollars with people they paid massive millions of dollars to do a Web site that didn't work. We have had people come to the Hill and say: We could have done that for about one-twentieth of the cost of what was paid and actually had it working.

But things are a little better in Texas. I loved hearing the President take credit for jobs that have been created in Texas. Unfortunately, when you look at the jobs that his policies have helped create around the country, the biggest thing he has helped create is part-time jobs in numbers like we have never had before.

I love when he brings people in here to hold them up as good examples. I wish he had brought some of my constituents, some of whom are brokenhearted because their part-time job went from 39 hours to 29. They had to get a second one. And they have also lost what benefits they did have at their first employment. Now they are spending more time away from their children, making less.

I know he has the image that $15,000 a year is supposed to support a family of four, but what most people in business can tell you—especially small business that employs about 70 percent

of American workers—the minimum wage is entry level. And when I talk to people at places like McDonald's, they are not even paying the minimum wage. They are paying more than that. And places where oil is being drilled and gas is being drilled, they are paying a lot more than minimum wage. Some of them are paying bonuses because that is what happens when the Federal Government does not impede the ability of industry and of American entrepreneurialism.

But here, also, the President wants to provide net neutrality. I want neutrality. I want Internet neutrality. But I don't want the government taking over because I know his friends end up doing well and his enemies don't do well.

I would like to make sure that the market is able to play. I would love it if he had come in here and said: You know what? We have wasted a lot of money trying to prop up solar energy and wind energy. We have squandered massive amounts of money, of taxpayer dollars, money we have had to borrow from China that won't be paid back in my lifetime. But here is a tax notion. Let's eliminate the subsidies for every energy form, whatever it is, eliminate them. Nobody is going to get subsidies. Nobody gets grants. Good luck.

What would that mean? It would mean the free market would take over.

And when I hear the commercials, oh, buy a solar energy whatever, air conditioner or whatever it is, heater, buy it now because the subsidies may be running out before long, well, let's run them all out. Let's let energy be determined by the free market without government intervention, without using the Tax Code.

I am pleased that perhaps the President has heard some of us. As we have said, the President keeps talking about Warren Buffett paying a lower tax rate than his secretary, but he has never offered any solutions to fix that, as some of us here have. What would be the best solution? Well, bring down the secretary's income tax rate to the capital gains rate that Warren Buffett is paying. That is how you do it.

I just love Arthur Laffer, Ronald Reagan's former economic adviser, such a brilliant guy. He explained to a group of us a few years ago here—and I am paraphrasing Arthur—he said: I hear people talking about we are going to tax the rich. The rich, he says, are the ones you are not going to tax.

Now, if you say we are going to tax this activity of the rich, they will change the activity. They can do that because they are ultrarich. If you say we are going to tax you in this location, this State, this city, this country, they are ultrarich; they can move. That is what rich people do.

So if one State where Secretary Kerry has his yacht has a really high tax, well, what is he going to do? He is going to do what he has done. He is going to move the yacht to a State that has a lower tax. That is what rich people do. So you may say: I am going to go after the rich and tax them, really put it to them, and then spread that wealth.

The ultrarich are the ones you are not going to tax. They will move. The rest of us, we can't just say: You know what? I am going to go be a lawyer in another country, another place.

You can't just do that. You have got to go through all kinds of training. You just can't do that. You can't go be a Member of Congress somewhere else. You can't just pick up your job and take it when you are middle class or you are poor.

So what happens when somebody says we are going to increase taxes on the rich, well, they move. They change their activity. They avoid the tax because they can do that. That is why Warren Buffett can say he is not worried about the inheritance tax. He takes actions to make sure he is not going to get hit with it. The poor can't do that. Of course, you have to have over a minimum amount now, so the poor don't get hit with it, but the middle class does.

My great-aunt was middle class through and through—as they say, land rich, cash poor. Land prices dropped within 6 months of her death. The IRS took every acre of her 2,500-acre farm. Every acre. They sold her home at an auction because land prices dropped. The FDIC had dumped land around there. Prices dropped. Under the inheritance tax, it is the value of that land at the time of the death. They took every acre, took the home place. The people she had specified in her will that would get specific things didn't get them. The IRS got them.

That is why I went when the call went out to family members to please show up and buy whatever you can so that we can keep it in the family. Yes, that lady was middle class. She lived middle class. I had been to her home numerous times. You wouldn't find anything that you would say was even upper middle class. They took every acre of her land, her home for taxes.

But if you are ultrarich, you don't run into that situation. You buy insurance policies. You convert the way you get income. You move cash here, there, to other countries. You can do that. But not when you are middle class.

So the policies of this President have caused, for the first time in American history, 95 percent of America's income to go to the top 1 percent.

□ 1445

The President admitted it a couple years ago, yeah, he was aware that happened. Well, how about working with the rest of us who have some good ideas that would increase the number of middle class, moving people up from poor; increase the people moving from lower middle class up to upper middle class; and moving people from middle class to wealthy? We want that. That is what we hope for. We don't want to bring down people from where they have done well, even if they are one of the few that were born on third base and have gone through life thinking they hit a triple. We want everybody to do well. And if you get jealous of them, your life is going to be ruined.

I loved the quotes from Martin Luther King, so many of them brought out in the movie ''Selma'': If you get eaten up with anger, revenge—and in the cases around here—jealousy, you are the one that is going to be miserable. Let's encourage people to get wealthy not by taking from the wealthy and bringing people down. Let's have a flat tax: if you make more, then you are going to pay more; if you make less, then you are going to pay less.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying that in 40 years over 57 million babies have been killed here in America. As a father who held a premature daughter in my hand and had her grasp the end of my finger with her tiny little hand, it wrenches my heart to think there are people that will want to kill a baby girl of that same age. Let's stop. God bless the March for Life.

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF THEODORE EMILE ''BO'' DOLLIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, before we left after this workweek, I wanted to make sure that I came to the floor and took the time to recognize the loss of a cultural icon in New Orleans and a family friend.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Theodore Emile ''Bo'' Dollis, the Big Chief of the Wild Magnolias Mardi Gras Indians and a cultural icon in New Orleans for decades. Bo Dollis died this week at the age of 71.

Though his family did not want him to join the Mardi Gras Indians as a child, Bo secretly sewed his own suit at his friend's home. He joined the Wild Magnolias as a Flag Boy and quickly rose in their ranks, becoming Big Chief in 1964, a position he held until his health no longer allowed it.

As Big Chief, just as his mentor, Big Chief Allison ''Tootie'' Montana, did, Bo encouraged the Indians to shun violence and instead hold prettiness contests when one group would meet another. Bo was also instrumental in bringing the music of the Mardi Gras Indians to an audience beyond New Orleans. With Bo Dollis on lead vocals, the Wild Magnolias recorded their first single in 1970 and their first album in 1974. Under Bo's leadership, the group toured all over the world, opened for Aretha Franklin, and played at Carnegie Hall. This week, the New Orleans Jazz and Heritage Festival announced

that Bo Dollis would appear on the festival's official poster. Bo has received numerous honors and awards, including Offbeat Magazine's Lifetime Achievement Award and the National Endowment for the Arts' National Heritage Fellowship.

Mr. Speaker, Bo Dollis embodied the happiness, the passion, and love of music that define the culture of New Orleans. His soaring voice brought joy to countless listeners, and his colorful personality brightened every room he entered. The city of New Orleans will not be the same without Bo Dollis, but his legacy will live on in the lives of all that he inspired. And this Mardi Gras will not be the same without Big Chief ''Bo'' Dollis' presence there.

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

SUNSET MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, another legislative day has come to an end, and sunset approaches fast in Washington, DC. And as I have so many years, I stand before you in this House with what I call a Sunset Memorial, because, you see, Mr. Speaker, before the sun sets today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children will be killed by abortion on demand in the land of the free and the home of the brave. That is more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country by a multitude of thousands. And it happens every day.

It has now been 42 years since the tragedy called Roe v. Wade was first handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 56 million of its own unborn children. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, cried and screamed as they died, but because it was amniotic fluid going over the vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

All of them had at least four things in common, Mr. Speaker. First, they were just little babies who had never done anything wrong to anyone. Each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never quite be the same. All the gifts that these children might have brought for humanity and to humanity are now lost forever.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to this blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself over and over again, and our silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims—those yet unborn.

We should remember the quotes of President Abraham Lincoln when he said:

> Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not themselves, and under a just God, cannot long retain it.

Mr. Lincoln called upon all of us to remember America's Founding Fathers when he said:

> Their enlightened belief was that nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on or degraded and imbruted by its fellows.

He reminded those he called posterity—and that is us, Mr. Speaker:

> When in the distant future some man, some factions, some interests should set up a doctrine that some were not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that their posterity—again, Mr. Speaker, that is us—might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began.

Mr. Speaker, when authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Kermit Gosnell, they found a torture chamber for little babies that defies description within the constraints of the English language.

According to the grand jury report:

> Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies: he killed them. Now, he didn't call it that. He called it ''ensuring fetal demise.'' And the way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it snipping. Over the years there were hundreds of snippings.

Mr. Speaker, Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing, and she described one as 2 feet long that no longer had eyes or a mouth, but, in her words, was making like this screeching noise. She said: ''It sounded like a little alien.''

For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, is this who we really are?

Kermit Gosnell now rightfully sits in prison for killing a mother and murdering innocent, pain-capable children like the one I just described. Yet if he had killed them only 5 minutes earlier and before they had passed through the birth canal, it would have all been perfectly legal in many of the United States of America, including here in the District of Columbia.

If there is one thing we must not miss about this unspeakably evil episode it is that Kermit Gosnell is not an anomaly. He is just the visible face of this lucrative enterprise of murdering pain-capable unborn children in America. Mr. Speaker, more than 18,000 very late-term abortions are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their pain-capable unborn babies to torture and death without anesthesia. It is the worst atrocity in America today, and this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Throughout history there has often been great intensity surrounding the debates of protecting the innocent lives of those who, through no fault of their own, find themselves obscured in the shadows of humanity. It encourages me greatly that in nearly all of those cases the collective conscience was finally moved in favor of the victims.

The same thing is beginning to happen in this debate related to innocent, unborn children, Mr. Speaker, especially those that are pain capable. We are beginning to ask ourselves the real question: Does abortion take the life of a child? We are especially asking the question recently: Does very late-term abortion torture and take the life of a pain-capable baby? And we are finally beginning to realize as human beings that it does.

Ultrasound technology now demonstrates to all reasonable observers both the humanity of the victim and the inhumanity of what is being done to them. And we are beginning to realize as Americans that taking brutally the lives of the innocent unborn does not liberate anyone and that 56 million children, Mr. Speaker, is enough.

Ironically I have heard Barack Obama speak such poignant words that, whether he knows it or not, apply so profoundly to the tragedy of abortion on demand in America. Let me quote excerpted portions of his comments. He said:

> This is our first task—caring for our children. It is our first job. If we don't get that right, we don't get anything right. That is how, as a society, we will be judged.

He went on to say:

> And by that measure, can we truly say, as a nation, that we are meeting our obligations? Can we honestly say that we are doing enough to keep our children—all of them—safe from harm? Can we say that we are truly doing enough to give all the children of this country the chance they deserve to live out their lives with happiness and purpose?

The President went on to say:

> I have been reflecting on this the last few days, and if we are honest with ourselves, the answer is no. We are not doing enough. And we will have to change.

Oh, how true the President's words are, Mr. Speaker.

The President also said:

> We can't tolerate this anymore. These tragedies must end. And to end them, we must change.

And then the President asked:

> Are we really prepared to say that we are powerless in the face of such carnage, that the politics are too hard? Are we prepared to say that such violence visited on our children year after year after year is somehow the price of freedom?

Mr. Speaker, is this not the most relevant of questions we should all be asking in the midst of this genocidal murder of thousands of unborn babies in America every day?

□ 1500

The President has said: ''Our journey is not complete until all our children'' . . . are ''cared for and cherished and always safe from harm.''

Finally, he said: ''That is our generation's task—to make these words, these rights, these values of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness real for every American.''

Mr. Speaker, never have I so deeply agreed with any words ever spoken by President Barack Obama as those I have just quoted, and yet this President in the most merciless distortion of logic and reason and humanity itself refuses to apply these majestic words to helpless unborn babies.

Oh, how I wish somehow that Mr. Obama and all of us could open our hearts and our ears to his words and ask ourselves in the core of our own soul why his words that should apply to all children cannot apply to the most helpless of all children.

Mr. Speaker, we honor Abraham Lincoln most because he found the courage as President of the United States in the days of slavery, and he found the humanity within himself to recognize the image of God stamped on the soul of slaves that the Supreme Court said were not human and that the tide of public opinion didn't recognize as protectable under the law.

Could it still be that President Barack Obama might consider that perspective as well as his own legacy, and even eternity itself, and recognize that those little unborn children look so desperately to him now for help?

Could it be that the President might finally remember that on the pages of the Bible on which he laid his hands were the words written in red: ''Inasmuch as you have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, you have done it unto Me''?

Whether he does or not, it is time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said:

The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government.

The phrase in the 14th Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says:

No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without the due process of law.

The 14th Amendment tells us that we should have equal protection of the laws for all. Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is that clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights, the rights of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core self-evident truth. It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. Mr. Speaker, it is truly who we are.

Yet today another day has passed. As so many sunset memorials that I have given, another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent, unborn babies who died today without the protection we should have given them.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude this sunset memorial in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard it will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies, that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express, and that it is time we stood up together again and looked up to the Declaration of Independence, and that we remember that we are the same America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust, and we are still the courageous and compassionate Nation that can find a better way for mothers and their unborn children than abortion on demand.

It is still not too late for us to make a better world and for America to be the one that leads the rest of the planet, just as we did in the days of slavery, from this tragic genocide of murdering nearly 4,000 of our own children every day.

So now, Mr. Speaker, as we consider the thousands, the hundreds of thousands out on The Mall marching to protect these little babies, as we consider the plight of the unborn for 42 years under Roe v. Wade, maybe we can each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are all numbered and that we, too, each one, shall walk from these Chambers one day for the very last time.

If it should be that Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries, when we finally hear the cries of innocent, unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity and the constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny little American brothers and sisters, from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

Mr. Speaker, it is now 42 years to the day since Roe v. Wade first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children—this, in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT OFFICE MANAGER, THE HONORABLE CHAKA FATTAH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Dolores Ridley, District Office Manager, the Honorable CHAKA FATTAH, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 16, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, for grand jury testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

DOLORES RIDLEY,
District Office Manager.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. AMASH, Michigan
Mr. PAULSEN, Minnesota
Mr. HANNA, New York
Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Arizona
Mr. GROTHMAN, Wisconsin

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of House rule XI, I am submitting the rules of the Committee on the Budget for the 114th Congress. The rules were adopted earlier today during our Committee's organizational meeting.

GENERAL APPLICABILITY

RULE 1—APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES

(a) Except as otherwise specified herein, the Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, or a motion to recess subject to the call of the Chair (within 24 hours), or a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, is a non-debatable motion of privilege in the Committee. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) The Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Chair of the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

MEETINGS

RULE 2—REGULAR MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month at 11 a.m., while the House is in session, if notice is given pursuant to paragraph (c) and paragraph (g)(3) of clause 2 of rule XI of House Rules.

(b) Regular meetings shall be canceled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

(c) The Chair shall give written notice of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee meeting, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which members have notice thereof, unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. An announcement shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 3—ADDITIONAL AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) The Chair may call and convene additional meetings of the Committee as the Chair considers necessary or special meetings at the request of a majority of the members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XI of House Rules.

(b) In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Chair shall provide public

electronic notice of additional meetings to the office of each member at least 24 hours in advance while Congress is in session, and at least 3 days in advance when Congress is not in session.

RULE 4—OPEN BUSINESS MEETINGS

(a) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by the member designated by the Chair as the Vice Chair of the Committee, or by the Ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair.

(b) Each meeting for the transaction of Committee business, including the markup of measures, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public in accordance with clause 2(g)(1) of rule XI of the House Rules.

(c) No person, other than members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee may authorize, shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

(d) Not later than 24 hours after commencing a meeting to consider a measure or matter, the Chair of the Committee shall cause the text of such measure or matter and any amendment adopted thereto to be made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 5—QUORUMS

(a) A majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. No business shall be transacted and no measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a quorum is actually present.

RULE 6—RECOGNITION

Any member, when recognized by the Chair, may address the Committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration before the Committee. The time of such member shall be limited to 5 minutes until all members present have been afforded an opportunity to comment.

RULE 7—CONSIDERATION OF BUSINESS

Measures or matters may be placed before the Committee, for its consideration, by the Chair or by a majority vote of the Committee members, a quorum being present.

RULE 8—AVAILABILITY OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Committee shall consider no bill, joint resolution, or concurrent resolution unless copies of the measure have been made available to all Committee members at least 24 hours prior to the time at which such measure is to be considered. When considering concurrent resolutions on the budget, this requirement shall be satisfied by making available copies of the complete Chairman's mark (or such material as will provide the basis for Committee consideration). The provisions of this rule may be suspended with the concurrence of the Chair and Ranking Minority Member.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, the Chair shall cause the text of such legislation to be made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 9—PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERATION OF BUDGET RESOLUTION

(a) It shall be the policy of the Committee that the starting point for any deliberations on a concurrent resolution on the budget should be the estimated or actual levels for the fiscal year preceding the budget year.

(b) In the consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall first proceed, unless otherwise determined by the Committee, to consider budget aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters on a tentative basis, with the document before the Committee open to amendment. Subsequent amendments may be offered to aggregates, functional categories, or other appropriate matters, which have already been amended in their entirety.

(c) Following adoption of the aggregates, functional categories, and other matters, the text of a concurrent resolution on the budget incorporating such aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters shall be considered for amendment and a final vote.

RULE 10—ROLL CALL VOTES

(a) A roll call of the members may be had upon the request of at least one-fifth of those present. In the apparent absence of a quorum, a roll call may be had on the request of any member.

(b) No vote may be conducted on any measure or motion pending before the Committee unless a quorum is present for such purpose.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee on any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(d) In accordance with clause 2(e)(1)(B) of rule XI of the House Rules, a record of the vote of each Committee member on each recorded vote shall be available for public inspection at the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote, and, with respect to any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report, shall be included in the report of the Committee showing the total number of votes cast for and against and the names of those members voting for and against.

HEARINGS

RULE 11—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

The Chair shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee hearing at least one week before the hearing, beginning with the day in which the announcement is made and ending the day preceding the scheduled hearing unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Such announcement shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 12—OPEN HEARINGS

(a) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or any of its task forces shall be open to the public except when the Committee or task force, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, or would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. The Committee or task forces may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

(b) For the purposes clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of House Rules, the task forces of the Committee are considered to be subcommittees.

RULE 13—QUORUMS

For the purpose of hearing testimony, not less than two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

RULE 14—QUESTIONING WITNESSES

(a) Questioning of witnesses will be conducted under the 5-minute rule unless the Committee adopts a motion pursuant to clause 2(j) of rule XI of the House Rules.

(b) In questioning witnesses under the 5-minute rule:

(1) First, the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member shall be recognized;

(2) Next, the Committee members present at the time the hearing is called to order shall be recognized in order of seniority; and

(3) Finally, the Committee members not present at the time the hearing is called to order may be recognized in the order of their arrival at the hearing.

(c) In recognizing Committee members to question witnesses, the Chair may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), the Chair and Ranking Minority Member may designate an equal number of members from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes, or may designate staff from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes.

RULE 15—SUBPOENAS AND OATHS

(a) In accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House Rules, subpoenas authorized by a majority of the Committee or by the Chair (pursuant to such rules and limitations as the Committee may prescribe) may be issued over the signature of the Chair or of any member of the Committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(b) The Chair, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses.

RULE 16—WITNESSES' STATEMENTS

(a) So far as practicable, any prepared statement to be presented by a witness shall be submitted to the Committee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation, and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee in advance of presentation.

(b) To the greatest extent possible, each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or sub-grant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

(c) Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of witnesses, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

PRINTS AND PUBLICATIONS

RULE 17—COMMITTEE PRINTS

All Committee prints and other materials prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the Committee prior to any distribution, unless such print or other material shows clearly on its face that it has not been approved by the Committee.

RULE 18—COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS ON THE INTERNET

(a) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

STAFF

RULE 19—COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) Subject to approval by the Committee and to the provisions of the following paragraphs, the professional and clerical staff of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chair.

(b) Committee staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to

Committee business, and shall be selected without regard to race, creed, gender, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions.

(c) All Committee staff shall be entitled to equitable treatment, including comparable salaries, facilities, access to official Committee records, leave, and hours of work.

(d) Notwithstanding paragraphs a, b, and c, staff shall be employed in compliance with House rules, the Employment and Accountability Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and any other applicable Federal statutes.

RULE 20—STAFF SUPERVISION

(a) Staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair, who shall establish and assign their duties and responsibilities, delegate such authority as he deems appropriate, fix and adjust staff salaries (in accordance with House Rule X, clause 9(c)) and job titles, and, at his discretion, arrange for their specialized training.

(b) Staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the Committee, who may delegate such authority, as they deem appropriate.

RECORDS

RULE 21—PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) A substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings shall be made of all hearings and business meetings subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(b) The proceedings of the Committee shall be recorded in a journal, which shall among other things, include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is taken.

(c) Members of the Committee shall correct and return transcripts of hearings as soon as practicable after receipt thereof, except that any changes shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(d) Any witness may examine the transcript of his own testimony and make grammatical, technical, and typographical corrections.

(e) The Chair may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any member or witness if he determines that such member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time for correction, and that further delay would seriously impede the Committee's responsibility for meeting its deadlines under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) Transcripts of hearings and meetings may be printed if the Chair decides it is appropriate, or if a majority of the members so request.

RULE 22—ACCESS TO COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a)(1) The Chair shall promulgate regulations to provide for public inspection of roll call votes and to provide access by members to Committee records (in accordance with clause 2(e) of rule XI of the House Rules).

(2) Access to classified testimony and information shall be limited to Members of Congress and to House Budget Committee staff and staff of the Office of Official Reporters who have appropriate security clearance.

(3) Notice of the receipt of such information shall be sent to the Committee members. Such information shall be kept in the Committee safe, and shall be available to members in the Committee office.

(b) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the House Rules. The Chair shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

OVERSIGHT

RULE 23—GENERAL OVERSIGHT

(a) The Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject of which is within its jurisdiction.

(b) The Committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under clause (1)(d) of rule X of the House Rules, and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of rule X of the House Rules, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in accordance with the provisions of clause (2)(d) of rule X of the House Rules.

REPORTS

RULE 24—AVAILABILITY BEFORE FILING

(a) Any report accompanying any bill or resolution ordered reported to the House by the Committee shall be available to all Committee members at least 36 hours prior to filing with the House.

(b) No material change shall be made in any report made available to members pursuant to section (a) without the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member or by a majority vote of the Committee.

(c) Notwithstanding any other rule of the Committee, either or both subsections (a) and (b) may be waived by the Chair or with a majority vote by the Committee.

RULE 25—REPORT ON THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

The report of the Committee to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget shall include a comparison of the estimated or actual levels for the year preceding the budget year with the proposed spending and revenue levels for the budget year and each out year along with the appropriate percentage increase or decrease for each budget function and aggregate. The report shall include any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report any measure.

RULE 26—PARLIAMENTARIAN'S STATUS REPORT AND SECTION 302 STATUS REPORT

(a)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 311 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending and revenues as compared to the levels set forth in the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall advise the Speaker on at least a monthly basis when the House is in session as to its estimate of the current level of spending and revenue. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee, transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Parliamentarian's Status Report, and printed in the Congressional Record.

(2) The Committee authorizes the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to transmit to the Speaker the Parliamentarian's Status Report described above.

(b)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 302 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of Committees as compared to the appropriate allocations made pursuant to the Budget Act in conformity with the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall, as necessary, advise the Speaker as to its estimate of the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of appropriate Committees. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee and transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Section 302 Status Report.

(2) The Committee authorizes the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to transmit to the Speaker the Section 302 Status Report described above.

RULE 27—ACTIVITY REPORT

(a) After an adjournment sine die of the last regular session of a Congress or after December 15 of an even-numbered year, the chair of the Committee may file any time with the Clerk the Committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause (1)(d)(1) of rule XI of the House Rules without the approval of the Committee, if a copy of the report has been available to each member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the Committee.

(b) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of the Committee; a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made; a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon; and a delineation of any hearings held.

MISCELLANEOUS

RULE 28—BROADCASTING OF MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

(a) It shall be the policy of the Committee to give all news media access to open hearings of the Committee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in clause 4 of rule XI of the House Rules.

(b) Whenever any Committee business meeting is open to the public, that meeting may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with clause 4 of rule XI of the House Rules.

RULE 29—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

(a) Majority party members recommended to the Speaker as conferees shall be recommended by the Chair subject to the approval of the majority party members of the Committee.

(b) The Chair shall recommend such minority party members as conferees as shall be determined by the minority party; the recommended party representation shall be in approximately the same proportion as that in the Committee.

RULE 30—WAIVERS

When a reported bill or joint resolution, conference report, or anticipated floor amendment violates any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Chair may, if practical, consult with the Committee members on whether the Chair should recommend, in writing, that the Committee on Rules report a special rule that enforces the Act by not waiving the applicable points of order during the consideration of such measure.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Rule XI clause 2, I am submitting the Ways and Means Committee rules for the 114th Congress. The rules were adopted during our Committee's organizational meeting, which was held January 21, 2015.

A. GENERAL

RULE 1. APPLICATION OF HOUSE RULES

The rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Ways and Means and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, is a non-debatable motion of high privilege in the Committee.

Each subcommittee of the Committee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable. Written rules adopted by the Committee, not inconsistent with the Rules of the House, shall be binding on each subcommittee of the Committee.

The provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House are incorporated by reference as the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

RULE 2. MEETING DATE AND QUORUMS

The regular meeting day of the Committee on Ways and Means shall be on the second Wednesday of each month while the House is in session. However, the Committee shall not meet on the regularly scheduled meeting day if there is no business to be considered.

A majority of the Committee constitutes a quorum for business; provided however, that two Members shall constitute a quorum at any regularly scheduled hearing called for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence. In establishing a quorum for purposes of a public hearing, every effort shall be made to secure the presence of at least one Member each from the majority and the minority.

The Chairman of the Committee may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet pursuant to the call of the Chair.

RULE 3. COMMITTEE BUDGET

For each Congress, the Chairman, in consultation with the Majority Members of the Committee, shall prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee. After consultation with the Minority Members, the Chairman shall include an amount budgeted by Minority Members for staff under their direction and supervision.

RULE 4. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE DOCUMENTS

Any Committee or Subcommittee print, document, or similar material prepared for public distribution shall either be approved by the Committee or Subcommittee prior to distribution and opportunity afforded for the inclusion of supplemental, minority or additional views, or such document shall prominently display near the top of its cover the following: ''Majority [or Minority] Staff Report,'' as appropriate.

The requirements of this rule shall apply only to the publication of policy-oriented, analytical documents, and not to the publication of public hearings, legislative documents, documents which are administrative in nature or reports which are required to be submitted to the Committee under public law. The appropriate characterization of a document subject to this rule shall be determined after consultation with the Minority.

RULE 5. OFFICIAL TRAVEL

Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolution as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern official travel of Committee Members and Committee staff. Official travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the full Committee for any Member or any Committee staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Official travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any Member and any Committee staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee, its Subcommittees, or any other Committee or Subcommittee of the Congress on matters relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee, and meetings, conferences, facility inspections, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

(1) The purpose of the official travel;

(2) The dates during which the official travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the official travel is being made;

(3) The location of the event for which the official travel is to be made; and

(4) The names of the Members and Committee staff seeking authorization.

In the case of official travel of Members and staff of a Subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, facility inspections and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the jurisdiction of such Subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Subcommittee Chairman and the full Committee Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the full Committee Chairman only upon the representation by the applicable Subcommittee Chairman in writing setting forth those items enumerated above.

Within 60 days of the conclusion of any official travel authorized under this rule, there shall be submitted to the full Committee Chairman a written report covering the information gained as a result of the hearing, meeting, conference, facility inspection or investigation attended pursuant to such official travel.

RULE 6. AVAILABILITY OF COMMITTEE RECORDS AND PUBLICATIONS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of Rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee. The Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible, make its publications available in electronic form.

RULE 7. COMMITTEE WEBSITE

The Chairman shall maintain an official Committee website for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members and other members of the House. The ranking minority member may maintain a similar website for the same purpose, including communicating information about the activities of the minority to Committee members and other members of the House.

B. SUBCOMMITTEES

RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEE RATIOS AND JURISDICTION

All matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means involving revenue measures, except those revenue measures referred to Subcommittees under paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6 shall be considered by the full Committee and not in Subcommittee. There shall be six standing Subcommittees as follows: a Subcommittee on Trade; a Subcommittee on Oversight; a Subcommittee on Health; a Subcommittee on Social Security; a Subcommittee on Human Resources; and a Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures. The ratio of Republicans to Democrats on any Subcommittee of the Committee shall be consistent with the ratio of Republicans to Democrats on the full Committee.

1. The Subcommittee on Trade shall consist of 16 Members, 10 of whom shall be Republicans and 6 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Trade shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to customs and customs administration including tariff and import fee structure, classification, valuation of and special rules applying to imports, and special tariff provisions and procedures which relate to customs operation affecting exports and imports; import trade matters, including import impact, industry relief from injurious imports, adjustment assistance and programs to encourage competitive responses to imports, unfair import practices including antidumping and countervailing duty provisions, and import policy which relates to dependence on foreign sources of supply; commodity agreements and reciprocal trade agreements involving multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations and implementation of agreements involving tariff and non-tariff trade barriers to and distortions of international trade; international rules, organizations and institutional aspects of international trade agreements; budget authorizations for the customs revenue functions of the Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. International Trade Commission, and the U.S. Trade Representative; and special trade-related problems involving market access, competitive conditions of specific industries, export policy and promotion, access to materials in short supply, bilateral trade relations including trade with developing countries, operations of multinational corporations, and trade with non-market economies.

2. The Subcommittee on Oversight shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Republicans and 4 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Oversight shall include all matters within the scope of the full Committee's jurisdiction but shall be limited to existing law. Said oversight jurisdiction shall not be exclusive but shall be concurrent with that of the other Subcommittees. With respect to matters involving the Internal Revenue Code and other revenue issues, said concurrent jurisdiction shall be shared with the full Committee. Before undertaking any investigation or hearing, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight shall confer with the Chairman of the full Committee and the Chairman of any other Subcommittee having jurisdiction.

3. The Subcommittee on Health shall consist of 16 Members, 10 of whom shall be Republicans and 6 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Health shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means

that relate to programs providing payments (from any source) for health care, health delivery systems, or health research. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Health shall include bills and matters that relate to the health care programs of the Social Security Act (including titles V, XI (Part B), XVIII, and XIX thereof) and, concurrent with the full Committee, tax credit and deduction provisions of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with health insurance premiums and health care costs.

4. The Subcommittee on Social Security shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Republicans and 4 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Social Security shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the Federal Old Age, Survivors' and Disability Insurance System, the Railroad Retirement System, and employment taxes and trust fund operations relating to those systems. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Social Security shall include bills and matters involving title II of the Social Security Act and Chapter 22 of the Internal Revenue Code (the Railroad Retirement Tax Act), as well as provisions in title VII and title XI of the Act relating to procedure and administration involving the Old Age, Survivors' and Disability Insurance System.

5. The Subcommittee on Human Resources shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Republicans and 4 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act, including temporary assistance for needy families, child care, child and family services, child support, foster care, adoption, supplemental security income, social services, eligibility of welfare recipients for food stamps, and low-income energy assistance. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall include bills and matters relating to titles I, IV, VI, X, XIV, XVI, XVII, XX and related provisions of titles VII and XI of the Social Security Act.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall also include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the Federal-State system of unemployment compensation, and the financing thereof, including the programs for extended and emergency benefits. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall also include all bills and matters pertaining to the programs of unemployment compensation under titles III, IX and XII of the Social Security Act, Chapters 23 and 23A of the Internal Revenue Code, and the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, and provisions relating thereto.

6. The Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Republicans and 4 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures shall consist of those revenue measures that, from time to time, shall be referred to it specifically by the Chairman of the full Committee.

RULE 9. EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEES

The Chairman of the full Committee and the Ranking Minority Member may sit as ex-officio Members of all Subcommittees. They may be counted for purposes of assisting in the establishment of a quorum for a Subcommittee. However, their absence shall not count against the establishment of a quorum by the regular Members of the Subcommittee. Ex-officio Members shall neither vote in the Subcommittee nor be taken into consideration for the purposes of determining the ratio of the Subcommittee.

RULE 10. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS

Insofar as practicable, meetings of the full Committee and its Subcommittees shall not conflict. Subcommittee Chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman of the full Committee and other Subcommittee Chairmen with a view towards avoiding, wherever possible, simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings.

RULE 11. REFERENCE OF LEGISLATION AND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Except for bills or measures retained by the Chairman of the full Committee for full Committee consideration, every bill or other measure referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chairman of the full Committee to the appropriate Subcommittee in a timely manner. A Subcommittee shall, within three legislative days of the referral, acknowledge same to the full Committee.

After a measure has been pending in a Subcommittee for a reasonable period of time, the Chairman of the full Committee may make a request in writing to the Subcommittee that the Subcommittee forthwith report the measure to the full Committee with its recommendations. If within seven legislative days after the Chairman's written request, the Subcommittee has not so reported the measure, then there shall be in order in the full Committee a motion to discharge the Subcommittee from further consideration of the measure. If such motion is approved by a majority vote of the full Committee, the measure may thereafter be considered only by the full Committee.

No measure reported by a Subcommittee shall be considered by the full Committee unless it has been presented to all Members of the full Committee at least two legislative days prior to the full Committee's meeting, together with a comparison with present law, a section-by-section analysis of the proposed change, a section-by-section justification, and a draft statement of the budget effects of the measure that is consistent with the requirements for reported measures under clause 3(d)(1) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 12. RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman of the full Committee shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those Committee Members as the Chairman may designate. In making recommendations of Minority Members as conferees, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

C. HEARINGS

RULE 13. WITNESSES

In order to assure the most productive use of the limited time available to question hearing witnesses, a witness who is scheduled to appear before the full Committee or a Subcommittee shall file with the Clerk of the Committee at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of their proposed testimony. In addition, all witnesses shall comply with formatting requirements as specified by the Committee and the Rules of the House. Failure to comply with the 48-hour rule may result in a witness being denied the opportunity to testify in person. Failure to comply with the formatting requirements may result in a witness' statement being rejected for inclusion in the published hearing record. In addition to the requirements of clause 2(g)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House regarding information required of public witnesses, a witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a summary of their position and shall provide sufficient copies of their written statement to the Clerk for distribution to Members, staff and news media.

A witness appearing at a public hearing, or submitting a statement for the record of a public hearing, or submitting written comments in response to a published request for comments by the Committee must include in their statement or submission, a list of all clients, persons or organizations on whose behalf the witness appears. Oral testimony and statements for the record, or written comments in response to a request for comments by the Committee, will be accepted only from citizens of the United States or corporations or associations organized under the laws of one of the 50 States of the United States or the District of Columbia, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the full Committee or Subcommittee involved. Written statements from non-citizens may be considered for acceptance in the record if transmitted to the Committee in writing by Members of Congress.

RULE 14. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

Committee Members may question witnesses only when recognized by the Chairman for that purpose. All Members shall be limited to five minutes on the initial round of questioning. In questioning witnesses under the five minute rule, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall be recognized first, after which Members who are in attendance at the beginning of a hearing will be recognized in the order of their seniority on the Committee. Other Members shall be recognized in the order of their appearance at the hearing. In recognizing Members to question witnesses, the Chairman may take into consideration the ratio of Majority Members to Minority Members and the number of Majority and Minority Members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage Members of the majority.

RULE 15. SUBPOENA POWER

The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the Chairman of the full Committee, as provided for under clause 2(m)(3)(A)(i) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 16. RECORDS OF HEARINGS

An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all testimony taken at a public hearing. The staff shall transmit to a witness the transcript of his or her testimony for correction and immediate return to the Committee offices. Only changes in the interest of clarity, accuracy and corrections in transcribing errors will be permitted. Changes that substantially alter the actual testimony will not be permitted. Members shall have the opportunity to correct their own remarks before publication. The Chairman of the full Committee may order the printing of a hearing without the corrections of a witness or Member if he determines that a reasonable time has been afforded to make corrections and that further delay would impede the consideration of the legislation or other measure that is the subject of the hearing.

RULE 17. BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS

The provisions of clause 4(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives are specifically made a part of these rules by reference. In addition, the following policy shall apply to media coverage of any meeting of the full Committee or a Subcommittee:

(1) An appropriate area of the Committee's hearing room will be designated for members of the media and their equipment.

(2) No interviews will be allowed in the Committee room while the Committee is in session. Individual interviews must take place before the gavel falls for the convening of a meeting or after the gavel falls for adjournment.

(3) Day-to-day notification of the next day's electronic coverage shall be provided by the media to the Chairman of the full Committee through an appropriate designee.

(4) Still photography during a Committee meeting will not be permitted to disrupt the proceedings or block the vision of Committee Members or witnesses.

(5) Further conditions may be specified by the Chairman.

D. MARKUPS

RULE 18. PREVIOUS QUESTION

The Chairman shall not recognize a Member for the purpose of moving the previous question unless the Member has first advised the Chair and the Committee that this is the purpose for which recognition is being sought.

RULE 19. POSTPONEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS

The Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment.

The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time. In exercising postponement authority the Chairman shall take reasonable steps to notify Members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote.

When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

RULE 20. MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE

The Chairman is authorized to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

RULE 21. OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPTS OF MARKUPS AND OTHER COMMITTEE MEETINGS

An official stenographic transcript shall be kept accurately reflecting all markups and other official meetings of the full Committee and the Subcommittees, whether they be open or closed to the public. This official transcript, marked as ''uncorrected,'' shall be available for inspection by the public (except for meetings closed pursuant to clause 2(g)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House), by Members of the House, or by Members of the Committee together with their staffs, during normal business hours in the full Committee or Subcommittee office under such controls as the Chairman of the full Committee deems necessary. Official transcripts shall not be removed from the Committee or Subcommittee office.

If, however, (1) in the drafting of a Committee or Subcommittee decision, the Office of the House Legislative Counsel or (2) in the preparation of a Committee report, the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation determines (in consultation with appropriate majority and minority committee staff) that it is necessary to review the official transcript of a markup, such transcript may be released upon the signature and to the custody of an appropriate committee staff person. Such transcript shall be returned immediately after its review in the drafting session.

The official transcript of a markup or Committee meeting other than a public hearing shall not be published or distributed to the public in any way except by a majority vote of the Committee. Before any public release of the uncorrected transcript, Members must be given a reasonable opportunity to correct their remarks. In instances in which a stenographic transcript is kept of a conference committee proceeding, all of the requirements of this rule shall likewise be observed.

RULE 22. PUBLICATION OF DECISIONS AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE

A press release describing any tentative or final decision made by the full Committee or a Subcommittee on legislation under consideration shall be made available to each Member of the Committee as soon as possible, but no later than the next day. However, the legislative draft of any tentative or final decision of the full Committee or a Subcommittee shall not be publicly released until such draft is made available to each Member of the Committee.

E. STAFF

RULE 23. SUPERVISION OF COMMITTEE STAFF

The staff of the Committee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman of the full Committee except as provided in clause 9 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives concerning Committee expenses and staff.

Pursuant to clause 6(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the full Committee, from the funds made available for the appointment of Committee staff pursuant to primary and additional expense resolutions, shall ensure that each Subcommittee receives sufficient staff to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee, and that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 26, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> 'I AB do solemnly swear (or Affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.'

Has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 114th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ALABAMA

1 Bradley Byrne
2 Martha Roby
3 Mike Rogers
4 Robert B. Aderholt
5 Mo Brooks
6 Gary J. Palmer
7 Terri A. Sewell

ALASKA

At Large, Don Young

ARIZONA

1 Ann Kirkpatrick
2 Martha McSally
3 Raúl M. Grijalva
4 Paul A. Gosar
5 Matt Salmon
6 David Schweikert
7 Ruben Gallego
8 Trent Franks
9 Kyrsten Sinema

ARKANSAS

1 Eric A. ''Rick'' Crawford
2 J. French Hill
3 Steve Womack
4 Bruce Westerman

CALIFORNIA

1 Doug LaMalfa
2 Jared Huffman
3 John Garamendi
4 Tom McClintock
5 Mike Thompson
6 Doris O. Matsui
7 Ami Bera
8 Paul Cook
9 Jerry McNerney
10 Jeff Denham
11 Mark DeSaulnier
12 Nancy Pelosi
13 Barbara Lee
14 Jackie Speier
15 Eric Swalwell
16 Jim Costa
17 Michael M. Honda
18 Anna G. Eshoo
19 Zoe Lofgren
20 Sam Farr
21 David G. Valadao
22 Devin Nunes
23 Kevin McCarthy
24 Lois Capps
25 Stephen Knight
26 Julia Brownley
27 Judy Chu
28 Adam B. Schiff
29 Tony Cárdenas
30 Brad Sherman
31 Pete Aguilar
32 Grace F. Napolitano
33 Ted Lieu
34 Xavier Becerra
35 Norma J. Torres
36 Raul Ruiz
37 Karen Bass
38 Linda T. Sánchez
39 Edward R. Royce
40 Lucille Roybal-Allard
41 Mark Takano
42 Ken Calvert
43 Maxine Waters
44 Janice Hahn
45 Mimi Walters
46 Loretta Sanchez
47 Alan S. Lowenthal
48 Dana Rohrabacher
49 Darrell E. Issa
50 Duncan Hunter
51 Juan Vargas
52 Scott H. Peters
53 Susan A. Davis

COLORADO

1 Diana DeGette

2 Jared Polis
3 Scott R. Tipton
4 Ken Buck
5 Doug Lamborn
6 Mike Coffman
7 Ed Perlmutter

CONNECTICUT

1 John B. Larson
2 Joe Courtney
3 Rosa L. DeLauro
4 James A. Himes
5 Elizabeth H. Esty

DELAWARE

At Large, John C. Carney, Jr.

FLORIDA

1 Jeff Miller
2 Gwen Graham
3 Ted S. Yoho
4 Ander Crenshaw
5 Corrine Brown
6 Ron DeSantis
7 John L. Mica
8 Bill Posey
9 Alan Grayson
10 Daniel Webster
11 Richard B. Nugent
12 Gus M. Bilirakis
13 David W. Jolly
14 Kathy Castor
15 Dennis A. Ross
16 Vern Buchanan
17 Thomas J. Rooney
18 Patrick Murphy
19 Curt Clawson
20 Alcee L. Hastings
21 Theodore E. Deutch
22 Lois Frankel
23 Debbie Wasserman Schultz
24 Frederica S. Wilson
25 Mario Diaz-Balart
26 Carlos Curbelo
27 Ileana Ros-Lehtinen

GEORGIA

1 Earl L. ''Buddy'' Carter
2 Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.
3 Lynn A. Westmoreland
4 Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr.
5 John Lewis
6 Tom Price
7 Rob Woodall
8 Austin Scott
9 Doug Collins
10 Jody B. Hice
11 Barry Loudermilk
12 Rick W. Allen
13 David Scott
14 Tom Graves

HAWAII

1 Mark Takai
2 Tulsi Gabbard

IDAHO

1 Raúl R. Labrador
2 Michael K. Simpson

ILLINOIS

1 Bobby L. Rush
2 Robin L. Kelly
3 Daniel Lipinski
4 Luis V. Gutiérrez
5 Mike Quigley
6 Peter J. Roskam
7 Danny K. Davis
8 Tammy Duckworth
9 Janice D. Schakowsky
10 Robert J. Dold
11 Bill Foster
12 Mike Bost
13 Rodney Davis
14 Randy Hultgren
15 John Shimkus
16 Adam Kinzinger
17 Cheri Bustos
18 Aaron Schock

INDIANA

1 Peter J. Visclosky
2 Jackie Walorski
3 Marlin A. Stutzman
4 Todd Rokita
5 Susan W. Brooks
6 Luke Messer
7 André Carson
8 Larry Bucshon
9 Todd C. Young

IOWA

1 Rod Blum
2 David Loebsack
3 David Young
4 Steve King

KANSAS

1 Tim Huelskamp
2 Lynn Jenkins
3 Kevin Yoder
4 Mike Pompeo

KENTUCKY

1 Ed Whitfield
2 Brett Guthrie
3 John A. Yarmuth
4 Thomas Massie
5 Harold Rogers
6 Andy Barr

LOUISIANA

1 Steve Scalise
2 Cedric L. Richmond
3 Charles W. Boustany, Jr.
4 John Fleming
5 Ralph Lee Abraham
6 Garret Graves

MAINE

1 Chellie Pingree
2 Bruce Poliquin

MARYLAND

1 Andy Harris
2 C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger
3 John P. Sarbanes
4 Donna F. Edwards
5 Steny H. Hoyer
6 John K. Delaney
7 Elijah E. Cummings
8 Chris Van Hollen

MASSACHUSETTS

1 Richard E. Neal
2 James P. McGovern
3 Niki Tsongas
4 Joseph P. Kennedy, III
5 Katherine M. Clark
6 Seth Moulton
7 Michael E. Capuano
8 Stephen F. Lynch
9 William R. Keating

MICHIGAN

1 Dan Benishek
2 Bill Huizenga
3 Justin Amash
4 John R. Moolenaar
5 Daniel T. Kildee
6 Fred Upton
7 Tim Walberg
8 Mike Bishop
9 Sander M. Levin
10 Candice S. Miller
11 David A. Trott
12 Debbie Dingell
13 John Conyers, Jr.
14 Brenda L. Lawrence

MINNESOTA

1 Timothy J. Walz
2 John Kline
3 Erik Paulsen
4 Betty McCollum
5 Keith Ellison
6 Tom Emmer
7 Collin C. Peterson
8 Richard M. Nolan

MISSISSIPPI

1 Alan Nunnelee
2 Bennie G. Thompson
3 Gregg Harper
4 Steven M. Palazzo

MISSOURI

1 Wm. Lacy Clay
2 Ann Wagner
3 Blaine Luetkemeyer
4 Vicky Hartzler
5 Emanuel Cleaver
6 Sam Graves
7 Billy Long
8 Jason Smith

MONTANA

At Large, Ryan K. Zinke

NEBRASKA

1 Jeff Fortenberry
2 Brad Ashford
3 Adrian Smith

NEVADA

1 Dina Titus
2 Mark E. Amodei
3 Joseph J. Heck
4 Cresent Hardy

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1 Frank C. Guinta
2 Ann M. Kuster

NEW JERSEY

1 Donald Norcross
2 Frank A. LoBiondo
3 Thomas MacArthur
4 Christopher H. Smith
5 Scott Garrett
6 Frank Pallone, Jr.
7 Leonard Lance
8 Albio Sires
9 Bill Pascrell, Jr.
10 Donald M. Payne, Jr.
11 Rodney P. Frelinghuysen
12 Bonnie Watson Coleman

NEW MEXICO

1 Michelle Lujan Grisham
2 Stevan Pearce
3 Ben Ray Luján

NEW YORK

1 Lee M. Zeldin
2 Peter T. King
3 Steve Israel
4 Kathleen M. Rice
5 Gregory W. Meeks
6 Grace Meng
7 Nydia M. Velázquez
8 Hakeem S. Jeffries
9 Yvette D. Clarke
10 Jerrold Nadler
11 [VACANT]
12 Carolyn B. Maloney
13 Charles B. Rangel
14 Joseph Crowley
15 José E. Serrano
16 Eliot L. Engel
17 Nita M. Lowey
18 Sean Patrick Maloney
19 Christopher P. Gibson
20 Paul Tonko
21 Elise M. Stefanik
22 Richard L. Hanna
23 Tom Reed
24 John Katko
25 Louise McIntosh Slaughter
26 Brian Higgins
27 Chris Collins

NORTH CAROLINA

1 G. K. Butterfield
2 Renee L. Ellmers
3 Walter B. Jones
4 David E. Price
5 Virginia Foxx
6 Mark Walker
7 David Rouzer
8 Richard Hudson
9 Robert Pittenger
10 Patrick T. McHenry
11 Mark Meadows
12 Alma S. Adams
13 George Holding

NORTH DAKOTA

At Large, Kevin Cramer

OHIO

1 Steve Chabot
2 Brad R. Wenstrup
3 Joyce Beatty
4 Jim Jordan
5 Robert E. Latta
6 Bill Johnson
7 Bob Gibbs
8 John A. Boehner
9 Marcy Kaptur
10 Michael R. Turner
11 Marcia L. Fudge
12 Patrick J. Tiberi
13 Tim Ryan
14 David P. Joyce
15 Steve Stivers
16 James B. Renacci

OKLAHOMA

1 Jim Bridenstine
2 Markwayne Mullin
3 Frank D. Lucas
4 Tom Cole
5 Steve Russell

OREGON

1 Suzanne Bonamici
2 Greg Walden

3 Earl Blumenauer
4 Peter A. DeFazio
5 Kurt Schrader

PENNSYLVANIA

1 Robert A. Brady
2 Chaka Fattah
3 Mike Kelly
4 Scott Perry
5 Glenn Thompson
6 Ryan A. Costello
7 Patrick Meehan
8 Michael G. Fitzpatrick
9 Bill Shuster
10 Tom Marino
11 Lou Barletta
12 Keith J. Rothfus
13 Brendan F. Boyle
14 Michael F. Doyle
15 Charles W. Dent
16 Joseph R. Pitts
17 Matt Cartwright
18 Tim Murphy

RHODE ISLAND

1 David N. Cicilline
2 James R. Langevin

SOUTH CAROLINA

1 Mark Sanford
2 Joe Wilson
3 Jeff Duncan
4 Trey Gowdy
5 Mick Mulvaney
6 James E. Clyburn
7 Tom Rice

SOUTH DAKOTA

At Large, Kristi L. Noem

TENNESSEE

1 David P. Roe
2 John J. Duncan, Jr.
3 Charles J. ''Chuck'' Fleischmann
4 Scott DesJarlais
5 Jim Cooper
6 Diane Black
7 Marsha Blackburn
8 Stephen Lee Fincher
9 Steve Cohen

TEXAS

1 Louie Gohmert
2 Ted Poe
3 Sam Johnson
4 John Ratcliffe
5 Jeb Hensarling
6 Joe Barton
7 John Abney Culberson
8 Kevin Brady
9 Al Green
10 Michael T. McCaul
11 K. Michael Conaway
12 Kay Granger
13 Mac Thornberry
14 Randy K. Weber, Sr.
15 Rubén Hinojosa
16 Beto O'Rourke
17 Bill Flores
18 Sheila Jackson Lee
19 Randy Neugebauer
20 Joaquin Castro
21 Lamar Smith
22 Pete Olson
23 Will Hurd
24 Kenny Marchant
25 Roger Williams
26 Michael C. Burgess
27 Blake Farenthold
28 Henry Cuellar
29 Gene Green
30 Eddie Bernice Johnson
31 John R. Carter
32 Pete Sessions
33 Marc A. Veasey
34 Filemon Vela
35 Lloyd Doggett
36 Brian Babin

UTAH

1 Rob Bishop
2 Chris Stewart
3 Jason Chaffetz
4 Mia B. Love

VERMONT

At Large, Peter Welch

VIRGINIA

1 Robert J. Wittman
2 E. Scott Rigell
3 Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott
4 J. Randy Forbes
5 Robert Hurt
6 Bob Goodlatte
7 Dave Brat
8 Donald S. Beyer, Jr.
9 H. Morgan Griffith
10 Barbara Comstock
11 Gerald E. Connolly

WASHINGTON

1 Suzan K. DelBene
2 Rick Larsen
3 Jaime Herrera Beutler
4 Dan Newhouse
5 Cathy McMorris Rodgers
6 Derek Kilmer
7 Jim McDermott
8 David G. Reichert
9 Adam Smith
10 Denny Heck

WEST VIRGINIA

1 David B. McKinley
2 Alexander X. Mooney
3 Evan H. Jenkins

WISCONSIN

1 Paul Ryan
2 Mark Pocan
3 Ron Kind
4 Gwen Moore
5 F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.
6 Glenn Grothman
7 Sean P. Duffy
8 Reid J. Ribble

WYOMING

At Large, Cynthia M. Lummis

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner, Pedro R. Pierluisi

AMERICAN SAMOA

Delegate, Amata Coleman Radewagen

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Delegate, Eleanor Holmes Norton

GUAM,

Delegate, Madeleine Z. Bordallo

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Delegate, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Delegate, Stacey E. Plaskett

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information.

Ralph Lee Abraham, Alma S. Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, Pete Aguilar, Rick W. Allen, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Brad Ashford, Brian Babin, Lou Barletta, Andy Barr, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Ami Bera, Donald S. Beyer, Jr., Gus M. Bilirakis, Mike Bishop, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Rod Blum, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Mike Bost, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Brendan F. Boyle, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Dave Brat, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Corrine Brown, Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Ken Buck, Larry Bucshon, Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Bradley Byrne, Ken Calvert, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cárdenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, Earl L. ''Buddy'' Carter, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Katherine M. Clark, Yvette D. Clarke, Curt Clawson, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins, Doug Collins, Barbara Comstock, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Ryan A. Costello, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. ''Rick'' Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Carlos Curbelo, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Mark DeSaulnier, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Debbie Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Tom Emmer, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. ''Chuck'' Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Rubén Gallego, John Garamendi, Scott Garrett, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Gwen Graham, Kay Granger, Garret Graves, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Glenn Grothman, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Janice Hahn, Richard L. Hanna, Cresent Hardy, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Jody B. Hice, Brian Higgins, J. French Hill, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Will Hurd, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Evan H. Jenkins, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, David W. Jolly, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, John Katko, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Robin L. Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Adam Kinzinger, Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Stephen Knight, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Robert E. Latta, Brenda L. Lawrence, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Ted Lieu, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Barry Loudermilk, Mia B. Love, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Luján, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Thomas MacArthur, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Thomas Massie, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Martha McSally, Mark Meadows, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, Grace Meng, Luke Messer, John L. Mica, Candice S. Miller, Jeff

Miller, John R. Moolenaar, Alexander X. Mooney, Gwen Moore, Seth Moulton, Markwayne Mullin, Mick Mulvaney, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murphy, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Dan Newhouse, Kristi L. Noem, Richard M. Nolan, Donald Norcross, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard B. Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, Beto O'Rourke, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Gary J. Palmer, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Scott Perry, Scott H. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Robert Pittenger, Joseph R. Pitts, Stacey E. Plaskett, Mark Pocan, Ted Poe, Bruce Poliquin, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Mike Quigley, Amata Coleman Radewagen, Charles B. Rangel, John Ratcliffe, Tom Reed, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Reid J. Ribble, Kathleen M. Rice, Tom Rice, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dennis A. Ross, Keith J. Rothfus, David Rouzer, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Raul Ruiz, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Steve Russell, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Matt Salmon, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, Mark Sanford, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Kyrsten Sinema, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Jason Smith, Lamar Smith, Jackie Speier, Elise M. Stefanik, Chris Stewart, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takai, Mark Takano, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, Scott R. Tipton, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Norma J. Torres, David A. Trott, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, David G. Valadao, Chris Van Hollen, Juan Vargas, Marc A. Veasey, Filemon Vela, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Ann Wagner, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Mark Walker, Jackie Walorski, Mimi Walters, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Randy K. Weber, Sr., Daniel Webster, Peter Welch, Brad R. Wenstrup, Bruce Westerman, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Roger Williams, Frederica S. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, Ted S. Yoho, David Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young, Lee M. Zeldin, Ryan K. Zinke

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

100. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Guard Youth Challenge Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to 32 U.S.C. 509(k); to the Committee on Armed Services.

101. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Defense Production Act (DPA) Title III Fund for Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2094; to the Committee on Financial Services.

102. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to the People's Republic of China, pursuant to Public Law 105-261, section 1512; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

103. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on United States Participation in the United Nations in 2013, pursuant to Public Law 79-264, section 4(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

104. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243) and the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the August 15, 2014 — October 14, 2014, reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

105. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Certification Related to Condition 7(C)(i) of Senate Executive Resolution 75 (1997) Concerning Advice and Consent to the Ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

106. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a 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.

107. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-270), the Department's 2012 and 2013 Inventories of Inherently Governmental Activities and of Commercial Activities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

108. A letter from the Vice President, Congressional and Public Affairs, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Fiscal Year 2014 Agency Financial Report, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

109. A letter from the Director, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's interim rule — Veterans' Preference (RIN: 3206-AM79) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

110. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to Patent Term Adjustment in View of the Federal Circuit Decision in Novartis v. Lee [Docket No.: PTO-P-2014-0023] (RIN: 0651-AC96) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

111. A letter from the FMCSA Division Chief, Regulatory Development, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inspection, Repair, and Maintenance; Driver-Vehicle Inspection Report (DVIR) [Docket No.: FMCSA-2012-0336] (RIN: 2126-AB46) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

112. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule; correction — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0072; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-04-AD; Amendment 39-18017; AD 2014-23-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

113. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0981; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-032-AD; Amendment 39-18036; AD 2014-24-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

114. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0366; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-024-AD; Amendment 39-18038; AD 2014-24-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

115. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Beechcraft Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0771; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-006-AD; Amendment 39-18056; AD 2014-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

116. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB-WERKE Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0848; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-031-AD; Amendment 39-18055; AD 2014-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

117. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0460; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-222-AD; Amendment 39-18054; AD 2014-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

118. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's immediately adopted final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Simferopol (UKFV) and Dnipropetrovsk (UKDV) Flight Information Regions (FIRs) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0225; Amdt. No.: 91-331A] (RIN: 2120-AK56) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

119. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazmat, PHMSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Harmonization with International Standards (RRR) [Docket Nos.: PHMSA-2013-0260 (HM-215M)] (RIN: 2137-AF05) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LONG, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 463. A bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to prohibit Federal education funding for elementary schools and secondary schools that provide on-campus access to abortion providers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 464. A bill to authorize Members of Congress to bring an action for declaratory and injunctive relief in response to a written statement by the President or any other official in the executive branch directing officials of the executive branch to not enforce a provision of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROBY (for herself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. LOVE, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. YODER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MICA, Mr. DOLD, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BLUM, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. HILL, Mr. PALMER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Ms. MCSALLY):

H.R. 465. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. AMASH):

H.R. 466. A bill to prohibit the Central Intelligence Agency from using an unmanned aerial vehicle to carry out a weapons strike or other deliberately lethal action and to transfer the authority to conduct such strikes or lethal action to the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 467. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to carry out programs and activities to ensure that Federal science agencies and institutions of higher education receiving Federal research and development funding are fully engaging their entire talent pool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 468. A bill to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to increase knowledge concerning, and improve services for, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. MARINO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 469. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 470. A bill to authorize the sale of certain National Forest System land in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 471. A bill to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 472. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to issue oleoresin capsicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 473. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 474. A bill 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.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 475. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to educational assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 476. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the process of approving courses of education pursued using educational benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 477. A bill to extend the authority to the establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor Brigadier General Francis Marion and his service; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 478. A bill to prohibit the marketing of electronic cigarettes to children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 479. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require contracting officers to consider information regarding domestic employment before awarding a Federal defense contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for employer-provided employee housing assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit for hiring the long-term unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 482. A bill to redesignate Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia and revise its boundary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TAKAI (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 483. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 484. A bill to amend the Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010 to create an expedited procedure to enact recommendations of the Government Accountability Office for consolidation and elimination to reduce duplication; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 485. A bill to ensure that the percentage increase in rates of basic pay for prevailing wage employees shall be equal to the percentage increase received by other Federal employees in the same pay locality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COLE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 486. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to ensure that on-duty time does not include waiting time at a natural gas or oil well site for certain commercial motor vehicle operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 487. A bill to allow the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to lease or transfer certain lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. HARDY):

H.R. 488. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in Nevada except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JONES, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 489. A bill to require States to report information on Medicaid payments to abortion providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 490. A bill to provide for a strategic plan to reform and improve the security clearance and background investigation processes of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 491. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify the circumstances in which a person may acquire geolocation information and for other purposes; 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. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan):

H.R. 492. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion receive an ultrasound and the opportunity to review the ultrasound before giving informed consent to receive an abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 493. A bill to update avian protection laws in order to support an all-of-the-above domestic energy strategy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 494. A bill to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MENG, Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 495. A bill to strengthen student achievement and graduation rates and prepare young people for college, careers, and citizenship through innovative partnerships that meet the comprehensive needs of children and youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 496. A bill to establish the Alabama Hills National Scenic Area in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 497. A bill to require training for teachers in social and emotional learning programming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 498. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to jointly ensure that the Vet Centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs have access to the Defense Personnel Record Image Retrieval system and the Veterans Affairs/Department of Defense Identity Repository system; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 499. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the volume cap for private activity bonds shall not apply to bonds for facilities for furnishing of water and sewage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BASS, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 500. A bill to establish the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking to review Federal Government policy on human trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COOK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 501. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 502. A bill to establish a pilot program to improve the management and accountability within the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to provide oversight of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 503. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. LATTA (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 504. A bill to clarify that no express or implied warranty is provided by reason of a disclosure relating to voluntary participation in the Energy Star program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 505. A bill to establish a Hazardous Materials Information Advisory Committee to develop standards for the use of electronic shipping papers for the transportation of hazardous materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 506. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand personal saving and retirement savings coverage by enabling employees not covered by qualifying retirement plans to save for retirement through automatic IRA arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 507. A bill to allow Members of Congress to decline certain retirement benefits and contributions by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. PETERS (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 508. A bill to establish a task force to review policies and measures to promote,

and to develop best practices for, reduction of short-lived climate pollutants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MENG, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 509. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction allowed for student loan interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 510. A bill to establish a uniform and more efficient Federal process for protecting property owners' rights guaranteed by the fifth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COLE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JONES, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 511. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 512. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage the development and use of DISARM antimicrobial drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 513. A bill to repeal the provision of law that provides automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. BASS, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 514. A bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking within the Department of State according to congressional intent in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 without increasing the size of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 515. A bill to protect children from exploitation, especially sex trafficking in tourism, by providing advance notice of intended travel by registered child-sex offenders outside the United States to the government of the country of destination, requesting foreign governments to notify the United States when a known child-sex offender is seeking to enter the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 516. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to save the American taxpayers money by immediately altering the metallic composition of the one-cent, five-cent, dime, and quarter dollar coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 517. A bill to establish a task force to evaluate the backlog of appeals to claims submitted to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain emergency medical devices from the excise tax on medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MICA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. BARTON):

H.R. 519. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the individual and employer health insurance mandates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 520. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt student workers for purposes of determining a higher education institution's employer health care shared responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 521. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 44. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to permit Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to the Congress to cast votes in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUINTA (for himself, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. COOK, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARR, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. JOLLY, and Ms. SINEMA):

H. Res. 45. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require each report of a committee on a public bill or public joint resolution to include an analysis of whether the bill or joint resolution creates a program, office, or initiative that would duplicate or overlap with an existing program, office, or initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H. Res. 46. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives condemning the recent terrorist attacks in Nigeria that resulted in the deaths of over 2,000 innocent persons and offering condolences to those personally affected by this cowardly act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 47. A resolution supporting women's reproductive health care decisions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 463.

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 Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 2, Section 1, Clause 8

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 465.

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. BURGESS:

H.R. 466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section VIII, Clause 1, ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States . . .'' In addition, Article I, Section VIII, Clause 14 provides, ''To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.'' Lastly, Article I, Section VIII, Clause 16 states ''The Congress shall have Power To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.''

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 467.

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. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. BASS:
H.R. 469.
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 1, Section 1.
Article. I.
Section 1.
All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:
H.R. 470.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
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.

By Mr. MARINO:
H.R. 471.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. The Constitution's Commerce Clause allows Congress to enact laws when reasonably related to the regulation of interstate commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:
H.R. 472.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 of the Constitution, and Section 1 of Article 3 of the Constitution to create and regulate Federal Courts.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:
H.R. 473.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:
H.R. 474.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:
H.R. 475.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:
H.R. 476.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:
H.R. 477.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Ms. ESTY:
H.R. 478.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Ms. ESTY:
H.R. 479.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:
H.R. 480.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. PASCRELL:
H.R. 481.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:
H.R. 482.
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. TAKAI:
H.R. 483.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DENT:
H.R. 484.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 485.
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 Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. MULLIN:
H.R. 486.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MULLIN:
H.R. 487.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. AMODEI:
H.R. 488.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. OLSON:
H.R. 489.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have power to . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer therof.

By Mr. LYNCH:
H.R. 490.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:
H.R. 491.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3, and the 4th and 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:
H.R. 492.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment V, Section 1—the ''Due Process'' clause protects any life from being taken without due process of law; this legislation provides unborn citizens a modicum of due process.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:
H.R. 493.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
the rules and regulations for property owned by the United States pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.
Authority to stay misapplied regulations from the executive Branch stems from Article I. Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GOSAR:
H.R. 494.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. (commerce clause)
''The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:
H.R. 495.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. COOK:
H.R. 496.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:
H.R. 497.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DENHAM:
H.R. 498.
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. DUNCAN of Tennessee:
H.R. 499.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:
H.R. 500.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. KILMER:
H.R. 501.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, sec 8, cl. 3 (commerce clause), & cl. 18 (necessary and proper clause); section 1 of the 14th Amendment (due process and equal protection clauses), and section 5 of the 14th Amendment (enforcement). In addition, Article 1, sec 8, & cl. 16.

By Mr. KILMER:
H.R. 502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 which states: ''The Congress shall have the Power To . . . establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization . . .''

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, cl. 3

The Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the states, and with Indian Tribes;

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the US constitution gives Congress the authority ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 6 of Article I of the Constitution as amended by the 27th Amendment to the Constitution. This section of the Constitution allows Congress to set their own compensation so long as new representatives have been elected.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article XVI of the Constitution—Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes . . .

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

5th Amendment to the Constitution

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 511.

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. ROSKAM:

H.R. 512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(a) Article I, Section 1, to exercise the legislative powers vested in Congress as granted in the Constitution; and

(b) Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the authority ''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'; and

(c) Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, which states that ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1. Section 6.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18, as this bill better equips the Executive Branch to properly carry out the powers vested in it by the Constitution, as well as ensures that Congress is accurately informed of a foreign nations' trafficking record and tier ranking when Congress considers regulation of commerce with foreign nations.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, as sex offenders are traveling in foreign commerce.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—''To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures''

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section, 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, as the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the imposition of the burdensome mandate on hardworking American taxpayers is an action Congress may take under its power to tax, and that this bill seeks to repeal sections of title 26 U.S.C., the Internal Revenue Code.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution: 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.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 24: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BABIN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 27: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 91: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 129: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 159: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. WALBERG, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 181: Mrs. WAGNER and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 187: Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 199: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 217: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 223: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 228: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 231: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 232: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 238: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 242: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 243: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 246: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 248: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 249: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 258: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 264: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 271: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 281: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICA, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 284: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 285: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 287: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 289: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 290: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 296: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 303: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 304: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 310: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 317: Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 321: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 344: Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 346: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 349: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 350: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 351: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 357: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 362: Mr. WELCH and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 363: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 366: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 373: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 399: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 402: Mr. LONG, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 416: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 420: Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 429: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 431: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MENG, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. VELA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BECERRA, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 438: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 448: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 451: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 452: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 456: Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KILMER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. BLUM.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. BARTON.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. BARTON.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. JONES and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.J. Res. 22: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HIMES.

H. Res. 11: Mr. RIBBLE.

H. Res. 12: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H. Res. 21: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H. Res. 24: Mr. FORBES, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LONG, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H. Res. 25: Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Res. 28: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 32: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H. Res. 35: Mr. BARLETTA.

H. Res. 43: Mr. SERRANO.

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:

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 7 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Ways and Means in H.R. 7 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 7 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *114th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 2015 *No. 11*

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the leader's heart is in Your hand and You turn destinies as You desire. Give our lawmakers wisdom to labor so that justice will abound and the righteousness will flow like a mighty stream.

Lord, may our Senators develop a clear vision of the light that leads to truth. Enable them to make the differing approaches expressed by both parties contribute to better solutions to the world's problems. Infuse our legislators with a reverential awe that will empower them to be aware of Your presence and to accept and obey Your plans. Use them as extensions of Your power in our Nation and world.

And, Lord, please place Your healing hands on Senator HARRY REID.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour before resuming consideration of the Keystone bill. Senators should expect votes on pending amendments to the bill after lunch today. Votes are possible into the evening tonight as well as during tomorrow morning's session of the Senate. We need to make progress on this bill and all Members should expect a busy day.

REAL DEBATE IN THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate, as I indicated, will continue its work on the Keystone jobs bill today. It is great to see a real debate on the floor of the Senate again. We saw some action in the Chamber yesterday and even some unpredictability. We saw how democracy in the Senate has looked many times in the past. It is great to see both sides able to offer amendments once more.

I know many of our Democratic friends have been ready to give more of a voice to their constituents too. I know they have been waiting for this moment for some time. The assistant Democratic leader said he welcomes our vision of the Senate where Members ''bring amendments to the floor, debate them, vote on them, and ultimately pass legislation,'' and that is what we are doing.

Another Democratic colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia, said he was ''very excited'' about the prospect of an open amendment process. He also noted that it gave Members of his party a valuable opportunity to pursue some of their own priorities through the legislative process.

The Senator makes an important point about the more open Senate we are working toward. A more open Senate presents more opportunities for legislators with serious ideas to make a mark on the legislative process. It can give Members of both parties a real stake in the ultimate outcome of the bill on the floor. And because it does, it represents one of our best avenues to secure passage of sensible legislation centered on jobs and the middle class. That is something we should all want.

So I hope Members in both parties will help us continue our efforts to make the Senate function better. That would be a good thing for our country. It would represent a change from the kind of Senate we have seen in recent years. And it would represent a positive step forward, not just for Congress but for the people we represent.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader is recognized.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me join the majority leader in saying that I think we are in a healthy environment on the floor of the Senate where we are pursuing amendments and active debate, and it is great to see that happening. The only way that happens in the U.S. Senate is when the majority and the minority both work for it to happen. The rules of the Senate are constructed, as we both know well, so that literally any one Senator can stop the process. But the good-will and good-faith efforts of Senators on both sides of the aisle have really brought us to a good moment here.

I wish to commend especially the leaders on the floor for this legislation, Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska on the Republican side, and on our side Senator MARIA CANTWELL and Senator BARBARA BOXER. The two of them, in an extraordinary show of cooperation, have been able to work together to process amendments.

The fact is we voted on nine amendments so far on this Keystone Pipeline measure. We have eight amendments pending today. So there is a good-faith effort on both sides to call up these important amendments with fairness to

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

both sides of the aisle. I want to see that continue.

I hope no one believes we are finished with eight amendments. We are not. There are other important amendments to be considered. Members have brought them to the attention of both sides, and I hope as quickly as we can that we will schedule them for consideration and a vote and move forward.

Yesterday, what was fascinating was the fact that we branched off from this conversation about the Keystone Pipeline itself and the jobs—35 permanent jobs—that will be created for this Canadian corporation and started talking about some underlying, critically important issues. We spent a great deal of time on the floor discussing the environmental impact not just of the pipeline but of the Canadian tar sands which will be brought by the pipeline, if it is approved, into the United States for processing.

It is interesting what we have learned so far during the course of this debate. When the Democrats insisted that this pipeline's product—the oil that is refined and used for consumption—be sold in the United States, the Republicans voted no. The Republicans voted no. I have a lengthy memo on my desk of all of the Republican Senators who have come to the floor insisting that the Keystone Pipeline was going to create more gasoline, more diesel fuel, and help the American economy. Yet, when Senator MARKEY of Massachusetts offered an amendment to say keep the products coming from the Keystone Pipeline in the United States, the Republicans, to a person, voted no.

Then Senator FRANKEN came forward and said, Well, let's agree that if this is about jobs in America that the Keystone Pipeline will use American steel. That seems reasonable to me, and I voted for it. The Republicans voted no. They defeated the notion that we would use American steel to build this pipeline.

This pipeline is Senate Bill 1 for the Senate Republicans. It is their highest priority. One would think that if it truly is a jobs bill, they would want American steel to be used to build the pipeline; let our steel mills build this pipeline in the future, create the jobs in America, and they voted no.

Yesterday I offered an amendment as well. We know at the end of this pipeline, if tar sands reach the United States through this means or otherwise, it is a pretty nasty process taking the tar and sand out of the oil, and what is left over is a nasty product known as petcoke.

Petcoke is now being stored in three-story-high piles in the city of Chicago. I have seen it. And the city is trying to get to the point where it is at least contained and covered. Yet, the company that owns it, which incidentally is a company owned by the Koch brothers—what an irony—this company has resisted the idea of covering these petcoke piles, so this nasty black substance blows through the community in southeast Chicago. The city of Chicago is in a battle.

I tried to put in an effort yesterday so that we would establish standards for transportation and storage of petcoke, and the Republicans insisted it was a benign substance, it isn't hazardous, not dangerous, don't worry about it. If some of the Senators who voted against my amendment, tomorrow, God forbid, face this issue in their community, I think they will have a little different view of petcoke and what it can do to people, the impact it has on respiratory disease and asthma.

Yesterday I didn't prevail. But I can tell my colleagues how over the years, as I fought the tobacco companies and they insisted there was nothing dangerous about tobacco, I heard those arguments from industry just as we are hearing the petcoke arguments from the petcoke industry. Ultimately, good sense prevailed, public health prevailed, and we moved toward regulation of tobacco products. We should do the same—basic regulation—to protect the public from any negative impact on their health relative to petcoke.

The amendments continue today. Some of them are extraordinarily important. I hope we will continue to move toward the completion of this task in an orderly manner. I commend not only the leadership on the majority side, but I commend my colleagues too. We found over the past many years that the process of amendment would break down when one Republican Senator would stand up and say, I won't let any amendment be considered until my amendment is considered, No. 1. It even reached a point where Republican Senators would say, I won't let any amendment be considered unless I am guaranteed my amendment will pass. Well, when people take unreasonable positions and threaten filibusters, we break down the amendment process.

We have tried, now being in the minority, to be more constructive, and we have reached that goal so far this week. I hope we continue to aspire to it and I hope we can wrap this bill up next week in an orderly manner.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks around the world—particularly in Paris—the American people know that terrorism, sadly, is a threat to us even to this day. We count on one department of government as much if not more than any other to protect us—the Department of Homeland Security.

This is the Department which monitors the terrorist threats to our country on a minute-by-minute basis. This is the agency that provides the inspectors at airports and in many other places to try to thwart terrorism before it strikes. It is a critically important part of our government—one of the most important departments.

That is why it is curious to me that House Republicans insisted that the budget—the regular budget for the Department of Homeland Security—be held up until the end of February. They need their Department budget. They need to invest it to keep America safe. Yet, the House Republicans said no. They gave a continuing resolution to the Department, which basically lets them operate on a day-to-day basis with no certainty for the future. That is no way to run an agency, particularly one that is supposed to keep America safe.

Then, last week, the U.S. House of Representatives took another step and really revealed what was behind this strategy. They added five negative riders to this Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. Their riders are the subject of immigration. Of course, the Department of Homeland Security has a responsibility when it comes to immigration. These riders were onerous and they threatened the very passage of this important legislation, so much so that the President of the United States has issued a veto threat if the Republican riders from the U.S. House of Representatives are included in the bill when it passes the Senate.

The right thing to do, the smart thing to do, the thing to do to protect America is for us to pass the homeland security appropriation now so this agency has its money. We should remove the onerous and unfair riders that were attached by the House of Representatives. If we are to debate the negative aspects of immigration, let's save it for another day and not put this Department of Homeland Security at risk and the safety of America at risk over this political effort by the Republicans in the House of Representatives.

One aspect of the House measure, an amendment to the Department of Homeland Security appropriation, I find particularly troublesome. It was 14 years ago when I introduced the DREAM Act. It is hard to imagine it has been that long. But the notion behind the DREAM Act was if a child is brought to America by a family and is undocumented in this country and that child grows up in America, completes high school, and has no serious criminal problems in their background, they ought to be given a chance to either enlist in our military, to go to college, to get on a path toward legalization. That is the DREAM Act.

Originally the DREAM Act had some Republican sponsorship, but over the years that support melted away. Yet, many Republicans have said from time to time: I think the DREAM Act is fair; we just haven't enacted it into law. Because of that, 2½ years ago many of us appealed to President Obama to protect these DREAMers, these young people. Many of them completed school and had nowhere to go. Being undocumented, they didn't qualify for a penny of assistance in going to

college and, many times, if they completed college, they couldn't get a job because of their immigration status.

Back in 2012 President Obama created a program called DACA. The DACA Program said that if these DREAMers—these young people who might be eligible under the law I described—would come forward and register with the government and submit to a background check and pay a filing fee, they would be given temporary status to live in the United States without being deported, to go to school, to work.

We estimate that some 2 million young people could qualify for this program, and 600,000 have signed up—so far, 600,000. In the State of Illinois, 30,000 have signed up. They have come forward.

I have met some of these young people who have qualified under DACA. They are extraordinary young people. I went to Loyola Medical School in Chicago. At the medical school I believe there are 10, perhaps 12 students who are DACA-protected who are now going to medical school. There are two things to be said. First, they are extraordinary students. They had no chance to go to medical school before DACA, and now they do. They are well qualified to go to medical school. Secondly, they have only come to Loyola with the promise that after they receive their medical license, they will practice in underserved areas in Illinois and across America, whether it is rural areas or inner city. They are prepared to dedicate their professional lives to serving people who otherwise might not have access to medical care.

That is just one example. Let me tell you about some others. I would like to update the Senate on two people whom I have come to the floor and talked about in the past—Carlos and Rafael Robles. They were brought to the United States when they were small children. They grew up in suburban Chicago in my home State of Illinois. They were both honor students at Palatine High School and Harper Community College.

In high school Carlos was the captain of the tennis team and a member of the varsity swim team. He volunteered for Palatine's physically challenged program, where every day he helped to feed lunch to special needs students. Carlos graduated from Harper Community College and went on to attend Loyola University in Chicago, majoring in education. This is what one of his teachers said about him:

> Carlos is the kind of person we want among us because he wants to make the community better. This is the kind of person you want as a student, the kind of kid you want as a neighbor and friend to your child, and most germane to his present circumstance, the kind of person you want as an American.

After he received DACA protection—President Obama's Executive order—Carlos was able to work as a tennis coach at his high school and help pay his tuition.

After he graduated from Loyola with a major in education, Carlos worked as a teacher in a public high school in Chicago. I ran into him at a meeting last year, and he told me about his ambition to be a teacher. He is now attending graduate school at the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy at the University of Michigan, where he is studying education policy. He is a bright and engaging young man who wants to make our schools more effective.

In high school, his brother Rafael was captain of the tennis team and a member of the varsity swim team and soccer team. He graduated from Harper Community College and now attends the University of Illinois, where he is majoring in architecture. One of Rafael's teachers said:

> Rafael is the kind of person I have taught about in my Social Studies classes—the American who comes to this country and commits to his community and makes it better for others. Raffi Robles is a young man who makes us better. During my 28-year career as a high school teacher, coach, and administrator, I would place Raffi in the top 5 percent of all the kids with whom I have ever had contact.

Since receiving DACA, Rafael has been a full-time student while also working at Studio Gang Architects, an award-winning architectural firm in Chicago. Rafael will graduate this spring with a 3.8 GPA.

In a letter to Congress, the Robles brothers shared their thoughts about efforts to overturn DACA. Here is what they said:

> We ask you today to see it in your heart to do the right thing, to listen, and to reward the values of hard work and diligence, values that made America the most beautiful and prosperous country in the world and that we're sure got you, as members of Congress, to where you are today in life. These are values we have come to admire and respect in the American people. We will continue to uphold these values until the last days of our lives. We hope eventually as citizens of the United States we will become part of a country we now see as home.

These two individuals, Carlos and Rafael Robles—extraordinary DREAMers—were brought to this country as children by their parents, undocumented with no future in America, and look what they have done with their lives. One has dedicated his life to education and has overcome the odds and graduated from Loyola University without any government assistance. Because he is undocumented, he doesn't qualify. Now he is going for a master's degree, again at his own expense. His brother is pursuing a degree in architecture.

Do you know what House Republicans say? Deport the Robles brothers. That is what their amendment to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations says. Deport these two young men. Send them out of this country despite the fact that they have worked so hard and succeeded in what they have set out to achieve.

The House Republicans want to deport the 600,000 just like them who have qualified under the President's DACA Program. And they have gone further—not a penny, they have said, for any additional young people to apply for the DACA Program. Two million young people, many of whom, like the Robles brothers, just want to make America a better place—the House Republicans say: Deport them. Further, they say: We won't pass the Department of Homeland Security appropriations to protect Americans from terrorism until you deport the Robles brothers and young people just like them.

What is wrong with this picture? Have the Members of the House of Representatives forgotten who we are as a nation? It is a nation of immigrants. My mother was an immigrant to this country. Her naturalization certificate is sitting right behind my desk upstairs. I am proud of it. She came to this country at the age of 2 from Lithuania and raised a family—a proud American citizen. Her son is honored to represent the State of Illinois in the U.S. Senate. That is my story. That is my family's story. That is America's story. That is the Robles' story.

Why do the House Republicans have such a vengeance against these young men and women who through no fault of their own found themselves in America and made the best of it and only want to make this a better Nation? It drives the House Republicans into a rage to think that the Robles brothers might stay in the United States and make this a better country. I don't get it. I don't understand their thinking.

I really would encourage the House Republicans to meet some of the DREAMers and get to know them. When they do, the images which perhaps they have in their minds would be dispelled quickly.

We have a job ahead of us. The Senate needs to pass the Department of Homeland Security appropriations and the sooner, the better. God forbid we face another terrorist attack. Let's not let it happen with this important Department facing the restrictions they have been facing because of this Republican strategy. Let's give them a full appropriation and tell them to do their best every single day to keep us safe. Let's not embroil their work in a political debate about immigration, which is what the House Republicans insist on. Let's do something different here in the Senate. Let's pass a clean Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. Take out the immigration riders. Save them for another day. Save them for amendments on another bill. Let's fund this Department, and let's get it done now. For the safety and security of this Nation, we need to come together on a bipartisan basis and put this political tactic by the House Republicans behind us.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. 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.

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 Democrats controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING WENDELL FORD

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, many have now heard the sad news that one of the giants of Kentucky politics passed away last night. Wendell Ford first came to the Senate in the 1970s, calling himself just ''a dumb country boy with dirt between his toes.'' But over a distinguished two-decade career, this workhorse of the Senate would prove he was anything but.

I had the opportunity to watch my Senate colleague up close as he ascended to leadership in his party and established himself as a leader on issues of importance to my State. A proud Kentuckian who rose from page in the statehouse to Governor of the State, Ford shaped the history of the Commonwealth in ways few others had before him.

He never forgot the lessons about hard work he learned while milking cows or tending to chores on the family farm. This World War II veteran never backed down from a fight either.

We imagine he approached his final battle with the same spirit. Elaine and I, and I am certain I speak for the entire Senate, send our condolences to his wife Jean—Mrs. Ford, as Wendell often called her—and the rest of the Ford family at this difficult time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. Senator ENZI was going to be here, so I am hoping his schedule will allow him to use his time this afternoon.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, yesterday we had an interesting debate on climate change in the Senate, and there were three separate votes. The first one I and virtually all the Republicans supported, the Whitehouse amendment No. 29, said climate change is real and not a hoax.

This is true. Climate has always changed, and I think there is an effort by those on the other side who are trying to promote the big Obama program that would cost $479 billion and not accomplish anything in terms of setting up a new bureaucracy of trying to say we are denying that climate changes.

As I said on the floor yesterday, climate has always changed. If we go back and read history, look at archeological findings, and read the Scriptures, it has changed since the very beginning of time. We know it is real.

The hoax is that somehow there are people so arrogant who are going to go along with the President's program to say: Yes, if we spend enough money we, the human beings, can stop the climate from changing. I think people do understand that is not going to happen. So I am very happy we were able to get it out so it cannot be used in a way that would be deceptive to the public—because the climate has been changing since the beginning of time.

The hoax I have referred to since 2002 is that man is going to be in the position to change climate. That is not going to happen.

What is interesting is these votes could have taken place any time over the last year. I hope I am not divulging something someone else is going to use, but we are on pace now to have more amendments and votes on this one bill—a popular bill—than we had on amendments in the entire year last year.

We were very critical of the majority and the fact that we were not doing anything here. I would go home this last year and people would say: What did you accomplish?

Nothing. We didn't have any votes. We didn't do anything.

We had 15 votes on amendments in the entire year last year. By the end of today we will have that many votes on amendments just in 1 week. So it is very significant that we are actually getting things done.

Why did the Democrats not have a vote on the Keystone Pipeline or on climate? Because voters don't care or because people have lost interest in that. They have caught on. They know that, despite the money that has been put in this thing by Tom Steyer—we have already talked about that on this floor—that went into midterm elections, the proglobal warming votes would be seen negatively by voters.

This wasn't true back in the 1990s. At that time they had everyone scared that global warming was coming and the world was going to come to an end. There was polling by the Gallup polls, and that was the No. 1 and No. 2 concern in America. Environmental concerns are now No. 14 out of 15 in America.

So that is where it is. That is why Tom Steyer has spent, by his own admission, some $70 million on the elections. He stated he was going to get involved in eight senatorial elections—and I say to the Presiding Officer, he knows which ones they would be—and they lost them all. But Tom Steyer is not out of money, and they are going to do what they can to try to resurrect this global warming as an issue.

So the Gallup polls—and not just the polls. The Pew Research Center said 53 percent of Americans either don't believe global warming exists or believe it is caused by natural variation. I don't have it here, but I do know there was a university that put together a poll of all of the television weather people and it came out to the same thing: It was 63 percent said either it doesn't exist or, if it does exist, it exists because of natural causes.

What do the American people care about? They are concerned about the deficit and they are concerned about jobs.

Yesterday on the floor we talked about the deficit. Under this President—not a believable figure but an accurate figure—he has increased the debt in America more than all Presidents in the history of America, from George Washington to George Bush.

So that is what people care about.

As chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, one of my top priorities in this Congress is to conduct vigorous oversight of EPA regulations and getting into President Obama's excessive regulation regime through numerous hearings. We are going to have hearings on these regulations. We actually have dates set already to have hearings so people will understand what the cost is of these regulations.

The Presiding Officer is from a rural State, as I am. I am from Oklahoma. When I talk to farmers—in fact, Tom Buchanan, president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, said I can use his quote: Our farmers in Oklahoma—and I suggest all throughout America—are more concerned about the EPA regulations than they are all the other problems that are out there or anything that you will see in the farm bill.

He talks about the endangered species, that they can't plow their fields anymore in certain places because there might be some kind of a bug down there. He talks about containment of fuel on their farms. He talks about the water of the United States. That bill is probably the No. 1 concern of farmers.

The western part of my State is arid. I was out in Boise City, in the panhandle, and it is one of the most arid parts of the United States. It could actually be declared a wetland if we were to pass this and allow the Federal Government to replace the States and come in and regulate water on the land.

These are the things they are concerned about.

We should look closely at this, and this is quite a breakthrough. Our friends in Australia already tried regulating their emissions. I think we all know the IPCC is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and that bureaucracy is supposedly the scientific community. Yet we find out now—and I talked about this yesterday. All the scientists were not believers in this, but a lot did believe and Australia did believe. So they joined in a Kyoto-type treaty and started stopping their emissions. They imposed a carbon tax on the economy a few years ago, and it caused horrendous damage—$9 billion in lost economic activity per year, and destroyed tens of thousands of jobs. It was so bad that their government recently voted to repeal the carbon tax they imposed just a couple years ago, and their economy is now better for it. In fact, it was announced just following the repeal that Australia experienced record job growth of 120,000 jobs—far more than the 10,000 to 15,000 jobs economists had expected.

We also looked closely at this because scientists are having a difficult time explaining the 15-year hiatus we have seen in temperature increases. This isn't me. The IPCC agrees with this, Nature magazine agrees with this, the Economist magazine agrees. They are reputable publications.

Reviewing the science is one thing they have to do in the EPW Committee, the committee I chair, because it is on this disputed science the EPA is building its significant greenhouse gas regulation package scheduled for this summer, which all together would be the costliest regulation in history. The component regulating CO_2 emissions from existing sources is the cause of a great concern in particular.

We heard in the President's message on Tuesday night that as proposed right now, the EPA's regulation will raise energy prices, destroy jobs, and impose billions of dollars in costs on the U.S. economy without achieving any kind of an effect.

It is interesting, and I have quoted her many times. The first EPA Administrator appointed by Barack Obama was Lisa Jackson. Lisa Jackson came before our committee many times. I always appreciated her because she would not get a message from the White House and come and repeat it in our committee.

I asked her a question: If we were to pass any of these regulations or the legislation to have cap and trade in America—which is what the President proposed on Tuesday night—would this have the effect of reducing CO_2 emissions worldwide.

Her answer, live on TV, in our meeting was, no, it wouldn't because this isn't where the problem is. The problem is in China, the problem is in India, the problem is in Mexico.

So what we do in the United States isn't going to affect what they do. In fact, the opposite is true. Because if we control emissions to the point where our manufacturing base runs out of energy in America, where do they go? They go to places such as China. China is sitting back hoping we pass something so they can benefit from our lost jobs in America.

The Wall Street Journal on June 3 called the proposal that the President suggested on Tuesday ''a huge indirect tax and wealth redistribution scheme that the EPA is imposing by fiat [that] will profoundly touch every American.''

Further quoting the Wall Street Journal: ''It is impossible to raise the price of carbon energy without also raising costs across the economy.''

This is clearly worthy of intense congressional oversight, and that is what we intend to do. EPA has gone beyond the plain reading of the Clean Air Act in an attempt to grossly expand its authority. It is forcing States to achieve dubious emission reduction targets from a limited menu of economically damaging and legally questionable options.

One of the foremost authorities in America is Richard Lindzen of MIT. Richard Lindzen some time ago made the statement, ''Controlling carbon is a bureaucrat's dream.''

That is what they want to do, try to control carbon emissions.

Controlling carbon is a bureaucrat's dream. If you control carbon, you control life.

The scientific community has been divided on this. We are in a position to try to make sure this doesn't happen to America, and so we are going to be very busy on that.

I wish to also mention we have seen Europe go down the road of imposing these mandates—the cap and trade and regimes they are proposing for America and in the green energy subsidies—and we have seen where that has gotten them. Electricity prices are up to 2½ times higher than those in the United States. In Germany, in 2012, CO_2 emissions actually rose by 1.3 percent over the 2011 levels, while the U.S. emissions fell by 3.9 percent—and they were imposing these new restrictions, we were not.

As a matter of fact, things got so bad in Germany that they backed off of their disastrous renewable fuels program and now plan to build 10 new coal-fired powerplants in Germany.

Make sure we heard that, 10 new coal-fired powerplants. This is what they are trying to do away with altogether in America—as if we could run the ''machine'' called America without fossil fuels and without nuclear. We can't do it.

A look closer to home: California has adopted similar carbon reduction policies, and its cap-and-trade scheme alone will increase electricity rates by 8 percent, according to the California Public Utilities Commission.

That is in California today. If we pass this, I don't have a figure as to how much that is going to increase out in California. Do we want our entire economy following the path of the State of California? It has one of the country's highest electricity rates. The rates in California are 65 percent higher than our rates in the State of Oklahoma, and it has one of the worst unemployment rates, one of the worst insolvent fiscal positions of any State, not to mention some of the worst air quality in the country.

Predictions of this rule's devastating impacts are prevalent. In Oklahoma, residential rates are projected to increase by 15 to 19 percent and industrial rates by 24 percent; that is, in the event they are successful in this program.

I notice the other side has not arrived. I ask unanimous consent to go an additional 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. The Kansas Corporation Commission calculates that compliance with the rule as proposed would cost the State $5 to $15 billion, the equivalent of a 10- to 30-percent increase in electric rates. The loss of cheaper and more reliable coal units will increase the power prices by as much as 25 percent on grids that serve about a third of the Nation's population, according to the Brattle Group in Massachusetts.

Now, I have gone on and talked about how much more this would cost State by State. There isn't time to go over all of it now. But let's stop and realize the cost of this. NERA's analysis of the increased cost if we were to adopt these programs projects that the cost to comply with the EPA's plan could be a total of $479 billion or more, with 43 States having double-digit electricity increases and 14 States potentially facing peak-year electricity price increases exceeding 20 percent.

I say this because—who is having to pay this? Everybody pays it, and they have to pay it equally. It has to be the most regressive type of increase in taxation that we could have. If you have a pilot program, with a family that is in poverty they have to spend the same amount of money for their electricity. That is a must, not a luxury. It is something they have to have. So they could easily spend half of their expendable income on electricity price increases, while wealthy people might only face a 1-percent increase of their income. That is why it is important and why we need to pay attention to it—to make sure we know the public is aware of this.

NERA also estimates that atmospheric CO_2 concentrations would be reduced by less than one-half of 1 percent—that is if they are successful in doing this—equating to reductions in global average temperatures of less than two one-hundredths of a degree. So all these things they say they might be able to accomplish, they have studied it and say it is just not true.

I have already talked about the fact that within the President's own administration, Lisa Jackson, the former head of the EPA, said even if they are successful, even if they are right about this, it is not going to reduce CO_2 emissions because this isn't where the problem is.

So this is going on right now. We have a committee that is clearly going to be working on this so the American people will be aware of what is happening. The Energy Information Administration determined that the China agreement would result in a 34-percent increase in electricity prices.

I bring this up because we heard in the President's speech on Tuesday that they were negotiating with China and some very successful negotiations took place. The Presiding Officer remembers that this was back when our Secretary of State went over and met with President Xi of China and came back and said it was a successful meeting. What came out of that negotiation? China said: Well, we will keep increasing our emissions until 2020, and then we will look at it and decide whether we want to lower it. That is not much of a negotiation, and it was not very comforting to us.

A comprehensive survey conducted by a Harvard political scientist shows that people who are worried about climate change are only willing to pay energy bills up to 5 percent higher. Whether it is global warming or climate change, the American people understand this proposal is in no way about protecting the environment or improving public health. This rule is an executive and bureaucratic power grab unlike anything this country has ever seen, and it is merely the tip of the spear in a radical war against affordable energy and fossil fuels.

At a time when domestic oil and gas prices through hydraulic fracturing continue to be one of the only bright spots in our economy, a lot of people are trying to stop this from taking place. I kind of wind up with this because I think it is important. I come from an oil State, so I have to buy it. I understand that. The process of hydraulic fracturing started in my State of Oklahoma—in Duncan, OK—in 1948. Did you know that by their own admission the EPA said there has never been a documented case of groundwater contamination since they started using hydraulic fracturing?

When the President made the statement in the State of the Union Message that the United States has dramatically increased in the last 5 years our production of oil and gas, that is correct, but that is in spite of the President. We have enjoyed a 61-percent increase in the production of oil and gas in America in the last 5 years—61 percent. However, all of that is either on State or private land. On Federal land we have had a reduction of 6 percent. So I look at that, and I believe it when people say that if we had been able to increase production on Federal land such as we have done in the last 5 years on private land and State land, we could be totally—100 percent—independent from any other country in developing our resources.

So I am committed to using our committee, the Environment and Public Works Committee, not only to conduct a rigorous oversight of the Obama EPA policies which are running roughshod over our economy, operating outside the scope of the law, and directly ignoring the intent of Congress but also to rein in this out-of-control agency through any and all means at our disposal.

This has been a problem. People used to say that it was just big business that wanted to reduce these regulations. That isn't true. As I mentioned before, the farmers of America—just in my State of Oklahoma—say the overregulation of EPA is the most difficult issue they have to deal with.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Murkowski amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute.

Fischer amendment No. 18 (to amendment No. 2), to provide limits on the designation of new federally protected land.

Sanders amendment No. 24 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding climate change.

Vitter/Cassidy modified amendment No. 80 (to amendment No. 2), to provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the Outer Continental Shelf.

Menendez/Cantwell amendment No. 72 (to amendment No. 2), to ensure private property cannot be seized through condemnation or eminent domain for the private gain of a foreign-owned business entity.

Wyden amendment No. 27 (to amendment No. 2), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum.

Lee amendment No. 71 (to amendment No. 2), to require a procedure for issuing permits to drill.

Murkowski (for Blunt/Inhofe) amendment No. 78 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of the Senate regarding the conditions for the President entering into bilateral or other international agreements regarding greenhouse gas emissions without proper study of any adverse economic effects, including job losses and harm to the industrial sector, and without the approval of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are back to continue debate and voting on amendments to this bipartisan Keystone XL bill.

I will focus on two main subjects today. The first is to speak to what I think is the good progress we have made on this bill, moving us toward ultimately a final vote and final passage. I believe we probably surprised a few people yesterday by adopting an amendment on climate change that few thought would be adopted. We have now processed a total of nine amendments. Some would say, well, nine is not much, but just to put it into context, last year, the Senate held just 15 rollcall votes on amendments. That was in all of 2014. Over just a couple of days here in this new Congress, we are already at 60 percent of last year's total, and it is still January. We have eight amendments that are pending at this moment and set to be voted on today. We will work out the timing and order of those votes. My hope is that we will exceed last year's total today.

I believe our productivity has been good. I appreciate the cooperation of the ranking member on the committee. What we have been able to do with this measure is important because I think it stands in pretty stark contrast to what we have seen in recent years and, quite honestly, to the delays the Keystone XL Pipeline has faced over those years.

The second part of my comments this morning—I wish to provide a little bit of perspective about how long this cross-border permit has been pending, awaiting a final decision by the President.

Sometimes when we talk in terms of the raw numbers, some ask: What does that really mean? What does it mean to be on the 2,316th day that has passed since the company seeking to build this pipeline first filed its first permit with the State Department?

It has been more than 6 years, more than 76 months, and more than 330 weeks.

The President noted in his State of the Union Address this week that Keystone XL was just a single oil pipeline. And he is right—it is just a single oil pipeline. We have multiple pipelines that cross the border. We have hundreds of pipelines that cross the country. So it begs the question: How and why has it taken so long to get action

on just one single pipeline? Why has it taken so long?

There have been a lot of examples we have heard on floor. I mentioned yesterday that President Obama was still a sitting Senator when the permit application was filed. Others have said the iPad was not even out on the market when the first permit was filed. We heard that 2,300 days is longer than it took the United States to win World War II, longer than Louis and Clark's expedition to explore the West, and longer than Project Mercury, which put the first American into space. There have been a lot of comparisons in terms of what it really means to be longer than 2,300 days.

I mentioned on the floor many times that in Alaska we are seeking to try to advance our natural gas resource, and in order to do so we need a big pipeline to move from the North Slope down to tidewater, and so we are working to train welders because we know that when that day comes and we have the opportunity to build that line, we are going to want Alaskans to have those jobs. They may be temporary in that you don't weld a pipeline forever, you do it until the job is complete, but those are good jobs for those Alaskans and for people who come up to our State.

The Fairbanks Pipeline Training Center in Alaska does a fabulous job. In my opinion, it is the best pipeline training facility we have in the country. Every year, graduates from the training center are sent out, ready to go to work on projects such as Keystone XL. We are probably talking about seven sets of welders who have graduated at this point, and we need to keep approving projects that can help these young people or those who have been retrained as welders to get jobs. That is what they are waiting for.

We can even think about this length of time which has ensued since the first permit application has been pending in terms of flying to Mars and back. We could probably complete about three roundtrips from here to Mars and back, depending, of course, on the distance between the planets, but I am just putting it in context.

If we wanted to stay closer to home, we could describe those 2,300 days in terms of how many times we could hike the Appalachian Trail—probably 10 or 12 depending on the weather. One of these days I would like to hike the Appalachian Trail. I don't know that I have the time, it is one of those issues when you think about how long this has been pending before this administration.

Today I will add one more example to show the comparison. At this time in the football season, we are all focused on what is going on with Super Bowl XLIX, which is coming up in 10 days now. We will see Super Bowl XLIX pit the reigning NFL champions, the Seattle Seahawks—in Alaska we don't have our own professional football team, so we kind of adopted the Seahawks. I will let my colleagues know that I will be standing with the ranking member in rooting for the Seahawks on the big day next week. A lot of folks are excited about it, and we will be watching it. The game will be played next Sunday.

For the moment, let's look back to September 19, 2008, when the first cross-border permit for the Keystone XL Pipeline was first submitted to the State Department. Let's specifically focus on the Seahawks because they provide a pretty good example of how much has changed over the past 6 years. Back in September of 2008, the Seahawks were about to start a season in which they would have a record of just 4 and 12—winning 4 games and losing 12. At that point they were still a good team and we were still rooting for them, but they were a pretty different team. For starters, the Seahawks had a head coach. Their current coach, Pete Carroll, was still at the University of Southern California coaching the Trojans. Their star running back, Marshawn Lynch, was about to start his second year in the NFL as a member of the Buffalo Bills. It would be another 2 years before Lynch joined the Seahawks and just over 3 years before the Nation discovered his love of Skittles during the game against the Philadelphia Eagles.

The most famous members of the Seahawks secondary—the Legion of Boom—are Richard Sherman and Earl Thomas. Back in September of 2008, both were still in college, respectively playing for Stanford and the University of Texas.

Of course, we cannot forget Russell Wilson. A lot of Alaskans are rooting for him to get a second consecutive Super Bowl as the starting quarterback for the Seahawks. Back in September of 2008—he played just a handful of college games at that time. He was a redshirt freshman at North Carolina State.

My point here is not necessarily about football—although that is what a lot of us are talking about—it is to demonstrate that a lot can happen over the course of 2,300 days, and it does, whether we are talking about what goes on in politics, in world events, or the world of sports. My point is that it should probably take the Federal Government less time to approve an important infrastructure project—what the President himself has called just a single oil pipeline—than it takes to build an NFL championship team.

I would like us to get to the point where we are done discussing the merits of this important project and be done in the sense that we can move forward not only with Keystone XL but move forward as a nation when it comes to North American energy independence and providing jobs and greater economic benefit to this country.

I am pleased with the process we have had on the floor over the past couple of days. I look forward to the series of amendments on which we will have votes this afternoon—likely after lunch—and the opportunity to be in further discussion about these issues that I think have been pent-up for a period of time.

With that, I acknowledge my colleague on the energy committee and co-fan of the Seattle Seahawks.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska. I am certainly tired of hearing about deflate-gate. I don't know if our bantering on the floor can keep the focus on the real talent of the football team and the individuals, but I certainly want to say that she has proven she is a true 12, and that is important to us in the Northwest. I thank the Senator for her comments.

We are here today to continue the debate on the Keystone XL Pipeline, and I see my colleague from Vermont is here, and he probably wishes to give comments about his amendments. Hopefully we will be voting later today on the various amendment proposals we discussed yesterday. We will be talking to Members about other amendments they would like to see on this legislation.

Before I turn it over to Senator SANDERS, I wish to draw focus for a few minutes to the fact that this process, debate, and discussion about the protection of environmental issues, property rights, and environmental laws is incredibly important in the United States of America. I say that because I want to submit for the RECORD two news articles that just came out today. One is entitled ''Montana oil spill renews worries over safety of old pipelines,'' and the other story is headlined ''Cleanup Underway for Nearly 3M-Gallon Saltwater Spill In ND.''

The reason I bring that up is that as we are sitting here today discussing whether we are going to override current environmental law and give special carve-out exceptions to a foreign company to basically build a pipeline through the United States of America, the fundamental question in my mind is, What is the hurry in giving them exemptions to these various laws as a way to get the pipeline built? These are things U.S. businesses don't get. They don't get these exemptions and they certainly don't get the U.S. Senate voting to basically override the President's authority—I should say to pass a bill that would basically prohibit the President from using his authority on what is in the national interest.

To me, the Montana spill in the Yellowstone River is similar to our current pipeline debate on Keystone XL and whether we have the right safety provisions in place. So, if anything, we should be discussing what we can do to further pipeline safety in the United States of America and not let a foreign company roll back existing U.S. laws on environmental issues that they should be complying with.

This is such a beautiful part of our country, and this article talks about how oil is floating 28 miles downstream

from the Poplar Pipeline spill. This is an issue we should be really thinking about.

I get that there has been an explosion of both tar sands and Bakken oil. The question is not are we going to rush to try to help these companies override rules; the question is whether they comply with rules and whether the United States of America has enough protections in place to make sure the safety and security of our citizens as this new opportunity and explosion of product is occurring.

I can say from my perspective in my State, I have worked with practically every city council in the State about how they want new safety regulations for crude oil transported by rail—something they are very concerned about, given the explosions that have happened on oil railcars.

Again, regarding this particular issue, I know my colleague from North Dakota thinks that somehow this alleviates the Northwest from having trains go through there, but I assure him it doesn't. So we will still have concerns about the safety of our citizens as more crude oil is being transported by rail.

But we shouldn't now be trying to exempt a foreign company from complying with U.S. laws; we should be saying they should follow the rules. In the meantime, we should be asking the NTSB—we should be asking our agencies—whether there are enough safety protections in place, given the large amount of crude that is now moving and the issues we have seen as a result. There is nothing more important to me than protecting farmers and landowners to make sure they are actually treated fairly, and to make sure that resources such as clean water are protected.

Just because the discussion has been going on for a long time doesn't mean we should overrule existing environmental laws and exempt a foreign company from complying with it. I would rather them follow the rules all the way through the process.

So, with that, I yield the floor. I see my colleague from Vermont is here to discuss his amendment.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Associated Press, Jan. 22, 2015]

MONTANA OIL SPILL RENEWS WORRY OVER SAFETY OF OLD PIPELINES

(By Matthew Brown)

BILLINGS, MT.—A second large oil spill into Montana's Yellowstone River in less than four years is reviving questions about oversight of the nation's aging pipeline network.

Investigators and company officials on Wednesday were trying to determine the cause of the 40,000-gallon spill that contaminated downstream water supplies in the city of Glendive.

Sen. Jon Tester said Saturday's spill from the decades-old Poplar Pipeline was avoidable, but ''we just didn't have the folks on the ground'' to prevent it.

The Montana Democrat told The Associated Press that more frequent inspections by regulators are needed, and older pipelines should face stricter safety standards.

''We need to take a look at some of these pipelines that have been in the ground for half a century and say, 'Are they still doing a good job?' '' Tester said.

The latest spill comes as Republicans and some Democrats, including Tester, want the Obama administration to approve TransCanada's Keystone XL pipeline from Canada to the Gulf.

Keystone would cross the Yellowstone roughly 20 miles upstream of the Poplar Pipeline spill.

In 2011, an ExxonMobil pipeline break spilled 63,000 gallons of oil during flooding on the Yellowstone near Billings. The break was blamed on scouring of the river bottom that exposed the company's Silvertip line to floodwaters.

Officials involved in the Poplar Pipeline spill have said it's too soon to say if that line also was exposed.

Poplar, owned by Wyoming-based Bridger Pipeline, was constructed in the 1950s. The breached section beneath the Yellowstone was replaced at least four decades ago, in the late 1960s or early 1970s, according to the company.

Based on the number of miles of pipelines in the U.S. that carry oil, gasoline and other hazardous liquids, just over half were installed prior to 1970, according to the U.S. Department of Transportation.

The agency's Office of Pipeline Safety has roughly 150 inspectors overseeing 2.6 million miles of gas, oil and other pipelines.

That number is slated to increase by another 100 inspectors under a $27 million budget increase approved last year. That would still leave inspectors stretched thin given the mileage of pipelines.

Dena Hoff, a farmer and rancher whose land borders the site of the Poplar accident, said she's had a good working relationship with Bridger Pipeline, and she commended the company for taking responsibility for the spill.

But Hoff said the spill should spur second thoughts about Keystone and whether it's a good idea to have pipelines that cross beneath surface waters.

''It's the nature of the beast. Pipelines leak and pipelines break. We're never going to get around that,'' she said. ''We have to decide if water is more valuable than oil.''

Authorities continue work to clean up Glendive's public water supply after cancer-causing benzene was detected in water coming from the city's treatment plant. The plant draws directly from the Yellowstone.

Bridger Pipeline has committed to providing bottled water for Glendive's roughly 6,000 residents until the water-treatment plant is running again.

Late Wednesday night, Dawson County Disaster and Emergency Services Coordinator Mary Jo Gehnert said in an email that the plant has been decontaminated. If tests conducted Thursday show that the plant's water is safe to use, county workers will give information to the public on how to flush the water in homes and businesses, Gehnert said.

Workers late Tuesday recovered about 10,000 gallons of oil that was still in the Poplar line after it was shut down because of the breach.

Bridger Pipeline Co. spokesman Bill Salvin said Wednesday only a ''very small'' amount of oil has been siphoned from the river itself.

Company officials and government regulators say most of the oil is thought to be within the first 6 miles of the spill site. That includes the stretch of the river through Glendive.

''What we're working on is identifying places where we can collect more oil,'' Salvin said. ''The cleanup could extend for a while.''

Oil sheens have been reported as far away as Williston, North Dakota, below the Yellowstone's confluence with the Missouri River, officials said.

The farthest downstream that free-floating oil has been seen was at an intake dam about 28 miles from the spill site, officials said.

Montana Department of Environmental Quality Director Tom Livers said he was concerned that when the ice breaks up in the spring, oil will spread farther downstream.

[From the Associated Press, Jan. 22, 2015]

CLEANUP UNDERWAY FOR NEARLY 3M-GALLON SALTWATER SPILL IN ND

(By Regina Garcia Cano)

Cleanup is underway after nearly 3 million gallons of brine, a salty, toxic byproduct of oil and natural gas production, leaked from a pipeline in western North Dakota, the largest spill of its kind in the state since the current energy boom began.

The full environmental impact of the spill, which contaminated two creeks, might not be clear for months. Some previous saltwater spills have taken years to clean up. A contractor hired by the pipeline operator will be on site Thursday, assessing the damage.

Operator Summit Midstream Partners LLC detected the pipeline spill on Jan. 6, about 15 miles north of Williston and informed North Dakota officials then. State health officials on Wednesday said they weren't given a full account of the size until Tuesday.

Inspectors have been monitoring the area near Williston, in the heart of North Dakota's oil country, but it will be difficult to assess the effects of the spill until the ice melts, said Dave Glatt, chief of the North Dakota Department of Health's environmental health section.

''This is not something we want to happen in North Dakota,'' Glatt said.

The spill presently doesn't threaten public drinking water or human health, Glatt said. He said a handful of farmers have been asked to keep their livestock away from the two creeks, the smaller of which will be drained.

Brine, also referred to as saltwater, is an unwanted byproduct of drilling that is much saltier than sea water and may also contain petroleum and residue from hydraulic fracturing operations.

The new spill is almost three times larger than one that fouled a portion of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in July. Another million-gallon saltwater spill in 2006, near Alexander, is still being cleaned up nearly a decade later.

Summit Midstream said in a statement Wednesday that about 65,000 barrels of a mix of freshwater and brine have been pumped out from Blacktail Creek. Brine also reached the bigger Little Muddy Creek and potentially the Missouri River.

Glatt said the Blacktail Creek will be completely drained as part of the initial cleanup, but the water and soil will have to be continuously tested until after the spring thaw because some of the contaminated water has frozen. The Little Muddy Creek will not be drained because it is bigger than the Blacktail Creek and the saltwater is being diluted.

''We will be monitoring to see how quickly it gets back to natural background water quality conditions, and we are already starting to see that,'' Glatt said of the Little Muddy Creek. ''It's getting back pretty quickly.''

Summit Midstream's chief operating officer, Rene Casadaban, said in a statement that the company's ''full and undivided attention'' is focused on cleaning up the spill and repairing any environmental damage.

Spokesman Jonathan Morgan did not immediately confirm exactly when the spill

began. It also was not clear what caused the pipeline to rupture. Glatt said the company has found the damaged portion of pipeline and it was sent to a laboratory to determine what caused the hole.

North Dakota has suffered scores of saltwater spills since the state's oil boom began in earnest in 2006.

A network of saltwater pipelines extends to hundreds of disposal wells in the western part of the state, where the briny water is pumped underground for permanent storage. Legislation to mandate flow meters and cutoff switches on saltwater pipelines was overwhelmingly rejected in the Legislature in 2013.

Wayde Schafer, a North Dakota spokesman for the Sierra Club, called the brine ''a real toxic mix'' and ''an extreme threat to the environment and people's health.''

''Technology exists to prevent these spills and nothing is being done,'' said Schafer. ''Better pipelines, flow meters, cutoff switches, more inspectors—something has got to be done.''

Daryl Peterson, a grain farmer from Mohall who has had spills on his property, said the latest incident underscores the need for tougher regulation and enforcement.

''Until we start holding companies fully accountable with penalties, I don't think we're going to change this whole situation we have in North Dakota,'' said Peterson, a board member of the Northwest Landowners Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 24

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Washington for their work on this legislation.

I rise today to say a few words about my amendment to the proposed Keystone Pipeline bill, an amendment that will be coming up for a vote in a few minutes. I wish to thank Senators BENNET, CARPER, LEAHY, MENENDEZ, MURPHY, WARREN, and WHITEHOUSE for cosponsoring this amendment.

This amendment is extremely simple. It is about 1 page and I will read it in a moment. It raises a very profound question as to how we implement public policy, not just on issues related to climate but on issues in general. The question is: As we go forward, tackling the very difficult problems facing our country and the world, to whom do we listen? Whose advice do we take as we proceed?

I would argue that historically and appropriately, what we do as a nation is we listen to the experts. That is what we do. I think in this debate, when we deal with the Keystone Pipeline and when we deal with the issue of climate change, it is absolutely appropriate that we listen to what the overwhelming percentage of scientists are telling us.

I hear some of my colleagues say, This is complicated and I am not a scientist; I don't know. Let me be very frank. I am not a scientist and I did not do terribly well in biology and in physics in college, but I can read. And I can listen and understand what the scientific community is saying on this issue.

As the Senate moves forward, when we deal with complicated medical issues and search for solutions in terms of cancer or heart disease or diabetes, to whom do we go? Who do we listen to for advice as to how we should proceed and allocate public funding? We listen to the doctors and the scientists and the researchers who know a lot more than virtually all of us do in terms of cancer or heart disease.

We spend a lot of money in this country on infrastructure, on roads and bridges and wastewater plants and water systems. That is complicated stuff. To whom do we look for advice? Who do we have at our hearings on these issues? We look to the engineers and the scientists who tell us the best way to proceed in terms of how we build roads and bridges in a cost-effective way.

We are dealing right now with the issue of cyber security—a huge issue—a threat to the Nation. To whom do we look for advice? We look to those experts in technology who can tell us the best way to prevent cyber security attacks against the United States. On and on it goes. Whether it is education or whatever it is, good public policy is dependent upon listening to the scientific community, listening to the people who know the best about this issue.

In terms of the issue of climate change, the fact is that the scientific community is virtually unanimous in telling us that climate change is real. It is caused by human activity. It has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world. The scientific community tells us there is just a brief window of opportunity before the United States and the entire planet suffer irreparable harm. They tell us it is imperative that the United States transform its energy system away from fossil fuels and toward energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible.

That is not the opinion of BERNIE SANDERS; that is the opinion of the scientific community.

So to those of my colleagues who say, This is complicated stuff, I am not a scientist, I don't know, let me tell my colleagues who does know. Thirty-seven major American scientific organizations—people who study this issue—do know. And what they say is that climate change is real. It is caused by human activities. It is already causing devastating problems in the United States and around the world, and we need to transform our energy system.

That is what the Sanders amendment says. That is all it says. It is a modest amendment. It is a conservative amendment. It simply tells us what the scientific community has told us year after year after year.

For those of us who are not scientists, let me tell my colleagues the scientific organizations that hold that point of view. They are, among others, the American Anthropological Association, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Chemical Society, the American Geophysical Society, the American Institute of Biological Sciences, the American Meteorlogical Society, the American Physical Society, the National Academy of Engineering, the National Academy of Sciences—37 separate scientific organizations, including those I mentioned.

That is not all. There are 135 international scientific organizations that say the same thing.

I refer my colleagues to the list of 135 international scientific organizations, 37 American scientific organizations, and 21 medical associations that all agree with the basic premises that are in the Sanders amendment that is printed with my remarks in yesterday's RECORD, Wednesday, January 21.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is the leading international scientific body that deals with climate change. Let me quote to my colleagues what they said last fall:

> Warming of the climate system is unequivocal, as is now evident from observations of increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice, and rising global average sea level.

More than 97 percent of the scientific community in the United States and across the globe agrees with these findings.

I am going to conclude my remarks by simply reading my amendment to make sure every Member of the Senate understands how simple and straightforward and noncontroversial this amendment is. This is what it says:

> It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the opinion of virtually the entire worldwide scientific community that
>
> (1) climate change is real;
>
> (2) climate change is caused by human activities;
>
> (3) climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world;
>
> (4) a brief window of opportunity exists before the United States and the entire planet suffer irreparable harm; and
>
> (5) it is imperative that the United States transform its energy system away from fossil fuels and toward energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible.

That is it. That is the entire amendment. And every provision in this amendment is supported by virtually the entire scientific community, the people who best understand this issue.

Clearly we are a nation divided politically and clearly we are a Congress divided politically. We have different views on almost every issue. But I hope very much the U.S. Senate does not reject science, because in doing so, it would not only lead to bad public policy but it would be an embarrassment before the entire world, that the U.S. Senate is rejecting what the overwhelming majority of scientists are telling us about what they consider to be one of the great crises facing our planet.

So I hope very much for strong bipartisan support for this amendment in the Senate and will say, as a Senate, that we are going to listen to what the

scientific community tells us and that we are going to develop public policy based on their knowledge and that information.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I had some concluding thoughts about the President's State of the Union speech on Tuesday night. Much of it we have heard before. In fact, what the President laid out was largely what his agenda has been for the last 6 years. In other words, we have been there and we have done that, and it hasn't worked very well. We have had tired big government proposals. In fact, the President seems as though he has doubled down in a lot of ways on higher taxes, more redistribution, and more regulations that are out of step with what the American people, I believe, want and need.

I think what they want more than anything else, from a strictly economic point of view, is to get the economy growing again. Let's create jobs. Let the private sector actually create jobs—not government. We know government is pretty incompetent when it comes to job creation. And we now have this nagging little minor detail called the national debt where we keep borrowing money and pushing that down the road to the next generation and beyond.

It is ironic in a lot of ways because the President came to the people's House to give his State of the Union speech, which is the House of Representatives, but his speech was anything but for the people. He claimed that really his focus was on middle-class economics. I think he had been listening to the senior Senator from New York who, after this last election, gave a speech at the National Press Club and said that Democrats had made a terrible mistake leading off with the President's new term in 2009 with ObamaCare and other big government programs and they had neglected stagnant wages and the middle class. So I think the President, in a tipping of his hat to Senator SCHUMER and his comments post election, has essentially acknowledged that his first 6 years have failed to address the needs of the middle class. That is why he kept using the phrase ''middle-class economics'' during his speech. But it wasn't really about the middle class. It wasn't about hard-working American taxpayers. Time and again, it seemed his most urgent priority was himself. His speech was really about him and his agenda, his pet projects, his vision for bigger government.

I would just point out that the President quite candidly admitted it was his agenda and his policies that were on the ballot on November 4. I think that sent a shudder through every incumbent who was running for reelection who happened to have voted for his big government agenda. But the point is that it was soundly rejected on November 4. You couldn't tell that from the President's tone and his cheerleading last Tuesday night. But my point is we have been there, we have done that, and it didn't work. So let's try something different.

We have felt the experience of this experiment in big government for the last 6 years. If anything, what the voters said on November 4 is enough is enough. I can't remember who originally said it, but someone said famously that the definition of insanity is trying the same thing over and over and expecting different results. You can't try the same old tired policies over and over and actually expect a different outcome. At least to my mind, reality wasn't what was driving the President's remarks. If it was, he would have focused on the biggest concerns Americans have right now. I mentioned jobs, stagnant wages, rising costs, and issues such as health care costs.

Unfortunately, ObamaCare really backfired on a lot of middle-class workers, and it actually raised their health care costs rather than lowered them. Then there are the stagnant wages I mentioned a moment ago. But if he really cared about those issues as he should and as we do, he would be working with Congress to address those issues, and he would have given some attention to one of the first major pieces of legislation that we have taken up in the 114th Congress on a bipartisan basis.

Of course I am referring to the Keystone XL Pipeline that we are debating now, where 11 Democrats joined all of the Republicans who are present to proceed to this bill. So when I say it is bipartisan, I am not just saying it. It actually is.

Sometimes you can tell a lot from what a person doesn't say. In this case, the President spoke more than 6,000 words, and he didn't mention the word Keystone in one of them. Instead of using this opportunity when millions of Americans and people around the world were listening to the President to lay out sound reasons why he continues to oppose this jobs and infrastructure project year after year, the President merely said we should look beyond a single pipeline to meet America's infrastructure needs. We need to start somewhere, and the President won't even start by taking the first step of approving this infrastructure and job-creating project known as the Keystone XL Pipeline.

I think there is a Chinese proverb that says a trip of a thousand miles has to start with the first step. That is true here as well. It may be a single pipeline, but it is a single pipeline that his own State Department has said has the potential to support more than 40,000 jobs.

Here is what I don't get. There are 2.5 million miles of oil and gas pipelines in America today—2.5 million. What is this fixation with this roughly thousand-mile pipeline that comes from Canada down to southeast Texas where it is refined, turned into gasoline, and other refined products? Why has this become such a political football?

It is because the President and, unfortunately, some of his own party who are wed to a political base that won't allow them to do the rational, realistic, practical thing, which would be to approve this pipeline. The President tried to minimize this.

We have heard people say these are temporary jobs. My job here is temporary. The President's job is temporary. It is going to run out in a couple of years. Every job is temporary in that sense. To try to denigrate these well-paying construction jobs from welders and others—people who make $125,000, $140,000 a year in my State—and to denigrate them, to minimize them, and to say it is just a temporary job and is really not all that important is a slap in the face to the people who are hungry to find work, people who are working part time who want to work full time, people who are working for minimum wage but want to improve their standard of living and their ability to provide for their family.

Then there is this. We need to remember the percentage of Americans participating in the workforce is at a 30-year low—a 30-year low. What that means to me is that some people just simply have given up looking for work, and so they have dropped out. They have retired. They have gone on to do other things. But it is a symptom of a disease in our economy. It is not something we should be proud of. If we are actually interested in getting more Americans back in the workforce, the President would approve this pipeline.

Let me tell you about one person with whom I met last Friday in Beaumont, TX. We call it the golden triangle. It is a place where refineries are seemingly almost everywhere. It is a blue-collar community but one that is proud and contributes a lot to the Texas economy. I was in Beaumont, as I said, and we were there to mark the 1-year anniversary of the southern leg of the Keystone XL Pipeline's coming online. This is a little confusing. But this is the portion of pipeline that is already in place, and it doesn't require a transit with Presidential approval to cross from Canada into the United States.

Believe it or not, there are already 4,800 jobs that have been created and an average of 400,000 barrels of Canadian crude pumped into southeast Texas already. We are not talking about doing something that is new. We are talking about adding to what already exists by completion of this pipeline.

My point is this. If the President wants to see what the potential economic impact and the impact on jobs and on the standard of living would be for the entire Keystone XL Pipeline, all he needs to do is to look to southeast Texas—to Beaumont, TX—where

the impact has been nothing but positive.

I met with the mayor of Beaumont, the county judge, other local businesses, officials, and stakeholders. The mayor and the county judge pointed out that it is the taxes they get from the economic activity caused by this pipeline—which exists and which would do nothing but be enhanced by the Keystone XL Pipeline—that helps pay the taxes that pave roads, provide health care to people who don't have access to it—who can't afford health care. It provides to pay the law enforcement. It provides all of the governmental functions, including education. This is what adds to the tax base which allows local governments, including school districts, to provide for the education of our children.

Then there is this. There is the multiplier effect of the investment by the private investment on this pipeline. It is the multiplier effect because people who earn these good wages spend the money at restaurants, buy homes, rent apartments. They buy things at retail outlets. That is the multiplier effect from this pipeline.

One person in particular I want to close with is a gentleman I met by the name of Kenneth Edwards who is a vice president with the United Association, the union of plumbers, fitters, welders, and service techs. I think Mr. Edwards would agree with me that we wouldn't necessarily see eye to eye on everything. But after being married 35 years, I don't know many married couples that agree on everything. So that is not all that unusual. It isn't a surprise that Republicans and unions haven't been on the same page on every issue. But there is an issue where we agree 100 percent, and that is the need for the President to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline after 6 long years.

Mr. Edwards speaks on behalf of many union workers nationwide who, as he put it, earn their living from a series of temporary jobs that happen to add up to a lifelong career. He told me last week he wants the President to put his famous veto pen away, to take out his approval pen, and to sign his approval of this project right away.

Speaking of temporary jobs, the President is ending his time in office. He has 2 more years left. His State of the Union Address leads me to believe he is not open to changing course and making much of a departure from the partisanship and gridlock that marked his first term and a half. But there is still time to change his mind.

With the Keystone XL Pipeline bill that a bipartisan majority of Congress will soon send his way, we are presenting him an opportunity to say that he heard the message that voters delivered on November 4. I heard the American people say we are tired of the dysfunction in Washington, DC. We actually want to see Congress and the White House work together to get things done on behalf of the American people.

It is not too late. I hope he will listen not only to people such as Kenneth Edwards and union workers across the country but to the vast majority of Americans who support this important project.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER).

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, for the information of all Senators, we are working now to set up votes on several pending amendments to the bill. These votes should be after lunch today. Right now, we are looking at 60-vote thresholds on the Fischer amendment, along with the Boxer side-by-side, the Sanders amendment, and the Lee amendment.

I do understand that the Boxer amendment is now filed at the desk.

AMENDMENT NO. 18, AS MODIFIED

I ask unanimous consent that the Fischer amendment, No. 18, be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ___. LIMITATION ON DESIGNATION OF NEW FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.

(a) DEFINITION OF FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.—In this section, the term ''federally protected land'' means any area designated or acquired by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of conserving historic, cultural, environmental, scenic, recreational, developmental, or biological resources.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The Secretary, prior to the designation or acquisition of new federally protected land, shall consider—

(1) whether the addition of the new federally protected land would have a negative impact on the administration of existing federally protected land; and

(2) whether sufficient resources are available to effectively implement management plans for existing units of federally protected land.

(c) This section shall not apply to

(1) congressionally designated federally protected land, or

(2) acquisitions of federally protected land authorized by Congress.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, we have a number of Members who have asked to come to the floor to speak over the course of these next couple of hours. Many will be speaking to their specific amendment on the Keystone XL Pipeline. Again, we encourage folks to use this time, while we have a little bit of time before we move to the votes this afternoon.

I see that my colleague from North Carolina is here to speak. I would welcome his remarks at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, long before I was actually sworn into the Senate, I traveled across the State of North Carolina. I promised the citizens of North Carolina that I would work toward commonsense solutions to provide opportunities for economic growth and opportunity.

Today I hope to send forth amendment No. 102 with the support of my good friend Senator BURR from North Carolina on the approval of the Keystone Pipeline, to take a look at things that we can do to do our part in North Carolina to contribute to the ultimate goal of energy independence in this Nation.

The amendment, the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Access and Revenue Share Act of 2015, will expand domestic offshore production, natural gas exploration and production, which, in turn, will create jobs and set our Nation on that track to energy independence.

Families across the country are too familiar with the impact energy prices play in our day-to-day lives, making decisions that are very difficult for them in these difficult economic situations.

When utility bills and gas prices increase, hard-working Americans face hardship and struggle to make ends meet. We need to make that easier and lift the burden on those hard-working taxpayers.

We also cannot underestimate the great impact energy plays in America's foreign policy decisions. We are in many ways dependent on oil from the Middle Eastern States that do not share our democratic values.

The predicament does not certainly place America in a position of strength. America has more energy potential than any other nation. It is time that we start realizing its full potential.

What the amendment does is fairly straightforward. It instructs the Secretary of the Interior to finalize the 5-year program for 2017 to 2022. That includes annual lease sales in both the Mid-Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf and the South Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf region. It grants to States in both of these regions a 37.5-percent share of all revenues collected from the Outer Continental Shelf leasing activities.

Each State in the region gets a minimum of a 10-percent share of that allocation. It directs 12.5 percent of the revenues collected for the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf activities to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The 37.5 percent for the States

and the 12.5 percent for other regions mirrors the revenue split given to the Gulf Coast States—Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama—under current law.

North Carolina has received approximately $209 million in funding over the past 5 decades, protecting places such as the Cape Lookout National Seashore, the Great Dismal Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, Pisgah and Nantahala National Forests. The Department of Interior is currently developing a 5-year leasing program for 2017 to 2022. The language of the amendment merely instructs the Department to include the Mid-Atlantic and the South Atlantic regions as part of that plan.

Current law requires that the Department of Interior give deference to the preferences of States when developing a leasing plan for areas within 50 miles of the shore. Keep in mind, the drilling that we are talking about in North Carolina, off our coast, is greater than 30 miles off the coast, far beyond the site horizon of our beautiful beaches in North Carolina.

I want to close by saying why we are moving this amendment now. First, it is the fulfillment of a promise I made to the citizens of North Carolina. It also does enormous progress for creating jobs and helping our economy get back on track in the State and the region.

It is estimated that more than 55,000 jobs can be created by 2035; more than $4 billion annually in economic contributions to the State of North Carolina. Almost $4 billion in government revenue for the State of North Carolina—$4 billion. As someone who served as Speaker of the House of North Carolina, I cannot tell you what an enormous impact that will have in terms of reducing the burden on taxpayers and businesses in North Carolina, creating more opportunities for economic expansion and job growth. There will be up to $577 million annually in revenue share payments according to a report published by the Southeast Energy Alliance in 2009.

These numbers increase opportunities in North Carolina unlike anything I saw in my 8 years in the State legislature. It is an opportunity for North Carolina to do its part to make the Nation energy independent and to help me fulfill my promises to the citizens of North Carolina, which is to create jobs and provide great opportunities for this generation and future generations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I come to the floor today to discuss an amendment that I filed to the pending legislation. It is an amendment to modify the Jones Act. The Jones Act is an archaic 1920s-era law that hinders free trade, stifles the economy, and hurts consumers, largely for the benefit of labor unions.

Specifically, this amendment would effectively repeal a law that prevents U.S. shippers from purchasing or otherwise supportively procuring the services of vessels that are built outside the United States for use in American waters. From time to time here in Congress, we find that legislation still remains on the books many decades after it has served its original stated purpose. If ever we had one, I think one of the best examples of this is a law called the Jones Act.

As many of you know, the Jones Act is simply a continuation of laws passed through U.S. history addressing cabotage—or port-to-port coastal shipping. Those laws have been used to protect U.S. domestic shipping dating back to the very first session of Congress.

The Jones Act may have had some rationale back in the 1920s when it was enacted, but today it serves only to raise shipping costs, making U.S. farmers and businesses less competitive in the global marketplace and increasing costs for American consumers.

According to the 2002 U.S. International Trade Commission economic study—by the way, the U.S. International Trade Commission is not a group of special interests, they are an international trade commission which is appointed to study issues affecting international trade, obviously, as the name implies.

Their study reached the conclusion that repealing the Jones Act would lower shipping costs by about 22 percent. The Commission also found that repealing the Jones Act would have an annual positive welfare effect of $656 million on the U.S. economy.

Since these decade-old studies are the most recent statistics available, imagine the impact the Jones Act repeal would have today—far more than a $656 million annual positive impact—likely closer to $1 billion, stimulating our economy in the midst of an anemic recovery.

The requirement that U.S. shippers must purchase vessels in the United States comes at a tremendous cost that is passed on to U.S. consumers. For example, just recently the U.S. container line Matson placed a $418 million order for two 3,600 20-foot equivalent unit container ships in a U.S. shipyard. The high price of $209 million per vessel reflects that the ships will be carrying goods within the United States and therefore governed by the protectionist Jones Act.

The fact is that Matson's order at $209 million per ship is more than five times more expensive than if those same ships were procured outside of the United States. Ships of that size built outside the United States would cost closer to $40 million each. For comparison, even Maersk Line's far larger ships cost millions less at an average of $185 million each.

The U.S. Maritime Administration, MARAD, has found that the cost to operate U.S. flag vessels at $22,000 per day is about 2.7 times higher than foreign flag vessels—just $6,000 a day.

There is no doubt that these inflated costs are eventually passed on to shipping customers. In the energy sector, for example, the price for moving crude oil from the gulf coast to the Northeastern United States on Jones Act tankers is $5 to $6 more per barrel, while moving it to eastern Canada on foreign flag tankers is about $2.

That can mean an additional $1 million per tanker in shipping costs for oil producers.

This increased cost is why, according to the Congressional Research Service, more than twice as much gulf coast crude oil was shipped by water to Canada as shipped to Northeastern U.S. refineries last year—all in an effort to avoid paying Jones Act shipping rates.

The implications of this fact touches just about every American who buys gasoline. It is American consumers who pay exorbitantly higher prices because of a law that protects the shipbuilding industry and domestically manufactured ships that transport crude and other refined products.

But it is not only the energy sector that deals with the distorted effects of the Jones Act. Cattlemen in Hawaii who want to bring their cattle to the U.S. mainland market, for example, have actually resorted to flying the cattle on 747 jumbo jets to work around the restrictions of the Jones Act. Their only alternative is to ship the cattle to Canada because all livestock carriers in the world are foreign owned.

I am deeply concerned about the impact of any barrier to free trade. I believe the U.S. trade barriers invite other countries to put up or retain their own barriers and that at the end of the day the U.S. consumer and the economy at large pays the price.

Throughout my career I have always been a strong supporter of free trade. Opening markets to the free flow of goods and services benefits America and benefits our trading partners. Trade liberalization creates jobs, expands economic growth, and provides consumers with access to lower cost goods and services.

Yet as clear as the benefits of free trade are, actually taking action to remove trade barriers and open markets can be almost impossible in Congress. Special interests that have long and richly benefited from protectionism flex their muscles and issue doomsday warnings about the consequences of moving forward on free trade. Judging from the hysterical reaction by some of the special interests to my simple filing of this amendment, the debate over the Jones Act will be no different.

The domestic shipbuilding requirement of the Jones Act is outdated and should be abolished.

U.S. consumers are free to buy a foreign-built car. U.S. trucking companies are free to buy a foreign-built truck. U.S. railroads are free to buy a foreign-built locomotive. U.S. airlines are free to buy a foreign-built airplane.

Why can't U.S. maritime special interests more affordably ship foreign goods on foreign-made vessels? Why do U.S. consumers, particularly those in

Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, need to pay for ships that are five times more expensive?

If there was a law that long ago outlived its usefulness—if it ever had any—it is the Jones Act. On the Jones Act, it is time to change course today.

I have a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation which states:

Farm Bureau believes that there should be no restrictions as to the quantities or vessels on which a commodity is shipped between U.S. ports. Repealing The Jones Act would allow more competition for the movement of goods between U.S. ports, thus driving down transportation costs.

Continuing to read from the letter ''TO ALL MEMBERS OF SENATE'' from the Farm Bureau:

Repeal of The Jones Act accomplishes the same purpose: a reduction in energy costs, increased competition to lower costs of U.S. goods and more opportunities to transport agricultural commodities at competitive prices.

Due to this importance, Farm Bureau policy, developed by our grassroots members consisting of working farmers and ranchers, explicitly supports the repeal of The Jones Act. Farm Bureau urges you to vote in support of Sen. McCain's amendment repealing sections of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920.

Then there is an article: ''McCain under fire.''

A growing number of politicians are taking aim at a prominent US Senator's crusade against the Jones Act . . . .

Oh my God. I am deeply concerned. All the special interests on this issue are weighing in. By the way, one of them would have effects on the U.S. shipbuilding and repair base. We all know the U.S. shipbuilding industry, because of the Jones Act, is moribund. In fact, I have an article from the Daily Signal which says: ''Shipbuilding industry stuck on ground.''

U.S. shipbuilding exports are tiny compared to exports of semis and trailers. Shipbuilding is subject to the protectionist Jones Act which hinders competition, while the semi industry is not.

According to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, ''The coastwise laws [like the Jones Act] are highly protectionist 'provisions that are intended to create a 'coastwise monopoly' in order to protect and develop the American merchant marine, shipbuilding, etc.''

But protecting U.S. industries from competition may actually have the opposite effect. Consider U.S. production of vessels designed to transport goods via water compared to U.S. production of semi-trailer trucks and trailers designed to transport goods via land. In 2013, U.S. manufacturers exported $4.1 billion in semi-trailer trucks and trailers, but they exported just $0.1 billion in commercial ships.

Americans in most states would benefit from the freedom to ship goods on the best-built, most affordable vessels, wherever they are made. The Alaska governor is actually required to ''use best efforts and all appropriate means to persuade the United States Congress to repeal those provisions of the Jones Act formally codified at 46 U.S.C. 861, et seq.''

The Jones Act drives up the price of gas, hinders U.S. infrastructure improvements, inflicts high costs on people in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and makes it difficult to transship goods between U.S. ports.

The facts are clear. What we have is an old-time 1920s law that may have been, I emphasize the word ''may,'' have had some utility in the past.

I am aware that all of the special interests have been mobilized and how this can be damaging, frankly, to certain special interests. It would not be damaging to the average citizen who would pay less for the goods that are transported much more cheaply as a result of the Jones Act repeal.

I say to those critics of this amendment, as has been my habit over the years, I will not quit on this issue. There will be other opportunities to put the Senate and Congress on record.

Sooner or later the Farm Bureau will be heard. Sooner or later the people of Hawaii and Puerto Rico who are paying exorbitant prices that they shouldn't have to pay will be heard. Sooner or later this protectionist—an anachronism—ancient protectionist act will be repealed and average American consumers will benefit from it and unfortunately the special interests will not.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the January 20, 2015, Farm Bureau letter, the Heritage Foundation piece called the Daily Signal, entitled ''Senator McCain's Jones Act Amendment: Good for America,'' and another article: ''If You Like Higher Prices, Enriched Cronies, And Weak National Security, Then You'll Love The Jones Act.'' It is one of my favorite pieces.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, January 20, 2015.

TO ALL MEMBERS OF SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR: The Senate will soon begin consideration of amendments to S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. On behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the nation's largest general farm organization, I am writing to convey our strong support for adoption of an amendment by Sen. John McCain that would repeal provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, known as The Jones Act. The Jones Act mandates that any goods shipped by water between two points in the United States or its territories must be transported by a vessel that is U.S. built, U.S. flagged, and at least 75 percent U.S. crewed.

Given the ability of ships to move large amounts of cargo, and the bulk nature of most agriculture commodities, shipping via water is a strategic and economic resource that should not be limited by antiquated provisions of U.S. law. Farm Bureau believes that there should be no restrictions as to the quantities or vessels on which a commodity is shipped between U.S. ports. Repealing The Jones Act would allow more competition for the movement of goods between U.S. ports, thus driving down transportation costs.

Farm Bureau supports the construction of pipelines in general and the Keystone XL pipeline in particular. We support projects of this nature for their ability to decrease energy and input costs, lower prices for consumers and diversify our transportation infrastructure. Repeal of The Jones Act accomplishes the same purpose: a reduction in energy costs, increased competition to lower costs of U.S. goods and more opportunities to transport agricultural commodities at competitive prices.

Due to this importance, Farm Bureau policy, developed by our grassroots members consisting of working farmers and ranchers, explicitly supports the repeal of The Jones Act. Farm Bureau urges you to vote in support of Sen. McCain's amendment repealing sections of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

[From the Daily Signal, Jan. 16, 2015]

SENATOR MCCAIN'S JONES ACT AMENDMENT: GOOD FOR AMERICA

(By Bryan Riley and Brian Slattery)

Senator John McCain (R–AZ) recently introduced an amendment to repeal harmful aspects of the Jones Act, a 1920 law that restricts the use of foreign-built or foreign-owned ships for transporting goods within the United States.

According to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, ''The coastwise laws [like the Jones Act] are highly protectionist provisions that are intended to create a 'coastwise monopoly' in order to protect and develop the American merchant marine, shipbuilding, etc.''

But protecting U.S. industries from competition may actually have the opposite effect.

Consider U.S. production of vessels designed to transport goods via water compared to U.S. production of semi-trailer trucks and trailers designed to transport goods via land. In 2013, U.S. manufacturers exported $4.1 billion in semi-trailer trucks and trailers, but they exported just $0.1 billion in commercial ships.

U.S. commercial shipbuilding accounts for just 21.7 percent of total shipbuilding. Most of the industry produces vessels for the military and will continue to do so with or without the Jones Act. The notion that U.S. defense needs require a ban on the use of foreign-built ships for commercial purposes (but not foreign-built aircraft or foreign-built cars and trucks) seems bizarre. In fact, by artificially inflating prices, protectionist measures such as the Jones Act may have given foreign competitors a competitive edge in international shipping.

The Persian Gulf conflict in the early 1990s proved that the Jones Act was not a necessary element in supplying and sustaining a military operation. For example, during the Persian Gulf War, Military Sealift Command shipped millions of tons of cargo to the operation. Of the 191 chartered dry cargo ships involved in this operation, 162 (or 85 percent) were foreign-flagged.

Additionally, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) has frequently leased foreign vessels to execute missions that required additional sealift capacity. This further obviates the need for the Jones Act. One could argue that such long-term leasing agreements are not cost-effective, but if that is the case then the military should purchase such vessels outright. The Jones Act doesn't solve this issue.

Americans in most states would benefit from the freedom to ship goods on the best-built, most affordable vessels, wherever they are made. The Alaska governor is actually required to ''use best efforts and all appropriate means to persuade the United States Congress to repeal those provisions of the Jones Act formerly codified at 46 U.S.C. 861, et seq.''

The Jones Act drives up the price of gas, hinders U.S. infrastructure improvements, inflicts high costs on people in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and makes it difficult to transship goods between U.S. ports. Senator

McCain's Jones Act amendment would promote competition, strengthen the economy, and benefit American consumers.

[From the federalist.com, Jan. 22, 2015]

IF YOU LIKE HIGHER PRICES, ENRICHED CRONIES, AND WEAK NATIONAL SECURITY, THEN YOU'LL LOVE THE JONES ACT

(By Scott Lincicome)

Sen. John McCain has found an archaic, protectionist boondoggle whose time for death is long past. It's called the Jones Act.

Lost in the never-ending debate about the KeystoneXL pipeline is great news for anyone who opposes cronyism and supports free markets and lower prices for essential goods like food and energy. Sen. John McCain has offered an amendment to repeal the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, also known as the Jones Act, which requires, among other things, that all goods shipped between U.S. ports be transported by American-built, owned, flagged, and crewed vessels.

By restricting the supply of qualified interstate ships and crews, this protectionist 94-year-old law has dramatically inflated the cost of shipping goods, particularly essentials like food and energy, between U.S. ports—costs ultimately born by U.S. consumers. Thus, the Jones Act is a subsidy American businesses and families pay to the powerful, well-connected U.S. shipping industry and a few related unions. For this reason alone, the law should die, but it turns out that the Jones Act also harms the very industry it's designed to protect and, in the process, U.S. national security.

THE JONES ACT INFLATES SHIPPING COSTS FOR AMERICANS

There is no question that the Jones Act inflates U.S. shipping costs. A 2011 Maritime Administration (MARAD) report, with input from the U.S. maritime industry, compared the costs of U.S.-flagged versus foreign cargo carriers, and found that the former far outweighed the latter due to the Jones Act and other U.S. Carriers noted that the U.S.-flag fleet experiences higher operating costs than foreign-flag vessels due to regulatory requirements on vessel labor, insurance and liability costs, maintenance and repair costs, taxes and costs associated with compliance with environmental law . . . [T]he operating cost differential between U.S.-flag vessels and foreign flag vessels has increased over the past five years, further reducing the capacity of the U.S.-flag fleet to compete with foreign-flag vessels for commercial cargo . . .

Higher costs are precisely what you'd expect from an industry that has a ''coastwise monopoly'' on shipping, due almost entirely to the Jones Act. As a result, U.S. vessel operating costs are 2.7 times more expensive than their foreign counterparts.

Domestic unions and shipbuilders, with a bipartisan coalition of their congressional benefactors, vehemently deny that these outrageous shipping costs differences have any effect on the ultimate cost of U.S. goods that are transported on Jones Act vessels, but several examples belie such claims (and prove that, once again, basic economics still works).

First, there is ample evidence that the Jones Act distorts the U.S. energy market and raises domestic gasoline prices. As I noted last year:

According to Bloomberg, there are only 13 ships that can legally move oil between U.S. ports, and these ships are 'booked solid.' As a result, abundant oil supplies in the Gulf Coast region cannot be shipped to other U.S. states with spare refinery capacity. And, even when such vessels are available, the Jones Act makes intrastate crude shipping artificially expensive. According to a 2012 report by the Financial Times, shipping U.S. crude from Texas to Philadelphia cost more than three times as much as shipping the same product on a foreign-flagged vessel to a Canadian refinery, even though the latter route is longer.

It doesn't take an energy economist to see how the Jones Act's byzantine protectionism leads to higher prices at the pump for American drivers. According to one recent estimate, revoking the Jones Act would reduce U.S. gasoline prices by as much as 15 cents per gallon 'by increasing the supply of ships able to shuttle the fuel between U.S. ports.'

For these and other reasons, the Heritage Foundation just recently called for the complete repeal of the Jones Act as part of its new energy policy agenda.

Second, the Jones Act has particularly deleterious effects on water-bound U.S. markets like Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii. A 2012 report by the New York Fed highlighted the issue for Puerto Rico:

Available data show that shipping is more costly to Puerto Rico than to regional peers and that Puerto Rican ports have lagged other regional ports in activity in recent years. While causality from the Jones Act has not been established, it stands to reason that the act is an important contributor insofar as it reduces competition (shipments between the Island and the U.S. mainland are handled by just four carriers). It costs an estimated $3,063 to ship a twenty-foot container of household and commercial goods from the East Coast of the United States to Puerto Rico; the same shipment costs $1,504 to nearby Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) and $1,687 to Kingston (Jamaica)—destinations that are not subject to Jones Act restrictions . . . Furthermore, over the past decade, the port of Kingston in Jamaica has overtaken the port of San Juan in total container volume, despite the fact that Puerto Rico's population is roughly a third larger and its economy more than triple the size of Jamaica's. The trends are stark: between 2000 and 2010, the volume of twenty-foot containers more than doubled in Jamaica, while it fell more than 20 percent in Puerto Rico.

A 1988 study by the U.S. Government Accountability Office found similar harms for Alaska and the U.S. economy. Thus, the idea that the Jones Act doesn't line the pockets of a few U.S. companies and unions at the expense of American families and businesses simply defies reality.

REGULATING INDUSTRIES CUTS THEM DOWN

Supporters of the Jones Act often rebut these economic criticisms by explaining that the law is absolutely essential for U.S. national security, but these claims also fail the smell test. Consider first the enervation of the U.S. shipping industry itself. The above-referenced MARAD report shows a U.S. industry that has declined nearly to the point of extinction under the weight of the Jones Act and other regulations—a shameful outcome when you consider the history and importance of the U.S. Merchant Marine, which is a component not just of the United States economy, but also our national defense. Mariners in World War II faced the highest casualty rate of any other service: 1 in 26 men went to their deaths on the sea. In 1950, ships waving the United States flag comprised 43 percent of the global shipping trade. Yet by 2009 the U.S. fleet had withered to 1 percent of the global fleet—while global demand for international shipping surged.

As of 2010, the picture was clear: there were 110 U.S.-flagged ships engaged in foreign commerce. Sixty in of these ships were part of the Maritime Security Program. Notably, as of 2012 these ships receive a subsidy (naturally) to the tune of $3.1 million per ship, per year, to offset their higher costs. Compare this to the 540 ships owned by American interests which flew a ''flag of convenience''—typically that of the Marshall Islands, Singapore, or Liberia. Why such a dramatic difference?

While it is certainly not the only factor at play, this precipitous decline in the U.S. fleet's standing is due in no small part to burdensome regulations which make American ships more costly and less competitive. The Jones Act requires ships engaged in the U.S. trade to be built in the country, but building a ship in the United States is exorbitantly expensive—three times the cost of a new ship built in Japan or South Korea. In nearly all cases it is far less burdensome to purchase an existing ship and reflag it rather than build new. And these burdens are before factoring the requirement to crew these ships with U.S. mariners, union men who unsurprisingly average more than five times the expense of a foreign crew. Indeed, the MARAD report identified labor costs as the single largest driver of the difference between U.S. and foreign carrier costs.

The Jones Act isn't the only harmful regulation, not by a mile. One of the unfortunate realities of operating a massive ocean-going vessel full of complex machinery is that things inevitably require maintenance. These inconveniences often arise overseas and necessitate repairs in foreign countries. Lest you worry the government would be left with beak unwetted in this instance, fear not: 19 USC §1466 to the rescue (link included if you're having trouble falling asleep). This outgrowth of the Tariff Act of 1930 requires the master, or owner of a vessel, upon the ship's return to a United States port, to declare to U.S. Customs any parts and services received onboard while in foreign waters. The ship owner is then required to pay an ad valorem duty of 50 percent on the dutiable vessel repair costs.

A few exceptions written into the law help mitigate this figure, at the further cost of man hours or maritime attorney fees. Free trade agreements between the United States and nations like Oman, South Korea, Singapore, and others help to alleviate these costs by allowing for almost total remission of duty for work performed in those countries. However, it's hardly practical for U.S.-flagged vessels to perform the entirety of their maintenance in these countries when stays in port can be measured in hours. Vessel repair duties are situated to remain a significant, punitive cost of doing business as a U.S. cargo vessel. Even with this 50 percent duty, in the majority of cases it is still less expensive to make the repairs overseas and pay up rather than to perform the work in the United States. This also holds true for the acquisition of new ships.

Thus, under the Jones Act, shipping prices (as well as those for the goods shipped) rise and the U.S. fleet degrades. (For more on how the Jones Act imperils U.S. maritime security, see this helpful Heritage Foundation report.) It's quite the double-whammy, and precisely what you'd expect from a protectionist law that thwarts the benefits of foreign competition. In short, the Jones Act has turned the U.S. merchant marine into a fleet of Ford Pintos and Chrysler K-Cars, all in desperate need of the kind of motivation only free market competition can bring.

TO TOP IT OFF, THE JONES ACT WORSENS EMERGENCIES

Moreover, the Act has proven to be a significant and costly obstacle in times of real emergency. Most recently, the deep freeze of 2014 saw New Jersey exhaust its supply of road salt, imperiling the lives of local travelers. Such salt was available in Maine, but it was delayed for days because of the requirement that only U.S. ships could engage

in coastwise trade to carry the shipment—even though an empty foreign ship was available and headed to Newark. The government denied a request to waive the Jones Act and use the foreign ship to supply the much-needed road salt. By the time a Jones Act barge was found to carry the salt, the cost of the operation had grown by $700,000. Sorry about those icy roads, New Jersey, but the shipping industry and unions gotta get paid.

During the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, the government similarly refused to issue Jones Act waivers so foreign vessels could aid in the cleanup and containment. Despite several offers for foreign assistance during an ongoing ecological disaster, the government cited the Jones Act to justify turning them away. Many suspect that the Obama administration was reluctant to go against the pro-Jones Act labor unions (tr. every labor union) he needed to cement his re-election. It's not a leap to say that such cronyism may have delayed the eventual resolution of the spill.

The Jones Act and its related statutes raise the cost of essential goods for American families and businesses; strangle the life from the industries they were designed to protect; jeopardizes U.S. maritime security; and exacerbates the pain of major national emergencies. (They also are major irritant in foreign trade relations.) So why hasn't Congress repealed these laws? Maybe we should ask the politicians and well-connected cronies who benefit from the current arrangement. I'm sure they'd be happy to explain.

McCain's amendment to repeal the Jones Act is a common-sense solution to the problems facing a key American industry and the pain of the U.S. economy. The amendment, as well as any broader proposal to kill off the Act, deserves widespread support from conservatives and liberals alike. Efforts to dispense with this archaic protectionist boondoggle will no doubt meet fierce resistance from entrenched interests, labor unions, and opponents of free trade. However, those same groups stand only to benefit from efforts to make the U.S. fleet more competitive and less costly. American mariners have what it takes to compete on a global scale, and they should be given the chance. More competition translates to more opportunity, and perhaps the expansion and revitalization of a crucial sector of our economy. Where artificial monopolies and ancient restrictions can be removed, American labor, American business, and American consumers will have a chance to thrive.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. 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. REED. Madam President, I would like to talk about an amendment I filed along with my colleague SUSAN COLLINS of Maine to support the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, the LIHEAP program.

As the Senate continues to debate whether to bypass a longstanding Presidential permitting process and essentially rubberstamp the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline—which, to be clear, would likely benefit major oil companies and could have a harmful consequence on our environment—I wish to take the opportunity to highlight a Federal program that helps our country's most vulnerable citizens, including seniors, meet their home energy needs.

The bipartisan amendment led by Senator COLLINS and me, along with several of our colleagues, expresses the sense of the Senate that the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program—better known as LIHEAP—should be funded at no less than $4.7 billion annually to ensure that more low-income households—those with children, senior citizens, individuals with disabilities, and veterans—are able to access this critical assistance.

I must commend Senator COLLINS. She and I have taken the lead on this effort over many sessions of Congress. Her efforts are extraordinarily critical for the continued support of this program, and it is no surprise that once again we are both together urging our colleagues to support this program.

LIHEAP is the main Federal program that helps low-income families, seniors, individuals with disabilities, and a growing number of veterans across the country pay their energy bills. It provides vital assistance during the cold winter months often seen in the Northeast, the Northern Plains, and across the northern part of the country, and also during the summer months in areas of the Southeast and Southwest where air-conditioning is absolutely critical to the health and welfare of seniors. Unfortunately, we often read very disturbing reports of individuals, particularly seniors, with serious medical conditions that can become fatal because they simply can't afford the cost of air-conditioning or home heating.

This is not a program that is regionally specific; this is a program that has a national impact and, as such, has to be supported. It is an indispensable lifeline that ensures recipients do not have to choose between paying their energy bills and affording other necessities such as food and medicine.

The funding also supports many small businesses, such as oil heating companies. They see the benefits of LIHEAP as well. It goes to pay utility bills, which indirectly affects small businesses and individual ratepayers across a broad spectrum. So the benefits of this legislation are not just for the specific recipients but also for the overall economy of our States and for small businesses, and that has to be noted.

We also recognize that there are many more households eligible than receive the benefits simply because the funding levels are insufficient.

Despite bipartisan efforts over many years—again, with Senator COLLINS being right there—funding reductions in 2011 and 2012, along with sequester cuts, mean LIHEAP funding has declined more than 30 percent since fiscal year 2010, from $5.1 billion down to about $3.4 billion. This raises another bigger issue.

We have seen our deficit decline significantly, from 9.8 percent of gross domestic product now to about 2.8 percent. In fact, that is a little bit below the 40-year average of deficits in the United States. This hasn't been just because of magic; it is because we have been cutting programs. This is an example of one of the programs we have cut very significantly, and it is a program that aids so many people in our communities—particularly seniors and people with disabilities. This deficit reduction has been hard won, and one of the costs has been supporting these people. The money has shrunk, so obviously the number of people serviced has shrunk. The number of households LIHEAP funds has declined by 17 percent, from about 8.1 million households to 6.7 million households, and they have seen this impact directly. Those receiving assistance have also seen their average LIHEAP grant reduced by about $100, down to about $400. This is estimated to cover less than half of the average home heating costs for a household this winter, meaning that many low-income families and seniors will have fewer resources available to meet other basic needs.

I must point out that we are seeing a temporary reprieve from very high energy prices—particularly oil prices in the Northeast—because of geopolitical developments that have impacted the price of oil. But that is not the solution. The bills these people face, even in this economic climate as well as meteorological climate, are still significant and challenging to people of very limited means. For many people, this is an issue of safety, it is an issue of their health, and it is an issue of just being able to get by and make ends meet.

So the need is clear, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of LIHEAP and in support of this amendment.

In this context, we need to be proactive in terms of recognizing something we can do on a bipartisan basis that works.

I do believe I should also comment at this moment on the underlying proposal, the Keystone XL Pipeline.

We understand this TransCanada pipeline would move crude oil from the Canadian tar sands—one of the dirtiest sources of fuel on the planet—to refineries on our gulf coast. There are many ways to extract hydrocarbons, and this is one of the most environmentally challenging ways. Constructing this pipeline runs counter to what we should be doing on a much broader basis, which is addressing climate change and protecting the environment.

I was struck yesterday at a meeting of the Senate Armed Services Committee—and the Presiding Officer is a distinguished and very valuable member of that committee—where we listened to Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft and

Zbigniew Brzezinski, two of the foremost experts on national security policy. General Scowcroft was National Security Adviser for President George Herbert Walker Bush, and Dr. Brzezinski was National Security Adviser for President Carter and was integral in negotiating the Camp David Accords between Israel and Egypt. I was struck, when asked about the big issues we face, that General Scowcroft said: Well, there are two big issues—cyber security and climate change. When you have these very authoritative individuals—again on a bipartisan basis—essentially saying climate change is a big national security issue, that is the context in which we have to view so many things, in particular this issue of the Keystone Pipeline.

The second issue is the obvious need in this country to create jobs. In fact—no pun intended—that is job number 1 for us. Now, there are jobs associated with the pipeline. Even if they are of short duration, they are still pretty good jobs. But the point has to be made that we have to do much more—particularly for our construction workers—than one single pipeline. I have been told that long-term employment of the pipeline, once it is built—will be very small.

We have to do much more. That is why I think we have to be very serious about an infrastructure program that goes way beyond Keystone and includes roads, bridges, sewers—all these things we have let decline. If we look at the spending levels—once again, a victim of our deficit reduction, a victim of the cuts we have made—we are at a level now where we are not doing what our fathers, grandfathers, grandmothers, and mothers did, which is invest a lot of money in building infrastructure for a productive America. We have been missing in action for the last several years as far as doing those things we used to do routinely—building new highways, building new sewer systems, improving our pollution control systems, all of those things. We have to do that.

We also have to do those things in the context of climate change—in other words, look at alternative energy and not just replicate what we did 20 or 30 years ago because this is a different planet.

According to the BlueGreen Alliance, a coalition of labor unions and environmental groups, repairing America's crumbling infrastructure could create 2.7 million jobs across the economy, increase GDP by $377 billion, while reducing carbon pollution and other greenhouse gas emissions. So it is not thousands of jobs; it is millions of jobs. It is not one project; it is a commitment to improving, advancing, and rehabilitating our infrastructure in every part of the country, while at the same time dealing with climate change, which is so central.

So, I would like to see us, as we move past this debate, move vigorously into a debate about infrastructure.

There is another issue too, and that is this debate about where the oil is going. Well, given the global market for petroleum products, it could go to parts of the United States, but it could easily go overseas. A lot of that is a factor of the price and the demand. We have seen a lot of oil going into Asia in particular. I think that trend will continue for several reasons. One reason is that they have done less, relatively speaking, than many other parts of the world in terms of lowering their dependence on oil and moving to alternative fuels. So the potential is that a significant amount, if not all, of this product—even though it reaches the gulf coast—will not be used in the United States. That is another factor we have to consider.

Bypassing the administration's traditional legislative review process with respect to Keystone is not the way to proceed. We have to get our energy policies right. I think we have to recognize climate change. We have to be sensitive to a whole host of issues. We also have to recognize that an energy policy is not just producing and getting these products into the marketplace, it is also making sure that very vulnerable Americans can afford these products, whatever their prices may be. That is where LIHEAP comes in.

I am very pleased, once again, that this is a continuation of a bipartisan effort Senator COLLINS and many others have pursued for the benefit of families all across this country. When we are doing that, I think we are doing the best possible work we can for our constituents and our Nation.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Ms. MIKULSKI pertaining to the submission of S. Res. No. 35 is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 71

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I stand today to encourage my colleagues to support my amendment No. 71. This amendment would solve a problem that has severely hamstrung oil and gas development on Federal lands, a problem that is particularly severe in the Western United States and that involves excessive delays in the issuing of permits by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management.

Federal law requires the BLM to approve or deny these permits within 30 days. They have 30 days to go one way or the other. But according to a report issued last year by the inspector general within the U.S. Department of Interior, BLM took an average of 228 days to approve each drilling permit in 2012—228 days. That is 7½ months. That is a lot longer than the 30 days under Federal law. In Moab and in Salt Lake City, UT, the average processing delay is 220 days. In Price, UT, the backlog is around 250 days. It doesn't have to take this long. In fact, to explain why, let's look at how States handle it.

State governments, by comparison, process these same permits in 80 days or less.

Approval of these permits is further complicated by endless environmental reviews, reviews that sometimes can take years upon years. The result of all this redtape is a serious backlog of about 3,500 permits.

My amendment would address this problem in a few ways. First, it would require BLM to issue a permit within 60 days of receiving an application. If the permit is denied, the BLM would be required to specify the reasons for its decision to deny the permit and to allow the applicant thereafter to address any issues.

The amendment would also address delays stemming from reviews under the Endangered Species Act and under the National Environmental Policy Act. Reviews under these statutes are required to be completed within 180 days. To provide companies with certainty and to hold BLM accountable, if either of these deadlines is not met, the applications would be deemed approved.

Significantly, there are currently 113 million acres of Federal land open and accessible for oil and gas development. Much of this Federal land contains abundant domestic energy resources. In Utah alone we have hundreds of acres available for drilling, acres that are currently being held up by bureaucratic delays. My amendment would ensure that Utah and other States in the West that are dominated by Federal land can access the energy, the vast wealth that lies within their borders, and provide the United States with a reliable source of domestic energy production.

Look, our security—our energy security and our national security, more broadly—depends ultimately on our ability to produce energy. I understand that fuel prices right now are down relative to what they have been. We cannot get too secure in this. We cannot assume it is always going to be the case. Certainly, when the Federal Government insists on owning this much land—roughly one-third of the land in the United States as a whole, roughly

two-thirds of the land in my State of Utah—if we are going to own this much land within the Federal Government, we should be using the resources within it.

We need to make sure we are using that land to shore up our energy independence. The less energy independent we are in this country, the more dependent we become on other countries that are producing their energy, that are using their natural resources—countries such as Saudi Arabia and Venezuela and other countries where there are a lot of people growing wealthy off of our petrodollars and where many of those same people are using our own petrodollars to fund acts of terrorism against us, countries that are often hostile to our interests.

We need to do this because it makes sense economically and we need to do this because it makes sense from a national security standpoint as well. But in order for any of this to work, we have to have procedures in place to make sure that those people who choose to go out and want to develop land—want to develop Federal land that has already been identified as suitable for oil and gas production within Federal lands—that they have some modicum of due process, that they have some ability to predict what the procedural outcome is going to be, what set of procedures they will have to follow and what kind of timeline they will be facing as they approach this often lengthy process.

We do need to be careful. We do need to be sensitive and we need to make sure we are developing our natural resources in a way that respects our environment and doesn't endanger our health or that of our Federal land, but this can be done in a way that doesn't have to result in open-ended and completely unforeseeable delays.

For this reason I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, amendment No. 71, with the understanding that as they do so, they will be shoring up America's energy independence, and with it, America's national security.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. 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. MORAN. I also ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, thank you very much for recognizing me to take the opportunity to address something I hope can readily and easily be solved. If common sense prevails—and we know it doesn't often enough here in our Nation's Capital—one, the Department of Veterans Affairs certainly, in my view, can solve this problem. If common sense doesn't prevail there, then surely the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the President could agree upon a legislative fix that is really nothing more than common sense. I am talking about a veterans issue—one that is certainly prevalent in a rural State such as mine. My guess is it is a problem that occurs in a State such as the Presiding Officer's as well.

I was very pleased. I came to the Senate floor and talked about the importance of passing and approving the CHOICE Act. We remember the scandal of last year in which it became clear the Department of Veterans Affairs had significant problems across the country. The VA hospital in Phoenix was a poster child for bad behavior that resulted in potentially the death of veterans. One of the things we did to try to help the Department of Veterans Affairs better take care of America's veterans was to pass the CHOICE Act. We did that in August of last year. It was signed into law, and it is now being implemented by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

There are many issues that are associated with the implementation of this bill, but let me raise one. The crux of that legislation is this. If you are a veteran and you live more than 40 miles from a VA facility or if you can't get the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide the services within 30 days or the timeframe in which you need those services, then the Department of Veterans Affairs is required by law to provide those services, if you choose, at a place of your choice, presumably your hometown.

This is about service to our veterans in their hometowns across Kansas and across States around the country. The theory is that the Department of Veterans Affairs is incapable of providing those services perhaps for a number of reasons, including lack of the necessary professionals. Therefore, let's take advantage of the professionals we have at home in our hometowns. Let the veterans see his or her hometown physician. Let the veteran be admitted to his or her hometown hospital. It is a pretty commonsense kind of reaction to the inability of the Department of Veterans Affairs to meet the needs of veterans across our country—provide another option. If that is the choice of the veteran, that veteran wants to have care at home, give them that option.

As a Senator from a State such as Kansas, this makes sense to me even in the circumstance in which the Department of Veterans Affairs can provide the service. For 14 years I represented a congressional district in Kansas, the western three-fourths of our State. The congressional district is larger than the State of Illinois and has no VA hospital.

We pushed for a number of years and were successful in opening outpatient clinics so veterans could get that care closer to home than the VA hospital, and those outpatient clinics provide—or at least intended to provide—routine care.

Here is the problem today. The law says if you live more than 40 miles from a VA facility, then the VA must provide the services at home if you choose. The Department of Veterans Affairs is defining facility as any facility, including the hospital or the outpatient clinic. That doesn't seem too troublesome to me until you take it to the next step, which is, even if the VA hospital or the outpatient clinic doesn't provide the service that the veteran needs, they still consider it a facility within 40 miles.

In my hometown, where I grew up, we have had an ongoing dialogue with one of our honored veterans. He needs a colonoscopy. My hometown is nearly 300 miles—250 miles from the VA hospital in Wichita. There is an outpatient clinic, a CBOC, in Hays, 25 miles away. But guess what. The outpatient clinic in Hays doesn't provide the service of colonoscopies.

One would think the veteran in my hometown could go to the local physician or the local hospital and have the colonoscopy performed and the Department of Veterans Affairs provide and pay for the services. But no, because there is an outpatient clinic within 40 miles, even though it doesn't provide the colonoscopy, our veteran is directed to drive to Wichita. Incidentally, we have calculated the mileage expense of the veteran doing it. It does not make sense economically, either. But regardless of that, it certainly doesn't make sense for that veteran.

I have said this many times over the years as we have tried to bring services closer to home to veterans. If you are a 92-year-old World War II veteran and you live in Atwood, KS, up on the Nebraska border, how do you get to the VA hospital in Wichita or in Denver?

Our initial attempt was to put an outpatient clinic closer. The problem with that—we now have an outpatient clinic in Burlington, CO, and an outpatient clinic in Hays, KS. But that is still 2½ hours from Atwood, KS. If you are a 92-year-old World War II veteran in Atwood, KS, how do you get to Hays or Burlington, CO? The answer is you probably don't.

Our veterans are not being served. We attempted to address this issue. Let me say it differently. We addressed this issue in the CHOICE Act and said that if you are 40 miles from a facility, then the VA provides the services at home. The VA is interpreting that facility—the word facility—just to mean any facility there regardless of what service it provides.

In many instances—I take Liberal, KS, where there is a CBOC. They haven't had a permanent physician in their CBOC in almost 4 years. But yet Liberal—the CBOC in Liberal—counts as a facility even though there is no physician who is regularly in attendance at the clinic. These issues ought

to be resolved in favor of whom? The veteran. Whom, of all people, would we expect to provide the best service to? In any capable way we can, whom would we expect to get the best health care in our Nation? I would put at the top of the list those who served our country.

The committee that passed this legislation, the CHOICE Act—it says in the language—the conferees recognized the issues I just described and added report language that allows veterans to secure health care services that are either unavailable or not cost-effective to provide at a VA facility, which was intentionally included to give the VA flexibility to provide veterans access to non-VA care when a VA facility, no matter what size or location, cannot provide the care the veteran is seeking.

Yesterday I introduced S. 207. I would ask my colleagues to join me. Again, I guess my first request is, Could the Department of Veterans Affairs fix this problem on their own? If not, I would ask that my colleagues join me in fixing this legislatively with one more directive to the Department of Veterans Affairs saying, if they cannot provide the service at the CBOC, then it does not count as a facility within the 40 miles.

This is a problem across our States. I had my staff at a meeting in the VISN in which they were describing how they were going to implement the CHOICE Act. They put up a chart in which they show how they are going to have a mobile van work its way through the area of our State and Missouri and talked about how that will then satisfy the 40-mile requirement.

Why is the VA bending over backward to avoid—let my say it differently. Why is the VA not bending over backward to take care of the veteran, instead of bending over backward to make sure it is the most difficult circumstance for a veteran to get the health care they need at home?

We ought to always err on the side of what is best for veterans, not what is best for the Department of Veterans Affairs—if you could ever make the case that providing services someplace far away from the veteran is good for the VA.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the opportunity to speak to this issue. It is an important one. I have mentioned it to a number of my colleagues. They have described similar circumstances in their State. I have met with the Department of Veterans Affairs personnel. I serve on the veterans' committee, have since I came to Congress. We will work in every way with the veterans' committee, Republicans and Democrats, to make certain there is a fix to this issue.

But I want to highlight the manner in which the Department is implementing the CHOICE Act is not the way Congress intended, and it is not the way that benefits the veteran. Finally, let me say that even if there was some circumstance in which the Department does not have the authority to do what we are asking them to do in the CHOICE Act, they have the ability today to provide non-VA care whenever they deem it necessary.

There is also the opportunity for them to use a pilot program that many of us have in our States. I see the Senator from Maine is on the floor. They have a pilot program, the ARCH Program, in which we are trying to provide services to veterans at home. There are a variety of ways the Department can solve this problem. I ask them to do that.

In the absence of their solution, I ask my colleagues to join me in sponsoring, in debating, in potentially amending but most importantly in passing and sending this bill to the President so we can resolve once and for all that the Department of Veterans Affairs is created for the benefit of the veteran, not the Department.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, first, as an original cosponsor of the good Senator's bill, I compliment him for taking the leadership position he has on this issue, for bringing it forward and so eloquently expressing his support for it.

This is an important bill. I think it is one we all can agree on, on a bipartisan basis. Let's get it through and to the President.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. President, I start with a question, a basic question: Why are we here? Why do we have those jobs? What is it we are supposed to do? The clearest expression of the answer to that question comes from the preamble to the Constitution, which lays out exactly what our responsibilities are.

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

This is the purpose of the Constitution. It is the purpose of the government. The most solemn responsibility of any government, I would submit—any government, anywhere, any time—is to provide for the security of its citizens, to provide for the common defense. That is our most solemn and fundamental responsibility.

We are not doing that right now. We are avoiding, missing, obfuscating, and not dealing with one of the most serious threats facing our country. I refer to the threat of cyber attack. Every intelligence official I have talked to in the last 2 years, every military official, everybody with any knowledge of the defense and the security, the national security of this country, has emphasized that the most serious threat we face right now is cyber.

What does that mean? Cyber attacks. The disabling of critical infrastructure, attacks on our businesses, financial systems. This is a direct threat that is heading at us like a freight train on a track. The problem is we see it coming, but we are not doing what we should to deal with it.

To say it is coming is kind of an understatement. This is an unusual chart, but it goes in time from 2004 until today. It is basically the frequency and size of cyber attacks in our country. The bigger bubbles are bigger attacks. The smaller bubbles are smaller attacks. From 2004 to 2006, a few but not many. It is bubbling up and it is about to boil over. Each year we have seen more attacks, larger attacks, more serious attacks. The evidence is overwhelming that this is a threat we are facing. Sony was a wake-up call if ever there was one. What if the Sony attack had been the New York Stock Exchange or the railroad system, where cars bearing toxic materials are derailed, or the natural gas pipeline system or any other of the critical infrastructure of this country, financial or physical, would have disabled us?

I was at a hearing yesterday in the Armed Services Committee. We had the testimony of two of the wisest men in America—Brent Scowcroft, Gen. Brent Scowcroft, who was the National Security Adviser to President Ford and President George H.W. Bush, and Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, who was the National Security Adviser to Jimmy Carter—talking about threats.

Brent Scowcroft said he believes the cyber threat was analogous to the nuclear threat: People would not be killed, but our country could be destroyed. He saw this as one of the two fundamental threats we face. Yet what are we doing in Congress? Not much. It is as if we got a telegram from Admiral Yamamoto in 1941 saying, I am steaming toward Pearl Harbor and we are going to wipe you out, and we did nothing, or a telegram or a text message from Osama bin Ladin saying, We are heading for the World Trade Center, what are you going to do, and we did nothing.

We have the notice. It is right in front of us. Yet we are not acting. What are the risks? The biggest risk is in the nature of our society. The good news is we are the most technologically advanced society on Earth. The bad news is we are the most technologically advanced society on Earth—because it makes us vulnerable.

It is what they call an asymmetric vulnerability. We are the most vulnerable because we are the most wired. We are in the most danger because of our technical advancement. What can they do to us? This gives you an idea of how this risk is accelerating and how it fits. This is the number of devices in the world connected to the Internet. Back in 2003 it was very few. By 2010 we were up to 10 billion devices connected to the Internet. The projection is, by the end of this year, we will be at 25 billion devices connected to the Internet. By 2020, not that long from now, 50 billion

devices will be connected to the Internet and therefore vulnerable to cyber attacks.

Critical infrastructure, I have mentioned. The financial system, what would it do to the country if all of a sudden everybody's bank account disappeared? Most of us, many workers in America, have their—we do not see cash money or a paycheck. It goes electronically into our bank account. What if all of that just disappeared? Chaos would ensue.

The same thing with transactions on the New York Stock Exchange or the great transactions of our banks. It would be chaos that would tumble through the economy and then into people's daily lives. Transportation could be paralyzed. The simply act of messing around with how red and green lights work in a major city could paralyze a major city for hours, if not days.

The transportation of toxic or volatile compounds could be compromised. Of course, the energy system, the electrical grid, we do not realize how dependent we are on these modern facilities until they go down. Periodically in Maine, when I was Governor, we had an ice storm where three-quarters of our people lost electricity for sometimes 2 weeks at a time. We learned what a disaster that was. One of the things we learned was that home furnaces, heating oil furnaces, need electricity to fire. People got cold. It was not just: Gee. I cannot watch TV tonight. It became life threatening.

The second area of vulnerability is financial. Data breaches, that is something that is happening all of the time. Then, finally, property ideas, theft of ideas. Where are these threats coming from? All over the place. North Korea, Russia, China, Iran. Terrorist organizations are now looking into the cyber field—hackers for hire, somebody in some country or somebody's basement somewhere in the world who hires out to take advantage of the vulnerability, particularly of the Western countries and particularly the United States.

We are already incurring huge costs, the cost of these data breaches, the cost of protection against these data breaches. Our financial system is spending a huge amount of money to protect itself from these breaches. We have to act. We have to act. It is beyond time to act.

My favorite quote from Mark Twain—and there are many. But my favorite is: History doesn't always repeat itself, but it usually rhymes.

History doesn't always repeat itself, but it usually rhymes.

Nothing new ever happens. This would not be the first time in history a great nation ignored threats to its existence. In August of 1939, Winston Churchill, in talking about the House of Commons, but he could have been talking about the U.S. Congress:

> At this moment in its long history, it would be disastrous, it would be pathetic, it would be shameful for the House of Commons to write itself off as an effective and potent factor in the situation, or reduce whatever strength it can offer to the firm front which the nation will make against aggression.

Earlier in the thirties he said—and this is a perfect analogy of where we are today:

> When the situation was manageable it was neglected, and now that it is thoroughly out of hand we apply too late the remedies which then might have effected a cure.

We are at the line between manageable and too late. I would argue it is almost over that line. Now is the time that we have to act, but we aren't acting because of a variety of reasons: the complexity of our process—four committees have to consider cyber legislation; the differences with the House; the differences with the White House. There are all kinds of complications in our system which seem to be preventing us from acting.

Again, Churchill is appropriate:

> There is nothing new in the story. It is as old as the Sibylline Books. It falls into that long, dismal catalogue of the fruitlessness of experience and the confirmed unteachability of mankind.

Boy, that is a dark judgment. Continuing:

> Want of foresight, unwillingness to act when action would be simple and effective, lack of clear thinking, confusion of counsel until the emergency comes, until self-preservation strikes its jarring gong—these are the features which constitute the endless repetition of history.

Let's act before the crisis starts. Let's act while we still have time.

There are at least three bills that I know of that are available. One is a bipartisan bill that was heavily negotiated in the Intelligence Committee, came out of the committee I think 12 to 3 last summer. That is available. It is a new Congress, but the ink is barely dry. There is a bill that came out of the Judiciary Committee. A bill that came out of the homeland security committee in December of 2012—and lost in this body by a couple of votes—from my friends Senator COLLINS and Senator Lieberman also dealt with this problem. In other words, we don't have to start from zero. We don't have to invent these solutions; we just have to have the will to put them in place. Yet we don't act.

People say: Well, we have national security, Senator. What are you talking about? We are spending almost $600 billion a year on the defense of this Nation.

And the answer is yes, but in some ways it reminds me of the famous Maginot Line of France in the thirties. The Maginot Line has come to symbolize a faulty defense premise, which really isn't true. The Maginot Line worked. The problem was that the Maginot Line stopped. It went from Switzerland to the Belgian border. It stopped at the Belgian border, and the Germans came around it and behind it and overwhelmed France in 6 days. So the problem wasn't that the Maginot Line was not an effective defense—and our defense budget certainly is not ineffective; it is absolutely essential. But we are not defending the whole frontier. There is a piece of it, like Belgium, that is undefended, and that is our failure.

So what are we going to say when the crisis strikes? What are we going to say when we go home to our citizens in our home States when the financial system goes down and people can't get their money? There are threats of violence and violence across our country when toxic waste is spilled in our waterways. What are we going to say? ''Well, we would have done something about it, but that was in four committees, and that was really hard'' or ''You know, we just got in this argument with the White House and couldn't work it out'' or ''Gee, we would have solved it and your paycheck wouldn't have disappeared except the House—you know how they are.'' Can you imagine trying to defend yourself with that kind of argument? You would be laughed out of the place.

Come on. Let's do this. I don't know exactly how to proceed, except maybe those four committees should get together, talk to each other, and say: Let's bring a bill to the floor.

I would like to see this body decide that we are going to pass cyber protection legislation between now and May 1. There is no reason we can't do it. The bills are drafted. We just have to pull ourselves together and take collective responsibility for defending our country.

If we don't do this—a friend and colleague on this floor yesterday—we were talking about it, and he said: It is political malpractice if we don't get this done.

This is a threat we know about. It is important. It is serious. We know at least some of the important things we have to do to coordinate better between the government and the private sector. We know how we can help to solve this; we just have to summon the political will to do it. And it isn't even that controversial. There are differences here and there, but this isn't one of the big fights in the Senate where we have great ideological differences, this is one where we should be able to come together. It is a lack of coordination and a lack of political will.

I don't know how I can say this more strongly. I think this is one of our most fundamental responsibilities. I go back to the preamble to the Constitution—the primary reason that governments are established and that our government was established, one of the basic reasons is to provide for the common defense. If we don't do that in the face of this threat, shame on us. This is one of the most solemn responsibilities we have as Senators, as Members of the Congress, and as members of the Federal Government of the United States.

I deeply hope that the next several weeks and months will be a time of productive discussions and a commitment to at least an attempted solution, the beginning of a solution to this

grave threat facing the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from Wyoming.

THE BUDGET

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss several issues that I hope Congress will consider in this Congress.

First, I intend to work this year to address our Nation's spending problems because I sit up nights worrying about our Nation's debt and how it will affect our children and grandchildren. As chairman of the Budget Committee, I will have a hand in handling that, so I have more responsibility.

We have a spending problem in this country, and we cannot spend our way to prosperity; rather, we have to stop spending more than we take in and find a way to start paying down $18 trillion. The debt is growing. In fact, last fiscal year we spent $469 billion more than we took in. This fiscal year we are projected to spend $550 billion more than we will take in.

The money on which we actually get to make decisions is about $1,000 billion. I could say $1 trillion, but $1,000 billion seems to me like a lot more. When we talk about one, we don't pay much attention, whether it is a penny or a dollar or a million or a billion or a trillion, but if we put it out in real terms, we are talking about $1,000 billion that we could actually make decisions on, and we go ahead and spend half more than that, half more than we take in. How long do you think we can do that?

Well, it is affected by interest. We have to pay interest on the money we spend that is in addition to the money we take in. Right now we are able to borrow that money at only 1.9 percent. Only? That amounts to $251 billion that we are paying in interest. It doesn't do a single program, just pays interest.

How many people think the interest rate is going to stay at 1.9 percent? Well, nobody does. In fact, the projections for this year for that interest rate, as we sell our bonds, is for 2.1 percent and going up. The average would be 5 percent. Let's see—$250 billion. If that doubled, that would be $500 billion. That could happen in 1 year. That would be an extra $250 billion that we couldn't spend out of that $1,000 billion that we now get to make decisions on, which is only two-thirds of what we actually spend. We have a spending problem, and it is catastrophic in the long run.

People would like us to balance the budget, and I have noticed that 24 States have already passed a constitutional convention balanced budget amendment. There is a provision—article V of the Constitution says you can have a constitutional convention, and there are ways of having it happen, and that is by two-thirds of the States saying they want to have one. The way all those are being phrased is as though it would be limited to a constitutional convention on the balanced budget amendment only, but there is no provision to keep it at that. The only real provision in article V is one that says that no matter what you do in a constitutional convention, the thing that cannot be violated is that all States have equal representation in the U.S. Senate. Since we are the least populated State, that is one of my favorite parts of that article, and that is my favorite article. But everything else could be tapped. There are 10 more States that are considering that resolution. If all 34 of them pass it, we will have a constitutional convention.

If we had to balance that budget in 1 year, that would mean we would have to cut $550 billion out of $1,000 billion. In other words, we would have to make a 50-percent cut to balance the budget.

The real tragedy of this—I am not even talking about paying down the national debt; I am just talking about what we would be able to spend after we pay interest because we overspend.

So we are trying to get it on a track where we can at least see the end of the tunnel and hope that is not the light of a train coming our way. So far it is. That is one of the things that keep me up. Several Members of the Senate have ideas on how we can do that, and I intend to work with them in an effort to find real solutions, eliminate some of the budget gimmicks we have had in the past, and I have some ideas I hope my colleagues will consider. One of them is my penny plan. That cuts the overall spending by 1 percent for 3 years to balance the budget. It is a little pain for virtually everybody. Everybody gives up one penny out every dollar they get from the Federal Government. The plan doesn't mandate any specific cuts. Congress would have the authority to make targeted cuts and focus on the worst first. That is what we ought to do—focus on the worst first, and there is plenty of worst-first out there. If we focus on identifying and eliminating all of the wasteful spending that occurs in Washington, we might not have to cut important programs and services. Let's not make the cuts hurt. Let's be smart about the spending cuts and prioritize how we spend taxpayers' money.

My biennial appropriations bill would allow for each of the appropriations bills to be taken up for a 2-year period. That means agencies would know what they are doing for 2 years. What happens right now is we don't meet the spending deadline—which is October 1—until sometime into the next year. So they not only don't know what they are going to do for 2 years, they don't even know what they are going to do for the year they are in. We need to solve that problem.

My biennial budgeting bill actually breaks up the spending into two pieces. We do 12 of the bills, so we do the six tough ones right after the election and then we do the six easy ones before an election to make that a little easier to get done. But each of them would allow the agencies to know what they are going to do for a 2-year period, and it would allow the appropriators to scrutinize the details of those budgets. When you are looking at $1,000 billion, how much detail do you think you can look at when you have to do that each and every year? So I am suggesting that we only have to do it once every 2 years for half of the budget, and I think that would get us into a position where we would be cutting that worst first.

Of course, the Defense appropriations bill would be taken up each year, just as we take up the authorization bill. Some people have mentioned that we are funding some things that aren't authorized right now. They were authorized before, but the authorization date has passed, so technically they are not authorized to happen. I was curious as to how many of those there were. I found out there were over 250 authorizations. So how many of those are current? Well, 150 of them are out of date. We are still spending the money, but we haven't looked at the program to see if that is what we intended for them to do and if that is how they are using the money and if it is getting done. It is about time we did that.

Eliminating duplication and waste as well as improper payments could be a real part of the solution this year because those are avoidable wastes of taxpayer dollars. The Government Accountability Office has reported that 31 areas of the Federal Government are in need of reform to eliminate duplicative and unnecessary programs. Consolidating programs and agency functions that overlap could save $95 billion.

Additionally, in fiscal year 2012 there were nearly $100 billion in improper payments. That is the last time we have an accurate record—or inaccurate record of inaccuracies. These are payments that shouldn't be going out the door to people who are no longer eligible for benefits or overpayments of benefits or, in the worst cases, payments to people who are deceased. Ending waste and duplication could not only help out our fiscal house and get it back in order, but it could restore some confidence in the ability of government to operate effectively.

Additionally, I believe that now is the time to deal with the problems we have seen each day since ObamaCare was implemented. Premiums are skyrocketing for many people this year, while small businesses continue to hold off on hiring new workers or are keeping people on a part-time schedule so they do not have to go out of business.

We should repeal this law because it is bad for consumers and bad for businesses. We need real health care reform that gets health care costs under control and ensures that rural health care providers can afford to continue to provide vital services. We can redo that so we provide what the President promised but hasn't provided.

I am also hopeful this Congress can take up tax reform legislation. This will be a challenge since the President

said he wants $1 trillion more in revenue from the Tax Code. I disagree with that premise because I don't think Washington needs to spend more. Tax reform shouldn't raise any more money for the Federal Government than the current system does, but if done correctly tax reform may generate additional revenue through economic growth. That revenue can be used to reduce the deficits and pay down the debt. I hope we can work on a bipartisan basis to take our Tax Code off of autopilot and make it more simple and more fair for everyone—families, small businesses, corporations, and particularly individuals. As the only accountant on the Finance Committee, I am ready to roll up my sleeves and get to work on tax reform.

I also hope Congress will work to improve our economy and make energy more affordable by approving the Keystone Pipeline that we are debating now and fighting against the President's war on coal—the only stockpileable energy source we have. The Keystone Pipeline application has been pending for more than 5 years, and the State Department has had five reviews of the project and wants more. Every one of those reviews has determined the pipeline would cause no significant environmental impacts and that the pipeline would create thousands of jobs. Let's get it built.

Similarly, we need to encourage coal production and prevent the administration from restricting this low-cost, reliable, stockpileable energy source. The coal industry provided—directly and indirectly—over 700,000 good-paying jobs in 2010, but since being sworn into office, President Obama's rulemaking machine has released rule after rule designed to make it difficult and more expensive to use coal. Instead of running from coal, America should run on coal, and I hope this Congress will embrace its abundance and its power and its potential. With the ingenuity of the American people, there isn't any problem I have seen where we couldn't solve it. So let's just go to work on having cleaner energy and putting some of that incentive into using coal.

We need to challenge the President's other regulatory overreach as well. President Obama has issued more Executive orders, more regulations and other Executive actions than either Presidents Bush, Clinton or Reagan. In fact, last month USA Today reported this President is on track to take more high-level Executive actions than any President since Truman, with 195 Executive orders and 198 Presidential memoranda under his belt. This year we need to fight the abuse of Executive power, whether it is used to grant illegal Executive amnesty to illegal immigrants or to regulate all bodies of water on public and private land or to make unconstitutional political appointments. I will be reintroducing my constitutional amendment to allow States to repeal Federal regulations and hope to work with my colleagues on other efforts to fight regulatory overreach.

I am confident we can make real progress for America this year on these and other issues because I believe the Republican leader has established regular order. I expect we will use the committee process so Senators can offer constructive amendments and debate bills in that forum, where they are intensely interested in that legislation. I am hopeful we will also have an amendment process on the Senate floor so all 100 Members of the Senate have an opportunity to improve the bills we consider. Each of us has a different background and each of us looks at every proposal from a different point of view. Working together we can make things better for the American people, and I hope we will do it this year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I wish to take a couple of minutes to talk about the pending business—the TransCanada tar sands pipeline. I think it is helpful to start out by recognizing that we actually haven't had a global energy bill in the Senate going back to 2005. So it has been about 10 years since we have truly looked at our entire energy policy in this country and set a new course for what we should be doing in the future.

Despite the fact I think bumper stickers are a little dangerous, I thought it would be helpful to at least try to encapsulate the general direction we should be going—the short and sweet of what lens we should be viewing our national energy policy through. I think if I had to boil that down to a simple and concise statement, what I would say is simply fewer imports and cleaner fuels. So as we look at different proposals over the course of this upcoming Congress, I think it will be very helpful, particularly on the energy committee and on the floor, to view these projects through that lens.

Oddly enough, we are not dealing with a major energy policy as the very first thing the Senate considers as its pending business. We are dealing with one single project put forward by TransCanada, an international corporation, that has spent millions and millions of dollars over the last few years lobbying Washington for this particular project.

A lot has been said about the tar sands and about oil sands, but one of the things I think would be helpful to talk about is the fundamental difference between the oil that is produced around the United States and tar sands production. At the end of the line we are talking about the energy that is produced, but at the front end there is an enormous difference between oil that is drilled in Southeast New Mexico, Northwest New Mexico, in West Texas, in North Dakota or Colorado and in the tar sands. If we look through that same lens of fewer imports and cleaner fuels, tar sands development fails on both of those fronts.

We talk about more dependency in the United States on importing energy, and here we are talking about a substantially dirtier fuel source. In fact, we aren't allowed props on the floor, but when having this conversation in caucus, I brought some tar sands with me so I could show people the difference between oil and tar sands and how just toxic and sticky it is and how it represents a step backward in our overall energy policy in this country.

When thinking of oil production, most people think of putting a well in place, you case the well, and there is a well pad. It has an impact, certainly, but it is substantially limited compared to what we are seeing going on in the boreal forest in northern Alberta right now.

This is a picture of northern Canada. For those of us in arid Southwestern States, I can't tell you how envious we are of the kind of water one finds in this part of Canada. Also, the fish and wildlife and the forest resources are substantial. If we look at this picture, some people would say: That is the kind of place one might want to see as a national wildlife refuge or a national park. This is what the boreal forest looks like before tar sands production.

The thing to remember is that tar sands are not drilled for. They are not produced the way oil and natural gas is produced. Tar sands are mined, and they are strip mined. Let us see a picture that exemplifies the boreal forest and then the tar sands production area in the back. This in the front is how it started out and the back is what you have once you are producing the tar sands.

We heard from our colleague from Wyoming in his statement recently on the floor that there is no significant environmental impact from this project. But when we look at tar sands production, I don't know how we can look at a photo such as this and say there is no significant environmental impact.

Let's look at the next picture, and we can take an even closer look at what the tar sands look like when it is in production. We are talking about an enormous area across northern Canada impacted in this way. As we can see, the tar sands is not oil, it is sand and bitumen together.

To be able to process tar sands, to send it through this tar sands pipeline—the Keystone or any other pipeline—to be able to produce it and refine it is a very complicated process. You start by removing the forest cover, then you scrape off the topsoil, and after that you dig up the remaining tar sands and then you have to heat those up and process it to get the energy-bearing oil portion out. Just to be able to move it through a pipeline you have to heat it up, you have to pressurize it and you have to add caustic solvents.

One of the reasons it has been so incredibly difficult to clean up the existing tar sands spills in places such as Michigan and Arkansas is because—unlike oil, where we have a fair amount

of experience, though it is not easy to clean up—there are additional solvents and because the very sticky nature of this substance makes it almost impossible to clean up. We have had very little luck cleaning up tar sands spills to date.

We see in the front of this picture the boreal forest—or what is left of it—and then we see acres and acres and acres, thousands upon thousands of acres of tar sands production. So I think the first thing that is important for people to know is that this simply is not traditional oil and gas development. It is not clear a well pad, drill a hole, and produce oil. It is the kind of impact that if it were proposed for New Mexico or New York or California or even Texas we would have enormous outcry. We don't have the kind of open-pit mining and strip mining we once had in this country, but that is what it is most analogous to.

That said, another one of the claims that has been made repeatedly about this particular project is that the emissions it would create are inconsequential. So it is helpful to look at the emissions to understand that, because tar sands are fundamentally not only harder to handle but fundamentally dirtier from a pollution point of view than traditional oil resources. It is instructive to look at the difference between if we created the same amount of energy from domestic New Mexico, Texas, Colorado or North Dakota crude oil versus if we produced that energy from tar sands.

Once again, we get an idea of the emissions just at the source of the tar sands development here, but if we were to build this tar sands pipeline and we burned all of that produced tar sands that will move through it, the incremental pollution impact of that, the incremental carbon pollution—not the base pollution of whether we created the same amount of energy from oil sources or from some other sources of energy, if we used oil from the United States to create this energy—not looking at that but just the increment of burning tar sands oil instead of conventional crude oil, it is the equivalent of putting 285 million cars on the road for 1 year.

So the addition of carbon pollution to the atmosphere is anything but inconsequential if we look at it from the point of view that it is the equivalent of doubling Pennsylvania's cars—putting another Pennsylvania's worth of auto traffic on the road every year for 50 years.

What that doesn't take into account is the additional carbon released simply because we are cutting down all the forests, eliminating the peat bogs, and fundamentally industrializing an enormous portion of Alberta and Canada. That increment is another 6 million cars' worth of carbon pollution on the road for 1 year.

So that brings me to: What difference does this make?

We may have seen in the news a few days ago how 2014 was the hottest year on record. I wish I could say that was an anomaly. Unfortunately, it is not. Fourteen of the last 15 years have been record-setting years. And if there is something we know from our geologic records—from ice cores, from the science that has been done at NASA and NOAA and analyzed by our national labs and our university scientists—it is that over time the amount of carbon pollution in the atmosphere—the parts per million of carbon dioxide at any given time—tends to correlate with temperature. It doesn't matter if it comes from a volcano, it doesn't matter if it comes from the exhaust of a car. But because we have added such an enormous increment in recent years, since 1880 and the Industrial Revolution, we can see that as the parts per million of particles go up over time—this is the CO_2 concentration over that time period from the Industrial Revolution to today. It is actually not quite up to date because, unfortunately, we are now up here above 400 parts per million. Over that same time period, the average temperature has gone up year in and year out, with fluctuations, but the trendline continues to go up to a very dangerous level.

Adding an additional increment of carbon pollution is simply not something we can afford at a time when we need to be showing real leadership in terms of cleaning up our energy sources, moving forward to a clean energy future, and putting Americans to work here, domestically, with that approach.

The temporary jobs this tar sands pipeline will create are not inconsequential. But since this has been sold as a jobs program, it is worth stepping back and talking about how much of a permanent impact this is going to make. I would make the argument that if we were truly serious here in the U.S. Senate about the type of temporary construction jobs this pipeline would create, we would get serious about passing a transportation bill—and not only passing a transportation bill, but financing transportation in this country, financing infrastructure in this country the way we have historically.

We have a deficit of trillions of dollars worth of infrastructure at this point in this country because we won't pay to maintain it. In fact, our parents' generation built an infrastructure that is the envy of the world. With the current approach in the Congress, we haven't even had the decency to maintain the infrastructure they built and pass it on to our children unimpaired, much less create additional infrastructure of the type we saw from previous generations.

So if we look at the permanent jobs, as articulated in the environmental impact statement, we are talking about 30 to 50 permanent jobs from Keystone. That is slightly less than a single McDonald's, although I would argue that construction jobs are usually higher paying than McDonald's. But it gives us a sense of the kind of scale we are talking about in terms of permanent jobs. If we compare that to just regional projects in individual States—a transmission line in the Southwest, three times as many jobs as that; an electric vehicle plant in the West in Nevada, substantially many, many increments of permanent jobs more, which once again brings us to the fact that in this recovery, just in the third quarter of 2014, we saw 18,000 in clean energy jobs created in this country.

We need jobs in this country. We need energy in this country. And I would argue that the sooner we commit ourselves to a clean energy job-intensive future, the sooner we will address the real challenges that are in front of us.

I continue to urge the President to exercise his discretion and his veto of this. I suspect it will pass the U.S. Senate. But the sooner we get through this process, my hope is that we can return to a real debate about how we address the science that all the scientists have said is out there. We did make a big step forward yesterday in that the Senate for the first time—and the Republicans in the Senate in particular for the first time—accepted the reality of climate change. Unfortunately, right now the policy prescription is to make that climate change worse.

It is time we had an Apollo project for clean energy in this country. That will take transition. That means we are going to continue to produce fossil fuels as a part of that transition. But the sooner we get serious about investing in research and development, the sooner we get serious in terms of scaling the very real and economically competitive technologies we already have, the sooner we get serious about building infrastructure, such as transmission lines to carry renewable energy from parts of the country where it can be produced today to parts of the country where it will be consumed, the sooner we will lead the world and put this country back on track to be the world leader in not only energy but in clean energy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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 (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROE V. WADE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today is the anniversary of a tragedy. Forty-two years ago today, the Supreme Court announced its creation of a right to abortions for virtually any reason at all virtually at any time. The result of that decision is a tragedy for our society, for our culture, and for our precious life lost.

Since even before America's founding, the law was on a steady march toward protecting human beings before birth. In the 19th century, medical professionals and civil rights activists led a movement that succeeded in prohibiting abortion in every State except to save the mother's life. America had reached a consensus on the importance of protecting the most vulnerable. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court swept all of that aside, imposing upon the country a permissive abortion regime that the American people to this day have never chosen or accepted.

The debate over the morality and legality or policy of abortion begins with one inescapable fact—every abortion kills a living human being. Many have tried mightily to avoid, obscure, distract from, or ignore that fact, but it will not go away. Every abortion kills a living human being. That fact informed President Ronald Reagan when he wrote a moving essay titled ''Abortion and the Conscience of the Nation'' in 1983.

He wrote, ''We cannot diminish the value of one category of human life—the unborn—without diminishing the value of all human life.'' The real question, President Reagan said, is not about when human life begins, but about the value of human life. I believe that remains the real question today.

Today the United States is one of only seven nations in the world to allow abortion into the sixth month of pregnancy and beyond. That list of nations includes such champions of human rights as China and North Korea. Yet, in 1948, the United States voted in favor of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which recognizes in its preamble the inherent dignity and inalienable rights of ''all members of the human family.''

Article 3 of the declaration states that ''everyone has a right to life.'' Words such as ''universal'' and ''inherent'' and ''all'' are unambiguous and clear.

Our embrace of the inherent dignity and worth of all human beings in 1948 stands in jarring contrast to the Supreme Court's decision in Roe just 25 years later, that the life of any human being may be ended before birth.

The Supreme Court might have thought in 1973 that it was settling the abortion issue. By 1992, however, the Court conceded that the rules it created in Roe simply did not work and issued revised regulations in a case titled Planned Parenthood v. Casey. The Court said then that the contending sides in the abortion controversy should ''end their national division by accepting a common mandate rooted in the Constitution.''

National division on any issue, let alone one so profound as the taking and the value of human life, will not end simply because the Court says so. The division over abortion not only continues, but has remained largely unchanged even after dozens of Supreme Court decisions and four decades of insisting that abortion is a constitutional right.

The Supreme Court can render opinions on constitutionality, but it is limited in its ability to forge lasting consensus. That is the provenance of our great deliberative bodies where the people are truly represented.

More than 70 percent of Americans believe abortion should be illegal in most or all circumstances. That figure has not changed in 40 years. What has changed is that more Americans today identify themselves as pro-life than pro-choice. Large majorities favor a range of limitations on abortion and last November elected scores of new pro-life Senators at both the State and Federal level.

We must not avoid the fundamental question of the value of human life, for no question is more important. Do we still, as we once did, believe that every human being has inherent dignity and worth?

Two nights ago, in his State of the Union Address, President Obama spoke about the values that are at stake in the public policy choices we must make. Is there any value more important than life itself? He spoke about expanding opportunities for individuals, but the first opportunity that must be secured is the opportunity for life itself.

For many, the right to abortion is a symbol of progress. However, the idea that an act resulting in killing a living human being should be held up as a step forward, as a light to guide our way, strikes me as deeply misguided. We should instead be deepening the conviction that all human beings have inherent dignity and worth. That has been and should remain the foundation of our culture, society, and even our politics.

In his 1983 essay, President Reagan wrote that ''we cannot survive as a free nation when some men decide that others are not fit to live and should be abandoned to abortion.''

Today's tragic anniversary is a reminder of how our Nation's survival depends on respecting the essential dignity and worth of every human individual. Resting in the balance is how we ultimately define who we are as a people and what we strive to be as a nation.

This is an important issue. It is not one that should be slighted over. It is an issue that should strike at the heart of every person in this body. It is an issue that we all should stand up to strengthen and fight against in the case of this issue of abortion.

I am so grateful that so many people feel the same way, and that more and more people in this country are starting to realize every human life is important and that this society has sometimes gotten off track and not respected the rights of human beings. I think Roe v. Wade led us there, and we should be let out of Roe v. Wade by those who know there is a better way to have the sensitivity that society deserves to have, should have, and I believe will have in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Presiding Officer. I heard the words of my friend, and he was eloquent in his remarks, but I don't think he would be surprised to know that I see this issue very differently.

Before Roe v. Wade was decided in the 1970s, women died because they could not end a pregnancy even if they were raped. There are bodies buried in America, and we don't know the cause of death because if a woman tried to end an unwanted pregnancy—sometimes as a result of rape or even incest—she would be considered a criminal. And that is what you hear from my colleagues on the other side. They say, let's go back to the last century—let's undo Roe v. Wade.

It is hard for me to believe that here I stand in this century arguing that women should be respected, that families should be respected, and that everyone's religion should be respected. I support a woman's right to choose, and that means if your religion says you will never end an unwanted pregnancy, I support you.

I believe this decision should be between a woman, her doctor, her family, and her God. I don't think any Senator should get in the middle of a woman's private life. It is dangerous to do so, it is wrong to do so, and to do so in the name of doing something that is going to help the family—it doesn't make sense to me.

The Republican Party used to be the party of individual freedom and individual rights. When I was on the board of Planned Parenthood so many years ago, before Roe v. Wade, do you know who was very active and on their board? George Herbert Walker Bush. This was an issue that was embraced by Republicans and Democrats—individual respect and rights for women and caring about a woman's health. It was not a partisan issue.

I don't see how interfering with a woman's health, or her right to choose, in any way is helpful to her in a time of need. It should be her decision within the law. We don't want to go back to the last century.

I was glad to see that the Republicans in the House pulled a bill off the floor because it was so nasty to women. It didn't even allow women the right to terminate a pregnancy at a certain date if the woman was a victim of rape. They pulled it, but then they replaced it with another terrible bill that also limits a woman's right to choose.

My Republican friends would make doctors criminals and put them in jail for years and years. They would make women criminals. They have even had a bill that said that a grandmother should be put in jail if she helps her granddaughter. As a grandmother, that was too much for me. How dare some Senator come down here and tell a

grandma what to do for her granddaughter? This is the party of individual freedom that always decries too much government? Come on. This is putting the government right in the middle of our most personal decisions. It never used to be that way, but that is the way it is now.

Everyone deserves respect for their views. They should not be taunted for their views, and that is why the right to choose makes so much sense. You don't tell someone that the government says you must do A, B, or C. You tell the person within the law—within Roe, which was a modest decision at the time—you make a decision, we respect that decision, and we don't need to know about it.

Putting Senators in the middle of our private lives is not why I came to the Senate. We have a lot of work to do. We have to work on good jobs. We have to pass a highway bill. We have to make sure this planet is habitable for people. Talk about kindness. Think about future generations who have to live on a planet that is increasingly inhospitable. Scientists tell us if we don't do anything about climate, at the end of the day it may be an uninhabitable planet.

We have a lot of work to do. We all do. It seems to me we should start off by doing what government should do, not putting ourselves in the middle of private lives.

Again, I greatly respect my colleagues whose views are different than mine. All I ask them to think about is this: If we embrace the right to choose, then we are saying to women all over America that this is a tough decision and we understand that. Make it with your God. Make it with your loved ones. But we are not going to be right there in the middle of people's living rooms telling them what we think is right, because that is not why we were elected.

I am glad I happened to be on the floor to follow the remarks of Senator HATCH. I feel very strongly about this. As many of my colleagues know, the Democratic women of the Senate and several of our Republican women colleagues will continue to fight against saying to a woman that she has no right to make a most private, most personal decision without satisfying U.S. Senators, most of whom are men, by the way. It is just not right.

Speaking of polls, because I think Senator HATCH mentioned one, people want us to have a moderate approach on this. They don't want abortion on demand and neither does any pro-choice Senator. Roe v. Wade spelled it out. In the early stages we know a woman has that right; later, only if her health or her life is threatened. It is pretty modest. It makes sense. Leave it alone. That decision was made in 1973. Don't turn the clock back in this century.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 3:50 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Boxer No. 113, which is a side-by-side to Senator FISCHER's amendment; then Fischer No. 18, as modified; Manchin No. 99; Sanders No. 24; Lee No. 71; Murkowski No. 123, which is a side-by-side to Senator WYDEN's amendment; Wyden No. 27; Blunt No. 78, as modified; Cornyn No. 126, as modified; and Menendez No. 72, as modified; further, that all amendments on this list be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption except for Cornyn No. 126 and Menendez No. 72, which are germane, and that no second-degrees be in order to the amendments. I ask consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between each vote, and that all votes after the first in the series be 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up my amendment No. 123.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI] proposes an amendment numbered 123 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that all forms of unrefined and unprocessed petroleum should be subject to the nominal per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING THE OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Congress should approve a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(2) it is necessary for Congress to approve a bill described in paragraph (1) because the Internal Revenue Service determined in 2011 that certain forms of petroleum are not subject to the per-barrel excise tax;

(3) under article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, the Senate may not originate a bill to raise new revenue, and thus may not originate a bill to close the legitimate and unintended loophole described in paragraph (2);

(4) if the Senate attempts to originate a bill described in paragraph (1), it would provide a substantive basis for a ''blue slip'' from the House of Representatives, which would prevent advancement of the bill; and

(5) the House of Representatives, consistent with article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, should consider and refer to the Senate a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

AMENDMENT NO. 78, AS MODIFIED

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify the Blunt amendment, No. 78, with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING BILATERAL OR OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS REGARDING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) On November 11, 2014, President Barack Obama and President Xi Jinping of the People's Republic of China announced the ''U.S.-China Joint Announcement on Climate Change and Clean Energy Cooperation'' (in this section referred to as the ''Agreement'') reflecting ''the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances''.

(2) The Agreement stated the United States intention to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by one-quarter by 2025 while allowing the People's Republic of China to double its greenhouse gas emissions between now and 2030.

(3) Analyses have shown that policies limiting greenhouse gas emissions lead to a material increase in electricity prices.

(4) The people of China will not see similar electricity price increases as they continue to emit without limit for the foreseeable future, at least until 2030.

(5) Increases in the price of electricity can cause job losses in the United States industrial sector, which includes manufacturing, agriculture, and construction.

(6) The price of electricity is a top consideration for job creators when locating manufacturing facilities, especially in energy-intensive manufacturing such as steel and aluminum production.

(7) Requiring mandatory cuts in greenhouse gas emissions in the United States while allowing nations such as China and India to increase their greenhouse gas emissions results in jobs moving from the United States to other countries, especially to China and India, and is economically unfair.

(8) Imposing disparate greenhouse gas emissions commitments for the United States and countries such as China and India is environmentally irresponsible because it results in greater emissions as businesses move to countries with less stringent standards.

(9) Union members, families, consumers, communities, and local institutions like schools, hospitals, and churches are hurt by the resulting job losses.

(10) The poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes are hurt the most by increased electricity rates.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Agreement negotiated between the President and the President of the People's Republic of China has no force and effect in the United States;

(2) the Agreement between the President and the President of the People's Republic of China is a bad deal for United States consumers, workers, families, and communities, and is economically unfair and environmentally irresponsible;

(3) the Agreement, as well as any other bilateral or international agreement regarding greenhouse gas emissions such as the United Nation's Framework Convention on Climate Change in Paris in December 2015, requires the advice and consent of the Senate and must be accompanied by a detailed explanation of any legislation or regulatory actions that may be required to implement the Agreement and an analysis of the detailed financial costs and other impacts on the economy of the United States which would be incurred by the implementation of the Agreement;

(4) the United States should not agree to any bilateral or other international agreement on greenhouse gases that imposes disproportionate and economically harmful commitments on the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 126, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up the Cornyn amendment, No. 126, as modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI], for Mr. CORNYN, proposes an amendment numbered 126, as modified, to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure private property is protected as guaranteed by the United States Constitution)

At the end add the following:

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—Land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) may only be acquired consistently with the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 72, AS MODIFIED

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Menendez amendment, No. 72, be modified with the changes that are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

In section 2 of the amendment, strike subsection (e) and insert the following:

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—Land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) may only be acquired from willing sellers and consistently with the Constitution.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. CANTWELL. On behalf of Senator MANCHIN, I call up his amendment, No. 99.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL], for Mr. MANCHIN, proposes an amendment numbered 99 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding climate change)

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the opinion of virtually the entire worldwide scientific community and a growing number of top national security experts, economists, and others that—

(1) climate change is real;

(2) climate change is caused by human activities;

(3) climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world;

(4) the Energy Information Administration projects that fossil fuels will continue to produce 68 percent of the electricity in the United States through 2040; and

(5) it is imperative that the United States invest in research and development for clean fossil fuel technology.

Ms. CANTWELL. I yield to Senator BOXER so she can call up her amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mrs. BOXER. I call up amendment No. 113.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 113 to amendment No. 2.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding federally protected land)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Presidents of both parties have designated public land to preserve the land for current and future generations and to honor the national heritage of the United States, and that designated public land includes—

(A) the Statue of Liberty;

(B) the Grand Canyon;

(C) Acadia National Park;

(D) African Burial Ground National Monument;

(E) the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park;

(F) Muir Woods National Monument;

(G) Arches National Park; and

(H) Devils Tower National Monument;

(2) outdoor recreation, including recreation within Federal land, adds over $600,000,000,000 into the economy of the United States and supports more than 6,000,000 jobs;

(3) Federal land, such as National Parks, National Monuments, or other federally designated land, conserves historic, cultural, environmental, scenic, recreational, and biological resources, and positive impacts include—

(A) economic opportunities and small business creation;

(B) local tourism in gateway communities;

(C) new direct and indirect employment opportunities;

(D) recreational opportunities; and

(E) environmental, historic, and educational opportunities; and

(4) regions surrounding National Monuments have seen continued growth or improvement in employment and person income.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should acknowledge the benefit that public land designations provide to local and regional communities and economies; and

(2) designations of federally protected land should continue where appropriate and with consultation by local communities, bipartisan elected leaders, and interested stakeholders.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes just before the vote starts to explain this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to make sure we understand the vote was scheduled to begin 3 minutes ago. As part of the unanimous consent agreement, there was not a time allowed for Senator BOXER to speak. I don't have a problem in giving——

Mrs. BOXER. Excuse me for interrupting. I assume we have at least a minute to talk about our amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I am happy to make sure that is allowed. It wasn't included in the consent, but I am certainly happy to allow for the minute as Senator BOXER has asked.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you. I have a minute. I actually asked for three, but as I understand, I have a minute. Is that where we are?

I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you so much. I know what a hard job it is to get this bill moving, and I am trying to be very helpful. I am offering an amendment I didn't expect to offer because basically my amendment says that we should acknowledge the benefit that parks provide to our local and regional communities and their economies for small business and enhanced local tourism and how much they contribute to employment and provide opportunities to

our families. Can my colleagues imagine America without Yosemite, Yellowstone, Grand Canyon, the Statue of Liberty, Natural Bridges in Utah, Scottsbluff in Nebraska, Muir Woods in California, Glacier Bay in Alaska?

These were all protected by Republican and Democratic Presidents, and in many cases, by Congress. Why do I offer this? It seems to me we shouldn't have to argue about this. It is because my friend, the Senator from Nebraska, Mrs. FISCHER, has an amendment that I think is very dangerous. I know she modified it, and I appreciate that, but at the end of the day, it is so vague that I think it is going to lead us right to the courthouse door.

For example, if a President now or in the future, Democratic or Republican, decided in California—because the community really wanted it—to declare a national monument as we just had recently, in many cases, I would tell you this: Under this Fischer amendment, what would happen is there would have to be under consideration what does this do to other monuments, to other parks, to the budget deficit.

If someone who did not like this said, I am taking this to court because the President didn't consider this, you would not have any more national monuments, and you would not have all the beautiful iconic things we have such as the Grand Canyon and Scottsbluff. I think it is a bad amendment. I know my friend is trying to make a point, but I think we should defeat it and pass the Boxer amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a vote in relation to amendment No. 113, offered by the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 13 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Cruz	Manchin
Ayotte	Donnelly	Markey
Baldwin	Durbin	McCaskill
Bennet	Feinstein	Menendez
Blumenthal	Franken	Merkley
Booker	Gillibrand	Mikulski
Boxer	Graham	Murphy
Brown	Heinrich	Murray
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Nelson
Cardin	Heller	Paul
Carper	Hirono	Peters
Casey	Kaine	Portman
Collins	King	Reed
Coons	Klobuchar	Rubio
Corker	Leahy	Sanders
Schatz	Tester	Whitehouse
Schumer	Udall	Wyden
Shaheen	Warner	
Stabenow	Warren	

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Vitter
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BARRASSO. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 18, as modified, offered by the Senator from Nebraska, Mrs. FISCHER.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, our national parks are facing $13 billion in maintenance needs. The entire Federal land of States is looking at $22 billion in needs. We want to keep these resources and parks open for our children and grandchildren to marvel at and enjoy.

All of us have unique and special areas within our States, but we in Congress have the responsibility to care for the natural resources of our country.

This amendment has been softened so that the limitations are now just considerations. Let's vote yes on this amendment to take care of the resources we have so that future generations can enjoy them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would open the courthouse door over disputes of whether to place worthy lands under protection because of challenges that there are not enough resources or certain issues were not considered ahead of time.

Let me give one concrete example. A little over 1 year ago the President designated the Harriet Tubman Park as a national historic monument. It was a prerequisite to becoming a national park. That could have been challenged in the courts and it could have prevented the protection of that land. That could have been done.

What this amendment does—and it was not intended to do that—is add additional bureaucracy to the protection of worthy lands. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. I think it will do harm to the protection of necessary lands in our country.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 14 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Gardner	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hatch	Perdue
Boozman	Heitkamp	Portman
Capito	Heller	Risch
Cassidy	Hoeven	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rounds
Cochran	Isakson	Rubio
Corker	Johnson	Sasse
Cornyn	Kaine	Scott
Cotton	King	Sessions
Crapo	Kirk	Shelby
Cruz	Lankford	Sullivan
Daines	Lee	Thune
Enzi	Manchin	Tillis
Ernst	McCain	Toomey
Fischer	McConnell	Vitter
Flake	Moran	Wicker

NAYS—45

Ayotte	Durbin	Murray
Baldwin	Feinstein	Nelson
Bennet	Franken	Peters
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Reed
Booker	Graham	Sanders
Boxer	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Burr	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Markey	Tester
Carper	McCaskill	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Warner
Collins	Merkley	Warren
Coons	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 99

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 99, offered by the Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL, for the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. MANCHIN.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, we can all agree climate change is real and that 7 billion people have had an impact on the climate. We have a responsibility. We can all agree we need to

act to address the potentially devastating impact of climate change. The Energy Information Administration predicts the United States will continue to rely on fossil fuels for almost 68 percent of our energy through 2040. That is right, the Department of Energy.

My amendment basically says that right now the only baseload fuels we have are coal and nuclear and that is going to expand to natural gas.

What we are asking for is we need a Federal commitment from the President to Congress to invest in the research and development of fossil energy so we can use the cleanest and most environmentally responsible way possible and find that technology to do it so we are responsible.

My amendment does recognize these facts. I ask for a ''yea'' vote and appreciate your support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the Manchin amendment is a side-by-side to my amendment, which will follow.

The first three provisions are exactly the same: Climate change is real, it is caused by human activity, and it is already causing devastating problems.

We agree on that. But what my amendment says, importantly, is that according to the scientific community, it is imperative the United States transform its energy system away from fossil fuel to energy efficiency and sustainable energy as quickly as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we had a robust discussion yesterday on two amendments that dealt with the issue of climate change. I think we had a very clear and resounding vote on the one that had a perfectly reasonable statement that climate change is real; climate change is not a hoax.

I also supported the amendment of my colleague from North Dakota on this same topic. I think it was important that we had that debate.

What I am hoping we can do now is get beyond the discussion as to whether climate change is real and talk about: What do we do? How do we move forward to those technologies? How do we make a difference with reasonable steps such as greater efficiency, a no-regrets energy policy that makes our energy supply even cleaner.

I want to move on to that. But I think at this point in time, with what we have had in front of us, we could have a whole series of amendments that basically restate the same thing.

I would like to move us beyond that conversation, and I look forward to that. But at this time I move to table, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute to reply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is my understanding that a motion to table is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not debatable. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANCHIN. I am asking for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is asking for unanimous consent.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the original agreement said that, further, that all these amendments be limited to 60-vote affirmative threshold adoption, except for Cornyn and Menendez, and that no second-degrees be in order. So the original agreement we entered into allowed for this vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous consent agreement was for a vote in relation to each amendment, and the motion to table is in order.

QUORUM CALL

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll, and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 2 Leg.]

PRESENT

Alexander	Enzi	Menendez
Ayotte	Ernst	Merkley
Barrasso	Feinstein	Murkowski
Bennet	Fischer	Nelson
Blumenthal	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Franken	Peters
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Boxer	Grassley	Rounds
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Cantwell	Heinrich	Sanders
Capito	Heitkamp	Sasse
Cardin	Hirono	Schumer
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Isakson	Stabenow
Collins	King	Sullivan
Coons	Kirk	Tester
Corker	Klobuchar	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Manchin	Vitter
Cruz	Markey	Warner
Daines	McCain	Warren
Donnelly	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	McConnell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 99

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 15 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Ayotte	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Graham	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Kirk	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murphy	
Gillibrand	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The motion was agreed to.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 24

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 24, offered by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, we are walking down a very dangerous road as a nation when we reject the findings of the vast majority of scientists on one of the most important issues facing humanity, which is climate change.

A vote to table this amendment is a vote to reject science, and that is a very bad idea for the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, for the same reasons that I just expressed in the previous amendment that was before us, I would suggest that we move to table this amendment.

I will make that motion now to table the Sanders amendment, and I would ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is still 30 seconds remaining for the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. This is a vote that our kids and grandchildren who will have to live with the consequences of climate change will remember.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 16 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McCaskill	Vitter
Daines	McConnell	Warner
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Graham	Reid

The motion was agreed to.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CORNYN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 71

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 71, offered by the Senator from Utah, Mr. LEE.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I stand to urge my colleagues to support this amendment. The purpose of this amendment is to expedite the process by which the Bureau of Land Management processes applications for a permit for drilling on Federal land. We all know that drilling and the production of oil and natural gas in our country on Federal lands is an essential activity for our energy security and therefore for our national security.

The fact is that although these applications are supposed to be handled in an expedited manner, they are not. The average right now for them to be processed is about 7½ months. That is too long. We need a simple up-or-down ruling by the Bureau of Land Management, especially given the fact that these lands, once they get to this stage, have already been deemed by the Bureau of Land Management as suitable for oil and gas leasing. I therefore urge each of my colleagues to support this amendment and thereby secure our energy security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, speaking against the Lee amendment, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this because it is an amendment relating to oil and gas permits on Federal land. I guess if colleagues want to keep trying to loosen environmental regulations, then maybe they should support this amendment.

This amendment would impose new limitations on the Secretary of the Interior and their ability to process permits for drilling and provides a waiver for the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act if necessary reviews have not been completed by an arbitrary deadline, and it waives judicial review of these actions.

So I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wish to remind Members that we are trying to keep a schedule here. We have six more amendments to go in this stack, and we are supposedly at 10-minutes per amendment. We have not been following that. I urge Members to stick close so we can move more expeditiously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 17 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Isakson	Sessions
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McCain	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Vitter
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker

NAYS—47

Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Kirk	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Lankford	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Collins	McCaskill	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—2

Graham	Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Mr. LEE. I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 123

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 123, offered by the Senator from Alaska, Ms. MURKOWSKI.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we have the sense of the Senate that would express that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude should be subject to the 8-cent-per-barrel excise tax associated with the oilspill liability trust fund. This is important because right now we have a legitimate but unintended loophole on the books, and it is also a matter of fairness because conventional oil pays into the trust fund. We need to address this, and I commend my colleague Senator WYDEN for the effort he has done. But the problem that we have is that as we work to enact legislation to update our laws, we have to make sure it is consistent with the Constitution, which requires revenue-raising measures to originate in the House.

If we agree that we want to close this loophole, which we should do, we need to allow for the House to address this. Otherwise, we face a blue slip issue, and quite honestly, it would act as a poison pill to the Keystone XL bill. The sense of the Senate expresses to do it legitimately through the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am glad Senator MURKOWSKI has now agreed that the outlandish tar sands loophole, which rips off taxpayers and communities, must be closed. The difference between our amendments is that Senator MURKOWSKI's amendment is a nonbinding resolution to close the loophole sometime down the road. My amendment, in contrast, closes the loophole now.

The argument Senator MURKOWSKI makes against my amendment is that it is a revenue measure that should start in the House. The fact is that there is a House revenue measure at the Senate desk right now that I would be happy to call up and amend as a substitute to my amendment to close the loophole that ends the tar sands double standard harming our communities and taxpayers. That way we will be acting in a constitutional fashion and the Senate makes clear we want to close the loophole today.

I will close by saying that until I can propound the unanimous consent request to do just that, I intend to go along with the Murkowski amendment. After its consideration, I hope my colleagues will vote for my amendment because closing this flagrant tax loophole is too important to wait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 18 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Alexander	Durbin	Merkley
Ayotte	Enzi	Mikulski
Baldwin	Ernst	Murkowski
Barrasso	Feinstein	Murphy
Bennet	Fischer	Murray
Blumenthal	Flake	Nelson
Blunt	Franken	Peters
Booker	Gardner	Portman
Boxer	Gillibrand	Reed
Brown	Heinrich	Rounds
Burr	Heitkamp	Sanders
Cantwell	Hirono	Schatz
Capito	Hoeven	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson	Sessions
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	King	Stabenow
Cassidy	Kirk	Sullivan
Coats	Klobuchar	Tester
Cochran	Leahy	Thune
Collins	Manchin	Tillis
Coons	Markey	Udall
Corker	McCain	
Daines	McCaskill	
Donnelly	Menendez	
Vitter	Warren	Wicker
Warner	Whitehouse	Wyden

NAYS—23

Boozman	Inhofe	Risch
Cornyn	Isakson	Roberts
Cotton	Lankford	Rubio
Crapo	Lee	Sasse
Cruz	McConnell	Scott
Grassley	Moran	Shelby
Hatch	Paul	Toomey
Heller	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—2

Graham	Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to remind everybody these are supposed to be 10-minute rollcall votes. To the extent that you do not make it in the 10 minutes, you inconvenience everybody else. I would hope people would be respectful of their colleagues and stay close to the floor and vote during the 10 minutes.

We have actually reached a milestone here that I think is noteworthy for the Senate. We just cast our 15th rollcall vote on an amendment on this bill, which is more votes—more rollcall votes on amendments than the entire Senate in all of 2014.

I particularly want to commend Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL for their fair and open process that has been engaged in. This is the way the Senate ought to work.

Now the question I know on everyone's mind is: What do we do next? Right? It is Thursday night. We have a current tranche of amendments. We are having a little difficulty getting our friends on the other side of the aisle to offer their amendments so they can be considered.

In order to consider amendments, they need to be offered. So here is where we are for the evening: We are going to finish this tranche. Chairman MURKOWSKI is interested in setting up an additional tranche of amendments tonight. Once she has been able to set up an additional tranche of amendments for tonight, we will be able to announce the way forward for later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, first, I want to thank the majority leader for the compliment which he has placed to the constructive minority in the Senate. We know that under the rules of the Senate, this procedure could have been stopped at any moment by any Senator. Yet we have worked in good faith with the good leadership of Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator CANTWELL, and Senator BOXER. We want to continue to.

We have had a number of amendments considered here. Many of them had Republican responses which we have accommodated. Many of your amendments had Democratic responses which you have accommodated. I think we have done that in good faith. We have not threatened any filibusters. We have not tried to stop the process, and we do not want to. We think we have constructive amendments. We want to bring them forward. We would like to have a vote.

I agree with the Senator completely, this is a constructive use of the Senate floor and the Senate procedure on a critical issue relative to our environment and energy policy in this country.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend from Illinois. He is entirely correct. We are open for business. When we finish this tranche, I hope Senators on both sides who have additional amendments to be considered will come and offer them.

After we get an additional tranche of amendments that are pending, then I think we will be in a better position to announce the way forward.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 27

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 27, offered by the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, it is very significant that more than 70 Senators just voted for a nonbinding resolution to close an outlandish tax loophole that favors Canadian tar sand producers over American oil and American taxpayers. That vote was for a nonbinding resolution. The next amendment that I offer allows the Senate to actually eliminate the flagrant loophole now.

As for the blue-slip question, this amendment is an amendment that we ought to pass now and then add to an appropriate House revenue measure. This amendment, colleagues, ends the double standard today. To say to your communities, to your taxpayers, and to your producers that Canada should essentially get a free ride is not right. Let's actually do the job now.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, again, let me remind my colleagues that while we may agree we need to address this legal—but there is a loophole in the law. As many of us have just voted, 75 I believe, we say we need to address this oilspill liability trust fund issue.

Doing so in the manner that the Senator from Oregon has suggested does create a blue-slip problem. It would cause this bill to fail. It is not constructive to do so. The sense of this Senate that we just passed, I think, sends clearly the message that we want to address it, but we need to do it in a constitutional way. I would ask Members to vote no.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there is a constitutional point of order that lies against the pending amendment.

It was filed and offered by my friend, the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Oregon.

A constitutional point of order lies against the amendment, numbered 27 because it violates article 1, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, commonly referred to as the origination clause. The origination clause states that ''All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives. . . . ''

In addition, the pending amendment is not germane to the bill we are debating, and is not expected to pass. I reserve the right to raise this constitutional point of order against amendment No. 27 in the unlikely event that it passes. I will hold off for now on raising this point of order to spare the Senate an unnecessary vote.

However, I want to put everybody in the Senate on notice that, in the future, I reserve the right to raise this constitutional point of order regarding any proposal that violates the origination clause. In the Senate, revenue proposals should first be processed in the committee of jurisdiction in the Senate, which is the Senate Finance Committee.

I will vote ''no'' on the pending amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 19 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Franken	Murphy
Ayotte	Gardner	Murray
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Kirk	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Udall
Collins	Markey	Warner
Coons	McCaskill	Warren
Donnelly	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Mikulski	

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	McCain	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	Moran	Toomey
Daines	Murkowski	Vitter
Enzi	Paul	Wicker
Ernst	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—3

Graham	Lee	Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 78, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate in relation to amendment No. 78 offered by the Senator from Alaska, Ms. MURKOWSKI, for the Senator from Missouri, Mr. BLUNT.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I rise to support this amendment, cosponsored by Senator INHOFE, the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee; by Senator CAPITO, the new chair of the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety.

This amendment simply says the United States should not be bound by commitments where we are the only party that has a commitment made in the agreement with China. We agree to reduce emissions by 27 percent between now and a point in the future; the Chinese agree to increase emissions between now and 2030.

The amendment also says the President should have these kinds of agreements approved by the Senate. It also says the United States should not enter any international agreements that are disproportionately a disadvantage to us.

I urge support of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I will speak for the Senator from New Jersey, although this is a foreign policy question in general.

Let me say this: In the next 10 years, 50 percent of the new buildings that are going to be built in the world are going to be built in China. They are the most energy-inefficient buildings on the planet. So when we reached an agreement through the President of the United States to work together as a way to reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gases, guess what is going to win. American business, American product, and we are selling it to them because we have an agreement to work together to be more energy efficient.

So I don't want to slow down this President or any President in cutting deals to get U.S. products into markets because they agree we need to deal with this issue. Please don't slow down the ability to get U.S. product into foreign markets. Oppose the Blunt amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Blunt amendment, as modified.

Mr. VITTER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 20 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johnson	Sessions
Cornyn	Kirk	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McCain	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Vitter
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker

NAYS—46

Ayotte	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Boxer	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	McCaskill	Warner
Collins	Menendez	Warren
Coons	Merkley	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Mikulski	Wyden
Durbin	Murphy	
Feinstein	Murray	

NOT VOTING—3

Graham	Lee	Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 126, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes equally divided

prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 126, offered by the Senator from Alaska, Ms. MURKOWSKI, for the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the next amendment following the Cornyn amendment seeks to prohibit the use of eminent domain in the building of the Keystone XL Pipeline, but eminent domain is actually irrelevant to this bill. This is actually designed to confuse things and ultimately end up being a poison pill. I think it is accurate to say that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey is no fan of the Keystone XL Pipeline, so he wants to add this provision to the bill to make it impossible, basically, to implement.

The bill doesn't authorize or mandate the use of eminent domain to take any property; it simply approves a cross-border permit. The decision on how the property should be taken should be and will be made by the individual States in a process overseen by State courts and subject to the U.S. Constitution. My amendment simply reiterates that the standard in the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution applies.

I ask all Senators to vote for the Cornyn amendment and to vote against the Menendez amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, what I am not a fan of is a foreign company coming to the United States and taking the property of U.S. citizens. This amendment seems innocuous, but it embraces the seizure of private property for private gain to the full extent of the Constitution.

Ten years ago my dear friend from Texas decried the Kelo decision and advocated for severely restricting the use of eminent domain for private gain. Now, with this amendment, he endorses it.

The Founders of our country and its Constitution never envisioned having a company from another country come to the United States and use eminent domain to take the property of U.S. citizens for private purposes. That is what we are trying to avoid with the Menendez amendment.

If you vote for the amendment by the Senator from Texas, you in essence will continue to allow the opportunity for any foreign company to come into the United States and take private property of U.S. citizens for private purposes. That is not what we want to see.

Vote no on the Cornyn amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 21 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Nelson
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blumenthal	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heinrich	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Carper	Heller	Rubio
Casey	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Kaine	Sullivan
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Tillis
Cotton	Lankford	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Warner
Daines	McCaskill	Wicker
Donnelly	McConnell	
Enzi	Moran	

NAYS—33

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	King	Schatz
Boxer	Leahy	Schumer
Brown	Markey	Shaheen
Cantwell	Menendez	Stabenow
Cardin	Merkley	Tester
Coons	Mikulski	Udall
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Franken	Peters	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Graham	Lee	Reid

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 72, as modified, offered by the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. This amendment protects private property from unjust seizure by foreign corporations using eminent domain proceedings against the will of those who are not willing sellers.

Let me read a letter from the Nebraska landowners to the majority leader.

Dear Senator McConnell, our farms and ranches are definitely at risk of tar sands and benzene spills. We ask, even knowing that you support the Keystone Pipeline, that you vote for Senator Menendez's amendment that makes it clear TransCanada cannot take land from unwilling sellers. We ask you to stand up for our property rights and not permit eminent domain be used for private gain.

I wish to yield the remainder of my time to Senator TESTER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I support the pipeline. I think it has a lot of good benefits, but make no mistake about it, if you do not support the Menendez amendment—and there are a lot of Aggies on the other side of the aisle. If you do not support this amendment, you will allow a foreign corporation—a foreign corporation—to come in and use eminent domain to take the property. We don't want to go down this line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the Senate has spoken on the preceding amendment and overwhelmingly affirmed the Constitution as the only standard that should apply under these circumstances.

The standard being proposed by the Senator from New Jersey is an anti-States rights amendment, and it is designed to be a poison pill on this Keystone XL Pipeline, which he obviously does not support and wants to use every means to kill.

I would ask for a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 22 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Ayotte	Heinrich	Peters
Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Bennet	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	King	Schatz
Booker	Klobuchar	Schumer
Boxer	Leahy	Shaheen
Brown	Markey	Stabenow
Cantwell	McCaskill	Tester
Cardin	Menendez	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Warner
Coons	Mikulski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Franken	Nelson	
Gillibrand	Paul	

NAYS—54

Alexander	Cotton	Heller
Barrasso	Crapo	Hoeven
Blunt	Cruz	Inhofe
Boozman	Daines	Isakson
Burr	Donnelly	Johnson
Capito	Enzi	Kirk
Carper	Ernst	Lankford
Cassidy	Fischer	Manchin
Coats	Flake	McCain
Cochran	Gardner	McConnell
Collins	Grassley	Moran
Corker	Hatch	Murkowski
Cornyn	Heitkamp	Perdue

Portman	Sasse	Thune
Risch	Scott	Tillis
Roberts	Sessions	Toomey
Rounds	Shelby	Vitter
Rubio	Sullivan	Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Graham	Lee	Reid

The motion was rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MORAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we have just gone through a considerable period processing some votes. I appreciate the patience of colleagues as we have gone through it. As the majority leader mentioned, we want to figure out what the next tranche—the next grouping of amendments—will be, and then we will be able to figure out the path forward.

It is the hope of myself and the ranking member of the committee that we be able to get through a few more votes this evening, at a minimum, but also to set up a more clearly defined path for the coming days ahead, for tomorrow and Monday.

So I ask for the indulgence of Members as we call up a few amendments now to get them pending, and then we will work together to figure out what those votes will actually look like—which votes we will actually take up this evening.

Again, I think the opportunity to get amendments pending on both sides is good. It gives everybody an idea of the lay of the land and gives them a chance to look at the amendments we will bring up.

So at this point in time I wish to call up an amendment. When I have concluded, I will turn it over to the ranking member and an amendment will be called up on the Democratic side, and then we will come back to this side. We will alternate back and forth to get these amendments pending so Members can know what it is we have in this universe out there.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

With that, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up Sullivan amendment No. 67.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI], for Mr. SULLIVAN, proposes an amendment numbered 67 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To restrict the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to arm agency personnel)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. POWERS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

Section 3063(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I turn to my colleague, Senator CANTWELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I know our colleagues have been working throughout the day on these amendments, and I applaud them for their cooperation. As the Senator from Alaska said, oftentimes these needed side-by-sides—people need to see these. We have various committees that have been involved in these amendments, so I appreciate the patience of our colleagues.

I think going back and forth tonight on getting another set of amendments pending is a good idea because we have many Members on our side who have amendments they are very interested in having votes on. I appreciate them being here tonight. So I call on Senator CARDIN to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside to call up amendment No. 75.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] proposes an amendment numbered 75 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide communities that rely on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the Keystone XL pipeline an analysis of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of the pipeline)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. COMMUNITY RIGHT TO PROTECT LOCAL WATER SUPPLIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) there are 2,537 wells within 1 mile of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline, including 39 public water supply wells and 20 private wells within 100 feet of the pipeline right of way;

(2) 254 miles of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline would traverse over the shallow Ogallala Aquifer, the largest underground fresh water source in the United States, underlying 8 States and 2,000,000 people, including 10.5 miles where the groundwater lies at depths between 5 and 10 feet and another 12.4 miles where the water table is at a depth of 10 to 15 feet;

(3) on July 26, 2010, a pipeline ruptured near Marshall, Michigan, releasing 843,000 gallons of tar sands diluted bitumen into Talmadge Creek, flowing into the Kalamazoo River;

(4) the Talmadge Creek tar sands spill is the costliest inland oil spill cleanup in United States history, and the Kalamazoo River continues to be contaminated from the spill;

(5) on March 29, 2013, the first pipeline of the United States to transport Canadian tar sands to the Gulf Coast, the ExxonMobil Pegasus Pipeline, ruptured, spilling 210,000 gallons of tar sands diluted bitumen in Mayflower, Arkansas; and

(6) following the Pegasus Pipeline tar sands spill, individuals in the Mayflower community experienced severe headaches, nausea, and respiratory infections.

(b) PETITION TO PROTECT LOCAL WATER SUPPLIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and prior to construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a), the President, or the designee of the President, shall provide to each municipality or county that relies on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the pipeline an analysis of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of that pipeline.

(2) NOTIFICATION TO GOVERNORS.—The President shall provide a copy of the analysis described in paragraph (1) to the Governor of each State in which an affected municipality or county is located.

(3) EFFECT ON CONSTRUCTION.—Construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a) may not begin if the Governor of a State with an affected municipality or county submits, not later than 30 days after receiving an analysis under paragraph (2), a petition to the President requesting that the pipeline not be located in the affected municipality or county.

(4) WITHDRAWAL.—A Governor may withdraw a petition submitted under paragraph (3) at any time.

(5) RIGHT OF ACTION.—A property owner with a private water well drilled into any portion of an aquifer that is below the proposed pipeline described in section 2(a) may sue the owner of the pipeline for damages if—

(A) the well water of the property owner becomes contaminated as a result of—

(i) construction activities associated with the pipeline; or

(ii) a rupture in the pipeline; and

(B) the property owner demonstrates that the well water was safe prior to construction and operation of the pipeline.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I will be very brief.

This is an important amendment, as it deals with the rights of property owners to clean water. The Ogallala Aquifer is the largest aquifer in the western part of the United States, and the Keystone Pipeline would bisect that. At some point the aquifer is only 5 feet from the surface. Private owners drill wells to get their drinking water, and there is no protection in the event there is a spill. A spill is a real possibility. We have seen in prior cases in Michigan and Arkansas the impact of spills from this tar sands oil and the damage it can cause.

My amendment is pretty straightforward. It allows our Governors to be able to challenge the safety of their drinking water. It is a States rights issue. It gives the property owners whose wells could be contaminated by this the right of action. I ask my colleagues to favorably consider this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up Murkowski amendment No. 98.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI] proposes an amendment numbered 98 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress relating to adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed $3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I wish to recognize the Senator from Rhode Island to call up his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 74.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, and Mr. SCHUMER, proposes an amendment numbered 74 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program should be funded at not less than $4,700,000,000 annually)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (referred to in this section as ''LIHEAP'') is the main Federal program that helps low-income households and senior citizens with their energy bills, providing vital assistance during both the cold winter and hot summer months.

(2) Recipients of LIHEAP assistance are among the most vulnerable individuals in the country, with more than 90 percent of LIHEAP households having at least one member who is a child, a senior citizen, or disabled, and 20 percent of LIHEAP households including at least one veteran.

(3) The number of households eligible for LIHEAP assistance continues to exceed available funding, with current funding reaching just 20 percent of the eligible population.

(4) The average LIHEAP grant covers just a fraction of home energy costs, leaving many low-income families and senior citizens struggling to pay their energy bills and with fewer resources available to meet other essential needs.

(5) Access to affordable home energy is a matter of health and safety for many low-income households, children, senior citizens, and veterans.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that LIHEAP should be funded at not less than $4,700,000,000 annually, to ensure that more low-income households and children, senior citizens, individuals with disabilities, and veterans can meet basic home energy needs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this is a bipartisan amendment, which I am proud to sponsor with Senator COLLINS of Maine. It would express the sense of the Senate that we should fund LIHEAP, the Low Income Heating Assistance Program, at $4.7 billion. We have seen a significant diminution of the LIHEAP funding over the years.

This amendment helps every aspect of the country. It helps low-income households, particularly seniors. It would help immensely families throughout this country. In the winter it is about heating oil in New England and Alaska and all through the north and central plains. In the summer it is about cooling in the southwest and the southeast. If families and households can't get access to these resources, they have to make a hard choice between literally paying for their energy or sometimes their rent or sometimes their food. This program has been long supported on a bipartisan basis. We should aim for this figure.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I turn to my colleague from Arizona at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 103.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. FLAKE] proposes an amendment numbered 103 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs)

On page 3, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. 4___. EVALUATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE GREEN BUILDING PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The term ''administrative expenses'' has the meaning given the term by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under section 504(b)(2) of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (31 U.S.C. 1105 note; Public Law 111–85), except that the term shall include, for purposes of that section and this section, with respect to an agency—

(A) costs incurred by the agency and costs incurred by grantees, subgrantees, and other recipients of funds from a grant program or other program administered by the agency; and

(B) expenses related to personnel salaries and benefits, property management, travel, program management, promotion, reviews and audits, case management, and communication about, promotion of, and outreach for programs and program activities administered by the agency.

(2) APPLICABLE PROGRAMS.—The term ''applicable programs'' means the programs listed in Table 9 (pages 348-350) of the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled ''2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue''.

(3) APPROPRIATE SECRETARIES.—The term ''appropriate Secretaries'' means—

(A) the Secretary;

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(C) the Secretary of Defense;

(D) the Secretary of Education;

(E) the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(F) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

(G) the Secretary of Transportation;

(H) the Secretary of the Treasury;

(I) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(J) the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and

(K) the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(4) SERVICES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term ''services'' has the meaning given the term by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The term ''services'' shall be limited to activities, assistance, and aid that provide a direct benefit to a recipient, such as—

(i) the provision of medical care;

(ii) assistance for housing or tuition; or

(iii) financial support (including grants and loans).

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2015, the appropriate Secretaries shall submit to Congress and post on the public Internet websites of the agencies of the appropriate Secretaries a report on the outcomes of the applicable programs.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In reporting on the outcomes of each applicable program, the appropriate Secretaries shall—

(A) determine the total administrative expenses of the applicable program;

(B) determine the expenditures for services for the applicable program;

(C) estimate the number of clients served by the applicable program and beneficiaries who received assistance under the applicable program (if applicable);

(D) estimate—

(i) the number of full-time employees who administer the applicable program; and

(ii) the number of full-time equivalents (whose salary is paid in part or full by the Federal Government through a grant or contract, a subaward of a grant or contract, a cooperative agreement, or another form of financial award or assistance) who assist in administering the applicable program;

(E) describe the type of assistance the applicable program provides, such as grants, technical assistance, loans, tax credits, or tax deductions;

(F) describe the type of recipient who benefits from the assistance provided, such as individual property owners or renters, local governments, businesses, nonprofit organizations, or State governments; and

(G) identify and report on whether written program goals are available for the applicable program.

(c) PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than January 1, 2016, the appropriate Secretaries shall jointly submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) an analysis of whether any of the applicable programs should be eliminated or consolidated, including any legislative changes that would be necessary to eliminate or consolidate the applicable programs; and

(2) ways to improve the applicable programs by establishing program goals or increasing collaboration so as to reduce the overlap and duplication identified in—

(A) the 2011 report of the Government Accountability Office entitled ''Federal Initiatives for the NonFederal Sector Could Benefit from More Interagency Collaboration''; and

(B) the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled ''2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue''.

(d) PROGRAM ELIMINATIONS.—Not later than January 1, 2016, the appropriate Secretaries shall—

(1) identify—

(A) which applicable programs are specifically required by law; and

(B) which applicable programs are carried out under the discretionary authority of the appropriate Secretaries;

(2) eliminate those applicable programs that are not required by law; and

(3) transfer any remaining applicable projects and nonduplicative functions into another green building program within the same agency.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, in its 2012 annual report on opportunities to reduce duplication and achieve savings, the GAO noted that in 2011 there were 94 Federal initiatives to foster green buildings in the non-Federal sector. This report highlighted many initiatives that provided similar types of assistance, grants, technical assistance, tax credits, and so forth. This obviously doesn't sound like a recipe for proper oversight if this is still going on 5 years later.

This amendment would help tackle the problem simply by requiring agencies to evaluate and eliminate duplicative green building programs consistent with GAO's recommendations.

We ask GAO to study these things, and we often don't follow through and make sure the agencies follow up on the recommendations. This is simply ensuring that happens.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I call on the Senator from Vermont to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up amendment No. 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] proposes an amendment numbered 30 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike a provision relating to judicial review)

Beginning on page 2, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 3, line 10, and insert the following:

(d) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this will be set aside in a moment. First, I wish to note that my amendment is simply to make sure that if people have appeals on actions under this law, they be able to appeal in the courts within their jurisdictions and not have to trundle their way to Washington, DC. Too many people think Washington has the answers to everything.

My amendment simply says it is a States rights issue. It says the appeals will be in courts within their districts. That is a simple explanation. I spoke earlier on the floor, and I will speak more when the amendment comes up.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at this time I turn to my colleague from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. CRUZ. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CRUZ] proposes an amendment numbered 15 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. CRUZ. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To promote economic growth and job creation by increasing exports)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EXPEDITED APPROVAL OF EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION MEMBER COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(c) For purposes'' and inserting the following:

''(c) EXPEDITED APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—

''(1) DEFINITION OF WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION MEMBER COUNTRY.—In this subsection, the term 'World Trade Organization member country' has the meaning given the term 'WTO member country' in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

''(2) EXPEDITED APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—For purposes''; and

(2) in paragraph (2) (as so designated), by inserting ''or to a World Trade Organization member country'' after ''trade in natural gas''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to applications for the authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) that are pending on, or filed on or after, the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, this is an amendment to allow expedited export of liquid natural gas to WTO member countries. It would have benefits to our country in terms of jobs and economic growth as well as substantial geopolitical benefits to our allies. I expect to debate this further in the coming days.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I call on the Senator from Rhode Island to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 28.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WHITEHOUSE] proposes an amendment numbered 28 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require campaign finance disclosures for certain persons benefitting from tar sands development)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. CAMPAIGN FINANCE DISCLOSURES BY THOSE PROFITING FROM TAR SANDS DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) DISCLOSURE BY TAR SANDS BENEFICIARIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) INITIAL DISCLOSURE.—Every covered entity which has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers in an aggregate amount in excess of $10,000 during the period beginning on January 1, 2013, and ending on the date that is 165 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection shall file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2) not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

''(B) SUBSEQUENT DISCLOSURES.—Every covered entity which makes covered disbursements (other than covered disbursement reported under subparagraph (A))and received covered transfers (other than a covered transfer reported under subparagraph (A)) in an aggregate amount in excess of $10,000 during any calendar year shall, within 48 hours of each disclosure date, file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2).

''(2) CONTENTS OF STATEMENT.—Each statement required to be filed under this subsection shall be made under penalty of perjury and shall contain the following information:

''(A) The identification of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, of any person sharing or exercising direction or control over the activities of such person, and of the custodian of the books and accounts of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer.

''(B) The principal place of business of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, if not an individual.

''(C) The amount of each disbursement or transfer of more than $200 during the period covered by the statement and the identification of the person to whom the disbursement was made or from whom the transfer was received.

''(D) The elections to which the disbursements or transfers pertain and the names (if known) of the candidates involved.

''(E) If the disbursements were paid out of a segregated bank account which consists of funds contributed solely by individuals who are United States citizens or nationals or lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20))) directly to this account for electioneering communications, the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of $1,000 or more to that account during—

''(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

''(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

Nothing in this subparagraph is to be construed as a prohibition on the use of funds in such a segregated account for a purpose other than covered disbursements.

''(F) If the disbursements were paid out of funds not described in subparagraph (E), the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of $1,000 or more to the person making the disbursement during—

''(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

''(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

''(3) COVERED ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered entity' means—

''(i) any person who is described in subparagraph (B), and

''(ii) any person who owns 5 percent or more of any person described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) PERSON DESCRIBED.—A person is described in this subparagraph if such person—

''(i) holds one or more tar sands leases, or

''(ii) has received revenues or stands to receive revenues of $1,000,000 or greater from tar sands production, including revenues received in connection with—

''(I) exploration of tar sands;

''(II) extraction of tar sands;

''(III) processing of tar sands;

''(IV) building, maintaining, and upgrading the Keystone XL pipeline and other related pipelines used in connection with tar sands;

''(V) expanding refinery capacity or building, expanding, and retrofitting import and export terminals in connection with tar sands;

''(VI) transportation by pipeline, rail, and barge of tar sands;

''(VII) refinement of tar sands;

''(VIII) importing crude, refined oil, or byproducts derived from tar sands crude;

''(IX) exporting crude, byproducts, or refined oil derived from tar sands crude; and

''(X) use of production byproducts from tar sands, such as petroleum coke for energy generation.

''(C) TAR SANDS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'tar sands' means bitumen from the West Canadian Sedimentary Basin.

''(4) COVERED DISBURSEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered disbursement' means a disbursement for any of the following:

''(A) An independent expenditure.

''(B) A broadcast, cable, or satellite communication (other than a communication described in subsection (f)(3)(B)) which—

''(i) refers to a clearly identified candidate for Federal office;

''(ii) is made—

''(I) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than President or Vice President, during the period beginning on January 1 of the calendar year in which a general or runoff election is held and ending on the date of the general or runoff election (or in the case of a special election, during the period beginning on the date on which the announcement with respect to such election is made and ending on the date of the special election); or

''(II) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, is made in any State during the period beginning 120 days before the first primary election, caucus, or preference election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party is held in any State (or, if no such election or caucus is held in any State, the first convention or caucus of a political party which has the authority to nominate a candidate for the office of President or Vice President) and ending on the date of the general election; and

''(iii) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than President or Vice President, is targeted to the relevant electorate (within the meaning of subsection (f)(3)(C)).

''(C) A transfer to another person for the purposes of making a disbursement described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(5) COVERED TRANSFER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered transfer' means any amount received by a covered entity for the purposes of making a covered disbursement.

''(6) DISCLOSURE DATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'disclosure date' means—

''(A) the first date during any calendar year by which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of $10,000; and

''(B) any other date during such calendar year by which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of $10,000 since the most recent disclosure date for such calendar year.

''(7) CONTRACTS TO DISBURSE; COORDINATION WITH OTHER REQUIREMENTS; ETC,.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (f) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.''.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this is a measure that will allow a needed beam of daylight to be shown on the politics behind this bill we are on. As everybody knows, it is a little bit unusual to some that the opening measure of the new Republican majority would be a project that advantages a foreign oil company.

This measure would require the disclosure of political donations made by companies that stand to earn more than $1 million from this project. This is the kind of information the U.S. Supreme Court has clearly said citizens are entitled to know in order to make appropriate decisions, and in our democracy we should put our citizens first.

I will speak further about this amendment on a later occasion, and I yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I turn to my very patient colleague from Kansas, Mr. MORAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside to call up amendment No. 73.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. MORAN], for himself and Mr. CRUZ, proposes an amendment numbered 73 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To delist the lesser prairie-chicken as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973)

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. _____. DELISTING OF LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN AS THREATENED SPECIES.

Notwithstanding the final rule of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status for the Lesser Prairie-Chicken'' (79 Fed. Reg. 19974 (April 10, 2014)), the lesser prairie-chicken (Tympanuchus pallidicinctus) shall not be listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, this is an amendment that sets aside the endangered threatened species listing of the lesser prairie chicken. It is an important issue to the citizens of Kansas but also to Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Colorado.

I look forward to having this conversation and debate on the Senate floor at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I call on the Senator from Delaware to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 121 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment to the Murkowski substitute, amendment No. 121.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. CARPER] proposes an amendment numbered 121 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. CARPER. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To impose a fee of 8 cents per barrel on oil transported through the pipeline)

At the end of section 2, add the following:

(f) FEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A fee of 8 cents shall be imposed on each barrel of oil transported through the pipeline referred to in subsection (a).

(2) USE OF FEE REVENUE.—Revenue from the fee imposed under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the land and water conservation fund established under section 200302 of title 54, United States Code.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President and colleagues, you will recall from our debate earlier this evening concerns raised about the equity of—most oil that is consumed and transported through this country or into this country pays a fee. It is an 8-cent-per-barrel fee that goes into the oilspill liability fund. One source of oil that does not pay that 8-cent-per-barrel fee is derived from the oil sands. There has been some discussion of whether—I think there is a fair amount of agreement that that does not seem right, it doesn't seem equitable, and it is not fair to assess an 8-cent-per-barrel fee on all these other sources of oil but not apply that to oil derived from tar sands.

What I seek to suggest with my amendment is that an 8-cent-per-barrel fee be assessed on the oil derived from tar sands and the revenues derived therefrom would be deposited not in the oilspill liability fund but rather in the land and water conservation fund which has been in existence for many years.

I believe the balance in the oilspill liability fund is measured in the billions of dollars. The balance in the land and water conservation fund is not. The moneys are much smaller, much more modest, and that money provides funding in all 50 States. Many of us know the need far outweighs the money appropriated every year for this program.

The land and water conservation fund is also established not just to provide the revenues for national parks—and we are always looking for moneys for national parks. We just expanded our national parks system. How are we going to pay for that? The amendment I hope to offer would help to address that.

The land and water conservation fund was also established to help protect rivers, lakes, and critical habitat for wildlife, areas that may be impacted by the construction of this pipeline or a possible spill from this pipeline or from another spill.

Again, that is what I am asking. I will be concise. No fee is now paid on tar sands oil. I believe it should be the same as that which is assessed against other sources of oil.

What I would suggest is rather than put the moneys derived from that 8 cents on the tar sands oil—rather than that money going into the oilspill liability fund, which is quite robust, to instead deposit that in the land and water conservation fund where we could use it in all 50 States for a variety of good purposes. That is the nature of my amendment. I hope I have the opportunity to offer that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to turn to my colleague from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 132 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside to call up amendment No. 132.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DAINES] proposes an amendment numbered 132 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. DAINES. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding the designation of National Monuments)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

It is the sense of Congress that the designation of National Monuments should be subject to—

(1) consultation with each unit of local government within the boundaries of which the proposed National Monument is to be located; and

(2) the approval by the Governor and legislature of each State within the boundaries of which the proposed National Monument is to be located.

Mr. DAINES. In Montana we understand our resource use must be done responsibly. We also know that Montanans who live and use the land every day understand how to best protect these resources.

Unfortunately, the current administration, as well as past administrations, both Republican and Democratic—their efforts to stretch the intent of the Antiquities Act threatens Montanans' ability to manage our State's resources. It is a trend we are seeing in other States as well.

Too often these unilateral designations ignore the needs of the local communities, of sportsmen, of farmers and ranchers, small business owners who are directly impacted by these new designations.

The amendment I am offering simply expresses the sense of Congress that all future national monument designations should be subject to consultation with local governance and the approval of the Governor of that State and the legislature of that State in which the designation would occur.

This amendment ensures the people affected most by these designations have a seat at the table and their voices are heard.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I would like to call on the Senator from Massachusetts to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], for himself and Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. BALDWIN, proposes an amendment numbered 25 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MARKEY. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that products derived from tar sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. INCLUSION OF OIL DERIVED FROM TAR SANDS AS CRUDE OIL.

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of section 4612(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which may be established either by an Act of Congress or any regulations, rules, or guidance issued by the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service or the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate).

Mr. MARKEY. I ask that the amendment be put in order for debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we now have in front of us six amendments that are pending on the Republican side, six amendments that are pending on the other side of the aisle. We indicated we wanted to try to get these up, alternating back and forth. I think we have a pretty good range in front of us. Recognizing that it is important Members have an opportunity to take a look at the now 12 amendments that are pending, I think it is our hope that we would be able to, as the chairman and the ranking member, sit down and figure out how many of these we might be able to move to a vote this evening and dispense with some of them.

I think it is pretty clear we will have a difficult time perhaps advancing such a plan with everything tonight. So if we could have a little bit of time to work through an agreement to present to Members—I think right now people are taking a little bit of a break from the floor activity, and that is appreciated, but I want to give them notice as to where we are.

It is my hope we will be able to come to an agreement relatively shortly in terms of how many amendments we might be able to take up and vote on this evening, thus giving Members a better chance as to whether we are staying in for the long haul tonight or perhaps just for a shorter period, but we need a little bit of time to take a look at that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, we did go back and forth on these amendments, but I heard Senator MCCONNELL say he wanted Members to offer amendments. We have several Members who want to offer amendments. I hope there will be a time that those Members will be allowed to get their amendments pending before this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Washington stating that. This is by no means saying this is it for the night. I am just saying give the floor managers an opportunity now, with a dozen amendments that we have in front of us, to figure out what it is that we have. This would probably be a great time for people to speak on either their amendments or other amendments that they might wish to bring pending, but I am not suggesting this is our finite list of amendments. This is what we have for this moment in time, having gone back and forth. That is all I am suggesting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I have a pending amendment. Does the Senator object to my bringing that up? I would like to bring that up; can I do that?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I think it was the intention of the ranking member and myself that we go back and forth. We have done that, six each time now. I don't have other Members on our side who are either present, which we have asked them to be, or have asked me to offer on their behalf. I am certainly not suggesting to the Senator from Vermont that he should not be allowed to get his amendment pending. I am just trying to keep with the agreement we have that we go back and forth.

Mr. SANDERS. Would it be OK if I brought mine up and the Senator could catch up to it later? I am sure there will be another one.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Through the Chair, I am sure we will have other amendments. Again, I want to defer to the Senator's ranking member on that as far as whether we bring it pending at this moment in time. It might be possible after we reach our agreement that we have another set of back-and-forths to get these pending agreements put forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRASSO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 73

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, earlier this evening an amendment of mine was made pending to the legislation that we now have before us, amendment No. 73.

I thank my colleagues for allowing that amendment to become pending, and I look forward to the opportunity now, while we are determining the remainder of the evening's schedule, to describe the nature of amendment No. 73.

I have a copy of the amendment in front of me. It is a short paragraph, but it is one that has significant consequences to the people of Kansas. But in addition to the people of Kansas, it has significant consequence to the people of Colorado, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

The story we are talking about is the lesser prairie-chicken. In March of 2014, the lesser prairie-chicken was listed not as an endangered species but a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act.

It is true the numbers of birds declined in 2012 and 2013. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service had their explanation for why there was the decline in the population of those birds, both those who live on the land but as well a number of wildlife experts—people who are very interested in conservation practices in our State—believe and agree that the primary reason behind the bird's decline in population was the historic and prolonged drought that our area of the country has experienced in the past several years.

There is less habitat for birds generally in our State and across this region of the country, but the reality is that it is because we have had so little rainfall. We have been in a drought in a significant part of the Nation, in our part of the country, for a number of years, and as a result there is less habitat and a decline in the bird population. What many believe is that with the return of rainfall, with the return of snow this winter and the moisture it will provide, we will have increasing wildlife habitat for the lesser prairie-chicken and a large number of birds and other wildlife in our State and in the surrounding States where this is a significant issue.

There are some exceptions that have been written into the designation, but the reality is that there are huge, ongoing, significant economic consequences to the listing as a threatened species of the lesser prairie-chicken in Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas. Front and center of that, of course, are the consequences to agriculture. It is how we earn a significant portion of our living in our State. Land values, for example, have dropped as a result of this issue. Oil and gas exploration has been disrupted. Wind energy projects that have been an important component of our State economy and particularly a benefit to the economy of rural Kansas have been harmed as a result of this listing. These disruptions have driven down county tax revenues that are used for essential services in some of the most challenging and difficult parts economically of our State, from damage to Main Street,

and certainly harmed a portion of Kansas that always struggles to be economically viable.

The listing, in my view, was based on an artificially low population estimate due to the drought I described. I guess I failed to mention that 1 year ago this was a bird which could be hunted in Kansas. So, again, it was prevalent enough to be able to be pursued by those who hunt, but because of the drought the population declined. In fact, every Kansas county that is included in the habitat area was experiencing a D3–Extreme or a D4–Exceptional drought, according to the U.S. Drought Monitor, again highlighting that what we need here is rainfall and moisture that comes from snow and rain and that listing this as a threatened species doesn't create the moisture necessary to create the habitat for the return of the population of the bird.

What we really have asked for is an opportunity which has been offered and suggested by conservation groups in Kansas, by the Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks, and by the Kansas Farm Bureau and others to work together to find a solution short of this listing to increase bird population in Kansas. And I assume that is true in the other States as well. We are looking for a cooperative effort to improve habitat, and the fact is that the listing as a threatened species has been so disruptive that we have been unable to get what we would say is a more commonsense, less broad-brush approach to solving this problem in place as compared to the heavy hand of this listing. We stand ready, willing, and able to provide that kind of local effort to improve habitat and bird population.

This amendment would not mean the lesser prairie-chicken would never be listed again, but it gives Kansans and others the opportunity to go back and make certain that efforts at the local level are given a chance to work before the very dramatic and devastating implementation of this decision to list the bird as threatened.

So this is a relatively straightforward and simple amendment that will take the lesser prairie-chicken off the list as a threatened species, give Kansans and others the opportunity to improve the habitat, reduce the economic damage that is being done in our State and the States that surround us as a result of this listing, and then give us the opportunity to again work with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to find a better solution and one that, I might add, may be more easily found once the rainfalls return to the State of Kansas.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the opportunity to describe this amendment, and it is certainly my request and I look forward to it being an amendment that would be considered tonight, later this evening.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING WENDELL FORD

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn today of the death of Senator Wendell Ford of Kentucky. Wendell Ford was a skilled political mind and as warm a human being as any U.S. Senator has ever been.

During my first 2 years in the U.S. Senate, Senator Ford was the assistant Democratic leader, the same job I have today. I was fortunate, able to learn by example from one of the best. And how fortunate the people of Kentucky and all Americans were to have had the benefit of Wendell Ford's public service.

Senator Ford served in the Senate for nearly a quarter of a century. Before that, he served the Bluegrass State as a State senator, Governor, and lieutenant governor. He defended America in uniform during World War II.

Maybe because he had already accomplished so much before he came to the Senate, he never worried about headlines. Instead, he was content to work quietly, diligently, effectively—often with colleagues from across the aisle—to solve problems.

The last desk Senator Ford occupied in the Senate was once occupied by another great Kentucky Senator, ''the great compromiser'' Henry Clay. Like Henry Clay, Wendell Ford believed that compromise was honorable and necessary in a democracy. But Wendell Ford also understood that compromise is, in Henry Clay's words, ''negotiated hurt.'' So Wendell Ford tried, whenever possible, to work out disagreements between the scenes, away from the cameras, where Senators could bend and still keep their dignity.

In 1991 Wendell's quiet bipartisan style convinced a Senator from across the aisle, Mark Hatfield of Oregon, to join him in sponsoring the motor voter bill. Working together, this Democrat and this Republican Senator convinced the entire Senate it was time to pass this landmark bill. To this day the motor voter bill remains the most ambitious effort Congress has made since the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to open up the voting booth to more Americans.

Wendell Ford distinguished himself in the Senate as a determined foe of government waste and duplication and a champion of campaign finance reform.

His raspy voice was unmistakable. His good humor and wise counsel were indispensable in some of the most important debates. He will be missed.

I know our entire Senate sends their condolences to Senator Ford's wife Jean and to all of Senator Ford's family and friends.

I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to thank the senior Senator from Illinois for what he said about my dear friend Senator Wendell Ford.

I was fortunate to come here to the Senate the same year that Senator Ford did. We were different in age, and I must say, different in experience. He had a lot more experience than I did, and I relied on his experience and his help. We traveled together, and we talked together so often. He had the unfailing characteristic of the best of the Senators—both Republicans and Democrats. He always kept his word. He was always very honest and direct with you. If he made a commitment, you could go to the bank with it.

I remember the night we had a dinner for his retirement. There was a dozen of us that came in that year. There were only four left and three were retiring that night—Wendell Ford, John Glen, and Dale Bumpers. It was wonderful to listen to the three of them reminisce about the Senate.

I said to Wendell Ford at that time: Save me a seat on that lifeboat as you are leaving. I thought how lonely it would be without him. Fortunately, I have a good friend like the senior Senator from Illinois to fill the void.

But Wendell Ford had probably more knowledge and sense of politics—not just knowledge but sense—of how to work things out, how to get liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats together, than most people ever have.

He had a raspy voice, but he was good natured, with a sense of humor. And when I go back through the people I have met, the 300 or more Senators I have had the opportunity to serve with, I think of Wendell Ford as one who epitomizes what a Senator should be.

I had talked to him just a few months ago. I will speak more about him later on, but I think the Senator from Illinois has given probably as good a description of this wonderful man as any of the rest of us might, and I thank him for that.

I yield the floor.

QUORUM CALL

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll, and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 3 Leg.]

Boozman	Hirono	Perdue
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sanders
Collins	Leahy	Sasse
Corker	Markey	Schumer
Cornyn	McConnell	Tillis
Durbin	Murkowski	Vitter

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 23 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Ayotte	Feinstein	Perdue
Baldwin	Fischer	Peters
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Bennet	Gardner	Reed
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Risch
Booker	Hatch	Roberts
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Boxer	Heitkamp	Rubio
Brown	Hirono	Sanders
Burr	Hoeven	Sasse
Cantwell	Inhofe	Schatz
Capito	Isakson	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson	Scott
Carper	Kaine	Sessions
Casey	King	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kirk	Shelby
Coats	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Lankford	Sullivan
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Markey	Thune
Corker	McCaskill	Tillis
Cornyn	McConnell	Toomey
Cotton	Merkley	Udall
Crapo	Mikulski	Vitter
Cruz	Moran	Warner
Daines	Murkowski	Warren
Donnelly	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Enzi	Nelson	

NAYS—5

Blunt	Heller	Wicker
Grassley	McCain	

NOT VOTING—6

Franken	Lee	Menendez
Graham	Manchin	Reid

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With the addition of Senators who did not answer the quorum call, a quorum is now present.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Can we have order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Senate is not yet in order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MCCONNELL. My colleagues, here is the situation. Earlier today we cast our 15th rollcall vote on this bill. That is more votes than we had on all amendments on the floor—rollcall votes—throughout all of 2014. We have now voted on 19 rollcall amendments, and here is the situation in which we find ourselves at 10 o'clock on Thursday night. There are 12 amendments pending—6 Democratic amendments and 6 Republican amendments—but our good friends on the other side will not agree to vote on their own amendments.

So we find ourselves in a unique situation. We have opened up the Senate for amendments for both sides. Our colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, have had more rollcall votes on amendments than all of last year combined. Yet our Democratic friends don't even want to agree to vote on the amendments they have pending.

We are left with only one way to avoid having to invoke cloture on each amendment, which would tie up the Senate for weeks, in order to provide our colleagues on the other side an opportunity to vote on the amendments they said they wanted to vote on. So there is really only one way to go forward, and so what I am going to do is ask unanimous consent that starting at 10 o'clock the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Sullivan No. 67, Cardin No. 75, Murkowski No. 98, Reed No. 74, Flake No. 103, Leahy No. 30; Cruz No. 15, Whitehouse No. 28, Moran No. 73, Carper No. 121, Daines No. 132, and Markey No. 25; further, that all amendments on this list be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption and that no second-degrees be in order to the amendments. I ask consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between each vote and that all votes after the first in the series be 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the majority leader came to the floor this evening and commended the Senate for the work we have done. He pointed out the constructive, bipartisan, good-faith efforts that have been made on both sides. Earlier today we disposed of 10 separate amendments, 5 on each side. Those amendments were given to us yesterday. During the last 24 hours there has been active negotiation back and forth on side-by-side amendments. In fact, the Republican Senator from Missouri and the Republican Senator from Nebraska asked to modify their amendments while they were still pending. There was a good-faith effort to make these amendments ready for floor consideration, and they were. They were brought before the Senate, and they were voted on in an orderly way. We all know that in the rules of the Senate you can stop the train. No one did on this side of the aisle. We moved forward in an orderly way.

Now at 8 o'clock this evening, 12 more amendments have come forward, 6 on each side. The majority leader is correct. What we are trying to do, as we did with the previous 10 amendments, is to work through these in an orderly fashion, and we propose that we start considering them tomorrow morning.

Those who are interested in—the staff who are interested, the Members who are interested can work to put these 12 amendments in order. We will start working on them as early as the majority leader wants to work tomorrow morning and start working through the amendments and those others that may be offered. But I would say, if we are going to continue in the spirit of good faith, bipartisan cooperation, then let us work together as we have leading up to today to come to the point where we can have a vote on those amendments.

There are others that may be offered on both sides. But for these pending amendments, we are ready to commit to you that we will be here first thing in the morning, and let's start considering them.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me just say one more time, I think everybody understands. What we have here are at least six Democratic amendments that presumably they understand because they offered them. I assume they know what is in them because they wrote them and offered them. Yet they do not want to vote on them.

We have been on this bill for a while. We have already had more rollcall votes on this bill than the entire Senate had on every bill through the whole year of 2014. I think it is time that we start moving forward.

So since there is an objection to setting votes on the pending amendments, there is really only one way to ensure a vote on these amendments absent a cloture motion, which I was explaining earlier. If we had to file cloture on each of these amendments, we would be on them for weeks trying to help our friends on the other side get votes on amendments they offered.

So given the fact that they are reluctant to vote on their own amendments, which presumably they understand, the only way to go forward is to table their amendments. So I, therefore, intend to begin tabling the pending amendments, ensuring a vote on the proposals they have offered, which presumably they understand, but moving the process along tonight.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. MCCONNELL. For a question only, without losing the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Did the majority leader not notify the entire Senate that we would be working on Fridays?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am not suggesting we are not working on Friday. I am suggesting we are working tonight.

Mr. DURBIN. I would say to the majority leader, we are prepared to start working in an orderly fashion on Friday, as we did earlier today.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Well, I have not said anything about Friday. Did anybody hear me say anything about Friday? We are talking about right now.

AMENDMENT NO. 25

Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 25, offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table the pending amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 1 minute to speak on my amendment before it is voted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. DURBIN, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 4 Leg.]

Alexander	Ernst	Nelson
Baldwin	Feinstein	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Peters
Bennet	Gardner	Risch
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Roberts
Blunt	Grassley	Rounds
Boozman	Hatch	Sasse
Boxer	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Heitkamp	Schumer
Cantwell	Heller	Sessions
Capito	Hirono	Shaheen
Cassidy	Hoeven	Shelby
Coats	Inhofe	Stabenow
Cochran	Isakson	Sullivan
Collins	King	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Corker	Manchin	Tillis
Cornyn	Markey	Toomey
Cotton	McCain	Udall
Crapo	McCaskill	Warner
Cruz	McConnell	Warren
Daines	Merkley	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Murkowski	Wicker
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Enzi	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 25

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 24 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Ernst	Perdue
Ayotte	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Flake	Risch
Blunt	Gardner	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rounds
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Capito	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Kirk	Sullivan
Corker	Lankford	Tester
Cornyn	McCain	Thune
Cotton	McCaskill	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Toomey
Cruz	Moran	Vitter
Daines	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Paul	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Franken	Hatch	Reid
Graham	Lee	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 121

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I call for the regular order with respect to Carper amendment No. 121.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to table the Carper amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized for 1 minute, please.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 25 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Enzi	Murkowski
Ayotte	Ernst	Paul
Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Bennet	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Sullivan
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McCaskill	Vitter
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Donnelly	Moran	Wyden

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Leahy	Schumer
Cantwell	Manchin	Shaheen
Cardin	Markey	Stabenow
Carper	Menendez	Tester
Casey	Merkley	Udall
Durbin	Mikulski	Warner
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—5

Coons	Graham	Reid
Franken	Lee	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 28

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I call for regular order with respect to the Whitehouse amendment No. 28.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent for just 1 minute to defend my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. May I ask unanimous consent for just 1 minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 26 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Ernst	Perdue
Ayotte	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Flake	Risch
Blunt	Gardner	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rounds
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Capito	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Sullivan
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Vitter
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Murkowski	
Enzi	Paul	

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Peters
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	King	Schatz
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schumer
Brown	Leahy	Shaheen
Cantwell	Manchin	Stabenow
Cardin	Markey	Tester
Carper	McCaskill	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Heinrich	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—5

Coons	Graham	Reid
Franken	Lee	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 30

Mr. MCCONNELL. I call for regular order with respect to Leahy amendment No. 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute to explain the States rights amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the request from the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. PERDUE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 27 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Ayotte	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heitkamp	Rubio
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	King	Schatz
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schumer
Brown	Leahy	Shaheen
Cantwell	Markey	Stabenow
Cardin	McCaskill	Tester
Carper	Menendez	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Warner
Donnelly	Mikulski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—6

Coons	Graham	Lee
Franken	Kirk	Reid

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 74

Mr. MCCONNELL. I call for regular order with respect to Reed amendment No. 74.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 1 minute on the Reed-Collins amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORNYN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 28 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alexander	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Flake	Risch
Blunt	Gardner	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rounds
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Capito	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	McCain	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Toomey
Cruz	Moran	Vitter
Daines	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Paul	
Ernst	Perdue	

NAYS—45

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Manchin	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	McCaskill	Udall
Collins	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—6

Coons	Graham	Lee
Franken	Kirk	Reid

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion on the pending substitute to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill 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 Murkowski amendment No. 2: the Keystone XL pipeline approval act.

Mitch McConnell, Lisa Murkowski, Richard Burr, Jerry Moran, John Thune, Marco Rubio, Johnny Isakson, Kelly Ayotte, Ben Sasse, Deb Fischer, John Boozman, David Vitter, Tim Scott, Roger F. Wicker, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Roy Blunt.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion on the underlying bill to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill 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 S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

Mitch McConnell, Lisa Murkowski, Richard Burr, Jerry Moran, John Thune,

Marco Rubio, Johnny Isakson, Kelly Ayotte, Ben Sasse, Deb Fischer, John Boozman, David Vitter, Tim Scott, Roger F. Wicker, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Roy Blunt.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that at 9:30 a.m. Friday, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Sullivan No. 67, Cardin No. 75, Murkowski No. 98, Flake No. 103, Cruz No. 15, Moran No. 73, and Daines No. 132; further, that all amendments on the list be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption and no second degrees be in order to the amendments. I ask consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between each vote and that all votes after the first in the series be 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, now that we have purged the calendar of five of the six Democratic amendments, the majority leader tells us it is time to vote.

It doesn't strike me that this is in the best interest of what we are trying to achieve. We are going back and forth in a bipartisan, constructive fashion. I would like to ask the majority leader is he prepared to be in session tomorrow and to consider Democratic and Republican amendments and work through the list, including the ones he just tabled?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Does the Senator from Illinois intend to object to my consent?

Mr. DURBIN. What I am asking is to try to amend this so it does have some balance. The majority leader mentioned one Democratic amendment and at least five or six Republican amendments to be considered tomorrow.

Mr. MCCONNELL. We just had votes on Democratic amendments that the Senator's Members offered and he didn't want to agree to have a vote.

Mr. DURBIN. The RECORD will reflect the spirited debate on those amendments when the majority leader wouldn't even give the authors 60 seconds to describe what was in the amendment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Am I correct the Senator from Illinois is going to object?

Mr. DURBIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the next vote will be Monday, at 5:30 p.m. The assistant Democratic leader and I have agreed to announce no more votes tonight.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO BEN RICHMOND

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a great Kentuckian and a man who has dedicated his entire career to promoting civil rights and helping people. My good friend Ben Richmond, the longtime president and CEO of the Louisville Urban League, recently announced his impending retirement from that position. Mr. Richmond has served as president and CEO of the Louisville Urban League for nearly 30 years-since 1987.

Mr. Richmond is a civil rights champion who has led a venerable civil rights institution such as the Louisville Urban League to new heights. Under his tenure, the Louisville Urban League has promoted job training and education for many in Louisville's African-American community. His body of work is so outstanding that in 2007 he received from the city the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Freedom Award, a recognition for a local activist who is dedicated to King's principles and who has promoted peace, equality, and justice.

Since Mr. Richmond took over the Louisville Urban League, the staff has grown from around 20 to 30 and the annual budget grown from under $1 million to around $3.3 million. Mr. Richmond is the driving force for fundraising for the budget.

The Louisville Urban League placed more than 200 people in jobs last year with a combined annual income of nearly $5 million. It helped about 1,000 prepare for finding employment through career expos, job training, referrals, and career counseling. It also has many programs to help youth and seniors.

The Louisville Urban League is nearly halfway towards realizing their goal of seeing 15,000 local African Americans earn college degrees between 2012 and 2020. Mr. Richmond oversaw the Louisville Urban League's move to a new headquarters in 1990. And under Mr. Richmond's tenure, the Louisville Urban League was just one of 13 Urban League affiliates nationwide to receive a top score in a self-audit required by the National Urban League.

We are lucky, that after his retirement, Mr. Richmond plans on staying in Louisville. Our city can continue to benefit from his wisdom and experience. I want to wish my good friend Mr. Ben Richmond all the best in retirement, and I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in congratulating Ben for his successful tenure at the helm of the Louisville Urban League. The city of Louisville and the State of Kentucky have certainly benefitted immeasurably by his many efforts over the decades.

The Louisville Courier-Journal newspaper recently published an article extolling Mr. Ben Richmond's many accomplishments. I ask unanimous consent that said article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Courier-Journal, Jan. 21, 2015]

URBAN LEAGUE CEO RICHMOND RETIRING

(By Sheldon S. Shafer)

Ben Richmond, a cornerstone of local social activism for more than a quarter century and a major advocate of economic equality, is retiring as president and CEO of the Louisville Urban League.

Richmond announced his impending retirement at an Urban League board meeting Tuesday, after serving as head of the civil-rights organization since 1987.

Under the leadership of Richmond, a mainstay in the push to improve economic development in western Louisville, the Urban League has long been dedicated to promoting job training and education, primarily for Louisville's poorer citizens.

Richmond ''has been one of the anchors for diversity and for stability in not only the African-American community but the overall Louisville community,'' said Raoul Cunningham, Louisville NAACP president. ''I am going to miss Ben, his counsel and his cooperative spirit.''

Richmond ''has become known around the country for innovative and groundbreaking approaches to helping residents improve their quality of life,'' said Dan Hall, a University of Louisville vice president and the Urban League board chairman. ''He is intensely passionate about helping individuals find a pathway to success.''

Richmond received Louisville Metro's Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Freedom Award in 2007, an annual recognition given by the city to a local activist dedicated to King's principles and who has promoted peace, equality and justice.

Then-Mayor Jerry Abramson said at the time that ''over his decades of leadership, countless lives have been improved through Ben's tireless efforts in workforce development, housing and youth programs.''

The national Urban League was founded in 1910, and the Louisville agency in 1921. The local league was set up chiefly to help rural black Southerners who had moved to Louisville after World War I.

The Louisville Urban League under Richmond has greatly expanded its reach. It placed about 250 people in jobs last year and

helped around 1,000 more prepare for finding employment. The league's career-development efforts range from helping job seekers draft resumes to mock job interviews.

In recent times the league has sponsored Saturday morning enrichment classes for children. And it has found buyers for dozens of new single-family homes built on vacant or abandoned property under its Project Rebound program in Russell, helping to transform the surrounding neighborhood.

League efforts annually include career expos; job training, referrals and career counseling; a variety of services for employers; homeownership training and counseling: a health and wellness program called Get Fit Louisville; a walk to defeat childhood obesity; and a long list of programs to help both youths and seniors in many ways.

Benjamin K. Richmond, 71 and single, was born in Durham, N.C., and raised in Jackson, Miss.

Richmond came to the Louisville Urban League as president and CEO in 1987, after top jobs with league affiliates in Wisconsin and Michigan. Richmond here replaced the league's longtime leader, the late Art Walters. Walters, who died in 2010 at age 91, directed the Louisville Urban League from 1970 to 1987.

Since Richmond took over, the league's staff has grown from around 20 to 30—also aided by dozens of volunteers—and its annual budget has grown from under $1 million to around $3.3 million this year. The funds have been cobbled together largely by Richmond—from Metro United Way and numerous public and private sources.

The current budget, for instance, includes about $340,000 from United Way, less than $100,000 from Metro Government and a $1.2 million federal grant earmarked primarily for programs for seniors.

The league has several departments, including the Center for Workforce Development, the Center for Housing and Financial Empowerment and the Center for Youth Development and Education.

Richmond said in an interview Monday that he expects to remain on the job until around June 30, or until a replacement is named by the agency's board, after a planned national search. He said he may then stay on under a contract for a while longer.

Richmond intends to stay in Louisville, while traveling some to visit relatives in Mississippi and Arizona.

But he pledges to remain active, noting that ''there are many opportunities in both the public and private sectors here. I will see what emerges. But I want to have fun.''

Among many achievements during his tenure, Richmond cited:

Opening the league headquarters in 1990 at 1535 W. Broadway, a 19,000-square-foot office, community meeting site, classroom and job-training facility. The league invested $1.6 million in the headquarters, which was paid off long ago. Richmond said the league headquarters has spurred significant nearby development along Broadway.

The economic impact of the league in terms of finding jobs for more than 200 people last year. Their combined annual income should be nearly $5 million.

Richmond noted that in recent years the league helped find jobs for dozens of minorities in construction of the KFC Yum! Center, and he said the league was instrumental in getting the PGA of America to establish an urban youth golf program and also hire top staff minorities.

That a halfway point has nearly been reached toward a goal—shared with partner organizations such as Simmons College and Jefferson Community and Technical College—to have 15,000 local African-Americans earn college degrees between 2012 and 2020. The minority effort is part of the community's 55,000 Degrees effort.

That the league last year received a top score in a self-audit—a review of its staff, policies, finances and procedures—required every three years by the National Urban League. The Louisville agency was just one of 13 affiliates of the national organization to achieve that status, Richmond said.

Richmond said he is proud that under his oversight the local league has attained financial stability, adding that he believes his organized is widely respected.

Under Richmond, the league has become more diversified. About half of its 36-member board and about half the staff are white. Richmond said he has strived to ''practice what we preach—racial diversity.''

Richmond ''has been a tremendous leader,'' said Metro Councilman David Tandy, D–4th District. ''There is still work to do, but he has been at the forefront of the second, or third, wave of the civil-rights movement, focusing on economic opportunity. . . . He has played a pivotal role in the community.''

Richmond ''has tried to create opportunities and meet challenges our community has faced,'' said longtime ally Sam Watkins, president of the Louisville Central Community Center, another West End-based, pro-development group.

''He's been a champion for west Louisville and has been proactive in trying to garner desperately needed attention for the area's issues and problems.''

REMEMBERING WENDELL FORD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today the United States Senate family lost one of its Members. Early this morning, our friend and colleague, Senator Wendell Ford, passed away at his home in Owensboro, KY.

Senator Wendell Ford's service to his State and country spanned seven decades. A veteran of World War II and longtime member of the Kentucky Army National Guard, Wendell Ford's first elected position was that of State senator. In 1967 he ran successfully for Lieutenant Governor. Four years later he was elected Governor.

Following his term as Governor, the people of Kentucky sent him to the U.S. Senate, where he enjoyed a distinguished 24-year career. He was my predecessor as Democratic whip, a position that he held from 1995 to 1999. When Senator Ford retired, he was the longest serving U.S. Senator in Kentucky history, a record that my friend, the majority leader, eclipsed in 2009.

Senator Wendell Ford loved Kentucky. His loyalty to his home State was never in question. During his time here in the Senate, he unabashedly and unapologetically fought for anything that would give Kentucky families a helping hand. Similarly, anyone or anything that threatened Kentucky and its people was met with Senator Ford's fierce opposition.

My thoughts today are with his family. I express my condolences to his wife of 71 years, Jean Neel, their children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Senator Wendell Ford will be greatly missed by his loved ones, the people of Kentucky and the United States of America.

FIVE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF CITIZENS UNITED DECISION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, yesterday marked the 5-year anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission. In this sweeping opinion, on a divided 5 to 4 vote, the Court held that the First Amendment permitted corporations to spend freely from their treasuries to influence elections. As a result of Citizens United and the series of decisions that followed in its wake, we have witnessed wealthy, well-connected campaign donors and special interests unleash a deluge of cash in an effort to sway Federal, State, and local elections across our Nation.

Let me be clear: I firmly believe that every voice should be heard in our country, and every perspective should have a seat at the Nation's policy-making table. However, Citizens United has led to a system that allows a privileged group of deep-pocketed donors and corporations to drown out the voices of ordinary citizens in an effort to buy and control every seat at the table.

The numbers speak for themselves. During the last Presidential election, outside groups poured more than one billion dollars into Federal races, over three times the $338 million that outside groups spent in 2008. More than 93 percent of all super PAC donations in 2012 came in contributions of at least $10,000 from 3,318 donors, who make up 0.0011 percent of the U.S. population. Of that group, an elite class of 159 people each contributed at least $1 million—funding nearly 60 percent of all super PAC donations that year.

We saw this trend continue during the recent midterm elections. Outside groups spent more than $560 million to influence 2014 Federal races—8 times the approximately $70 million spent in 2006, the last midterm election cycle before Citizens United. In 2014, we also saw a significant increase in political activity by tax-exempt ''dark money'' groups that do not publicly disclose their donors. Citizens United and its progeny have created a campaign finance system flush with secret cash and sorely lacking in transparency.

The impact stretches from Congress to state capitols to city halls throughout the country. As in Federal campaigns, Citizens United has led to an explosion of outside spending at the State and local levels, with corporations and wealthy single spenders looking to play kingmaker, pouring cash into races for positions ranging from district attorney to city commissioner. One of the most startling examples last fall occurred in Richmond, CA, a city with a population of 107,000. Chevron—an energy company with more than $200 billion in annual revenue—spent approximately $3 million through campaign committees aimed at influencing the mayoral and city council races. That means Chevron spent at least $33 per voting-age resident in Richmond.

While the influx of spending is well documented, I believe that the long-

term damage to our political process from Citizens United is just beginning to reveal itself. Some scandals have already emerged, and there will doubtlessly be more stories of corruption and corrosive influence ahead. As a result, the public confidence in our government will continue to erode.

I have worked with my colleagues on a number of solutions to address these concerns. Yesterday, several of these proposals were introduced in both the Senate and House of Representatives. I strongly support my colleagues in their efforts to improve disclosure and create a more transparent campaign finance system, and I will continue my efforts to establish a public financing system for Congressional elections through the Fair Elections Now Act, which I plan to reintroduce soon.

We also must continue to push for a constitutional amendment that would protect and restore the First Amendment by overturning Citizens United and empowering Congress and State legislatures to set reasonable, content neutral limitations on campaign spending. Last year, as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights, I was proud to preside over a hearing and a vote on Senator UDALL's Democracy for All amendment. A majority of the Senate voted in favor of the bill, but not enough to defeat a Republican filibuster. We will continue to pursue this amendment and work toward its ultimate ratification.

As I said last year, supporting a constitutional amendment to reform our campaign finance system was not a decision I came to lightly. There is a very high bar for amending the Constitution and that is exactly the way it should be. In fact, Senator UDALL's amendment was the only constitutional amendment that the Constitution Subcommittee approved during my time as chairman. But I believe it is necessary to clean up our campaign finance system once and for all. Only a constitutional amendment can fully undo the damage of Citizens United and ensure that elections are a contest of the best ideas—not just the ideas of multimillionaires and corporate titans.

In the 5 years since Citizens United was decided, we have watched the corrosive influence of special interest money grow. It crosses the political spectrum, with wealthy donors vying for influence and streams of secret cash emerging from both the right and the left. Meanwhile, everyday Americans struggle for their voices to be heard amidst the endless ads blanketing the airwaves, so often financed by corporate interests.

As Justice Rehnquist once noted, corporations are granted the advantages of perpetual life, property ownership, and limited liability ''to enhance [their] efficiency as an economic entity.'' But he went on to say that ''those properties, so beneficial in the economic sphere, pose special dangers in the political sphere.'' While some First Amendment protections have rightfully been extended beyond everyday Americans to corporations, Citizens United went too far. Living, breathing Americans face challenges and have concerns that are very different than those faced by corporations—and their resources pale in comparison.

The special dangers of corporate influence in elections have never been more evident. The Supreme Court should fully examine the impact and effects of Citizens United and consider its damaging consequences as future cases involving campaign finance come before the Court. In the meantime, I will work with my colleagues to continue our legislative efforts to fix America's campaign finance system and overturn Citizens United so that elected officials listen to the everyday Americans who elected them—not just the wealthy donors and special interests that bankrolled their success.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying rules for the Senate Committee on Finance be printed in the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

I. RULES OF PROCEDURE (ADOPTED JANUARY ??, 2015)

Rule 1. *Regular Meeting Days*.—The regular meeting day of the committee shall be the second and fourth Tuesday of each month, except that if there be no business before the committee the regular meeting shall be omitted.

Rule 2. *Committee Meetings*.—(a) Except as provided by paragraph 3 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to special meetings called by a majority of the committee) and subsection (b) of this rule, committee meetings, for the conduct of business, for the purpose of holding hearings, or for any other purpose, shall be called by the chairman after consultation with the ranking minority member. Members will be notified of committee meetings at least 48 hours in advance, unless the chairman determines that an emergency situation requires a meeting on shorter notice. The notification will include a written agenda together with materials prepared by the staff relating to that agenda. After the agenda for a committee meeting is published and distributed, no nongermane items may be brought up during that meeting unless at least two-thirds of the members present agree to consider those items.

(b) In the absence of the chairman, meetings of the committee may be called by the ranking majority member of the committee who is present, provided authority to call meetings has been delegated to such member by the chairman.

Rule 3. *Presiding Officer*.—(a) The chairman shall preside at all meetings and hearings of the committee except that in his absence the ranking majority member who is present at the meeting shall preside.

(b) Notwithstanding the rule prescribed by subsection (a) any member of the committee may preside over the conduct of a hearing.

Rule 4. *Quorums*.—(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) one-third of the membership of the committee, including not less than one member of the majority party and one member of the minority party, shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business.

(b) Notwithstanding the rule prescribed by subsection (a), one member shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

Rule 5. *Reporting of Measures or Recommendations*.—No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the committee unless a majority of the committee is actually present and a majority of those present concur.

Rule 6. *Proxy Voting; Polling*.—(a) Except as provided by paragraph 7(a)(3) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to limitation on use of proxy voting to report a measure or matter), members who are unable to be present may have their vote recorded by proxy.

(b) At the discretion of the committee, members who are unable to be present and whose vote has not been cast by proxy may be polled for the purpose of recording their vote on any rollcall taken by the committee.

Rule 7. *Order of Motions*.—When several motions are before the committee dealing with related or overlapping matters, the chairman may specify the order in which the motions shall be voted upon.

Rule 8. *Bringing a Matter to a Vote*.—If the chairman determines that a motion or amendment has been adequately debated, he may call for a vote on such motion or amendment, and the vote shall then be taken, unless the committee votes to continue debate on such motion or amendment, as the case may be. The vote on a motion to continue debate on any motion or amendment shall be taken without debate.

Rule 9. *Public Announcement of Committee Votes*.—Pursuant to paragraph 7(b) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to public announcement of votes), the results of rollcall votes taken by the committee on any measure (or amendment thereto) or matter shall be announced publicly not later than the day on which such measure or matter is ordered reported from the committee.

Rule 10. *Subpoenas*.—Witnesses and memoranda, documents, and records may be subpoenaed by the chairman of the committee with the agreement of the ranking minority member or by a majority vote of the committee. Subpoenas for attendance of witnesses and the production of memoranda, documents, and records shall be issued by the chairman, or by any other member of the committee designated by him.

Rule 11. *Nominations*.—In considering a nomination, the committee may conduct an investigation or review of the nominee's experience, qualifications, and suitability, to serve in the position to which he or she has been nominated. To aid in such investigation or review, each nominee may be required to submit a sworn detailed statement including biographical, financial, policy, and other information which the committee may request. The committee may specify which items in such statement are to be received on a confidential basis. Witnesses called to testify on the nomination may be required to testify under oath.

Rule 12. *Open Committee Hearings*.—To the extent required by paragraph 5 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to limitations on open hearings), each hearing conducted by the committee shall be open to the public.

Rule 13. *Announcement of Hearings*.—The committee shall undertake consistent with the provisions of paragraph 4(a) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate

(relating to public notice of committee hearings) to issue public announcements of hearings it intends to hold at least one week prior to the commencement of such hearings.

Rule 14. *Witnesses at Hearings*.—(a) Each witness who is scheduled to testify at any hearing must submit his written testimony to the staff director not later than noon of the business day immediately before the last business day preceding the day on which he is scheduled to appear. Such written testimony shall be accompanied by a brief summary of the principal points covered in the written testimony. Having submitted his written testimony, the witness shall be allowed not more than ten minutes for oral presentation of his statement.

(b) Witnesses may not read their entire written testimony, but must confine their oral presentation to a summarization of their arguments.

(c) Witnesses shall observe proper standards of dignity, decorum, and propriety while presenting their views to the committee. Any witness who violates this rule shall be dismissed, and his testimony (both oral and written) shall not appear in the record of the hearing.

(d) In scheduling witnesses for hearings, the staff shall attempt to schedule witnesses so as to attain a balance of views early in the hearings. Every member of the committee may designate witnesses who will appear before the committee to testify. To the extent that a witness designated by a member cannot be scheduled to testify during the time set aside for the hearing, a special time will be set aside for the witness to testify if the member designating that witness is available at that time to chair the hearing.

Rule 15. *Audiences*.—Persons admitted into the audience for open hearings of the committee shall conduct themselves with the dignity, decorum, courtesy, and propriety traditionally observed by the Senate. Demonstrations of approval or disapproval of any statement or act by any member or witness are not allowed. Persons creating confusion or distractions or otherwise disrupting the orderly proceeding of the hearing shall be expelled from the hearing.

Rule 16. *Broadcasting of Hearings*.—(a) Broadcasting of open hearings by television or radio coverage shall be allowed upon approval by the chairman of a request filed with the staff director not later than noon of the day before the day on which such coverage is desired.

(b) If such approval is granted, broadcasting coverage of the hearing shall be conducted unobtrusively and in accordance with the standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the Senate.

(c) Equipment necessary for coverage by television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing room while the committee is in session.

(d) Additional lighting may be installed in the hearing room by the media in order to raise the ambient lighting level to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(e) The additional lighting authorized by subsection (d) of this rule shall not be directed into the eyes of any members of the committee or of any witness, and at the request of any such member or witness, offending lighting shall be extinguished.

Rule 17. *Subcommittees*.—(a) The chairman, subject to the approval of the committee, shall appoint legislative subcommittees. The ranking minority member shall recommend to the chairman appointment of minority members to the subcommittees. All legislation shall be kept on the full committee calendar unless a majority of the members present and voting agree to refer specific legislation to an appropriate subcommittee.

(b) The chairman may limit the period during which House-passed legislation referred to a subcommittee under paragraph (a) will remain in that subcommittee. At the end of that period, the legislation will be restored to the full committee calendar. The period referred to in the preceding sentences should be 6 weeks, but may be extended in the event that adjournment or a long recess is imminent.

(c) All decisions of the chairman are subject to approval or modification by a majority vote of the committee.

(d) The full committee may at any time by majority vote of those members present discharge a subcommittee from further consideration of a specific piece of legislation.

(e) The chairman and ranking minority members shall serve as nonvoting ex officio members of the subcommittees on which they do not serve as voting members.

(f) Any member of the committee may attend hearings held by any subcommittee and question witnesses testifying before that subcommittee.

(g) Subcommittee meeting times shall be coordinated by the staff director to ensure that—

(1) no subcommittee meeting will be held when the committee is in executive session, except by unanimous consent;

(2) no more than one subcommittee will meet when the full committee is holding hearings; and

(3) not more than two subcommittees will meet at the same time.

Notwithstanding paragraphs (2) and (3), a subcommittee may meet when the full committee is holding hearings and two subcommittees may meet at the same time only upon the approval of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee and subcommittees involved.

(h) All nominations shall be considered by the full committee.

(i) The chairman will attempt to schedule reasonably frequent meetings of the full committee to permit consideration of legislation reported favorably to the committee by the subcommittees.

Rule 18. *Transcripts of Committee Meetings*.—An accurate record shall be kept of all markups of the committee, whether they be open or closed to the public. A transcript, marked as ''uncorrected,'' shall be available for inspection by Members of the Senate, or members of the committee together with their staffs, at any time. Not later than 21 business days after the meeting occurs, the committee shall make publicly available through the Internet—

(a) a video recording;

(b) an audio recording; or

(c) after all members of the committee have had a reasonable opportunity to correct their remarks for grammatical errors or to accurately reflect statements, a corrected transcript.

Notwithstanding the above, in the case of the record of an executive session of the committee that is closed to the public pursuant to Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the record shall not be published or made public in any way except by majority vote of the committee after all members of the committee have had a reasonable opportunity to correct their remarks for grammatical errors or to accurately reflect statements made.

Rule 19. *Amendment of Rules*.—The foregoing rules may be added to, modified, amended, or suspended at any time.

II. EXCERPTS FROM THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

RULE XXV

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, and shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed, with leave to report by bill or otherwise on matters within their respective jurisdictions:

* * *

(i) Committee on Finance, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Bonded debt of the United States, except as provided in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

2. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.

3. Deposit of public moneys.

4. General revenue sharing.

5. Health programs under the Social Security Act and health programs financed by a specific tax or trust fund.

6. National social security.

7. Reciprocal trade agreements.

8. Revenue measures generally, except as provided in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

9. Revenue measures relating to the insular possessions.

10. Tariffs and import quotas, and matters related thereto.

11. Transportation of dutiable goods.

* * *

RULE XXVI

COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

* * *

2. Each committee shall adopt rules (not inconsistent with the Rules of the Senate) governing the procedure of such committee. The rules of each committee shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress, except that if any such committee is established on or after February 1 of a year, the rules of that committee during the year of establishment shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than sixty days after such establishment. Any amendment to the rules of a committee shall not take effect until the amendment is published in the Congressional Record.

* * *

5. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of the rules, when the Senate is in session, no committee of the Senate or any subcommittee thereof may meet, without special leave, after the conclusion of the first two hours after the meeting of the Senate commenced and in no case after two o'clock post meridian unless consent therefor has been obtained from the majority leader and the minority leader (or in the event of the absence of either of such leaders, from his designee). The prohibition contained in the preceding sentence shall not apply to the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on the Budget. The majority leader or his designee shall announce to the Senate whenever consent has been given under this subparagraph and shall state the time and place of such meeting. The right to make such announcement of consent shall have the same priority as the filing of a cloture motion.

(b) Each meeting of a committee, or any subcommittee thereof, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by a committee or a subcommittee thereof

on the same subject for a period of no more than fourteen calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in clauses (1) through (6) would require the meeting to be closed, followed immediately by a record vote in open session by a majority of the members of the committee or subcommittee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(2) will relate solely to matters of committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(3) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(4) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(5) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets of financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(A) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(B) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(6) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations.

(c) Whenever any hearing conducted by any such committee or subcommittee is open to the public, that hearing may be broadcast by radio or television, or both, under such rules as the committee or subcommittee may adopt.

(d) Whenever disorder arises during a committee meeting that is open to the public, or any demonstration of approval or disapproval is indulged in by any person in attendance at any such meeting, it shall be the duty of the Chair to enforce order on his own initiative and without any point of order being made by a Senator. When the Chair finds it necessary to maintain order, he shall have the power to clear the room, and the committee may act in closed session for so long as there is doubt of the assurance of order.

(e) Each committee shall prepare and keep a complete transcript or electronic recording adequate to fully record the proceeding of each meeting or conference whether or not such meeting or any part thereof is closed under this paragraph, unless a majority of its members vote to forgo such a record.

* * *

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—114TH CONGRESS

I. MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. Meetings of the Committee may be called by the Chairman as he may deem necessary on three days' notice of the date, time, place and subject matter of the meeting, or in the alternative with the consent of the Ranking Minority Member, or pursuant to the provision of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as amended.

2. Unless a different date and time are set by the Chairman pursuant to (1) of this section, Committee meetings shall be held beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Thursdays the Senate is in session, which shall be the regular meeting day for the transaction of business.

3. At the request of any member, or by action of the Chairman, a bill, matter, or nomination on the agenda of the Committee may be held over until the next meeting of the Committee or for one week, whichever occurs later.

II. HEARINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. The Committee shall provide a public announcement of the date, time, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the Committee or any Subcommittee at least seven calendar days prior to the commencement of that hearing, unless the Chairman with the consent of the Ranking Minority Member determines that good cause exists to begin such hearing at an earlier date. Witnesses shall provide a written statement of their testimony and curriculum vitae to the Committee at least 24 hours preceding the hearings in as many copies as the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee prescribes.

2. In the event 14 calendar days' notice of a hearing has been made, witnesses appearing before the Committee, including any witness representing a Government agency, must file with the Committee at least 48 hours preceding appearance written statements of their testimony and curriculum vitae in as many copies as the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee prescribes.

3. In the event a witness fails timely to file the written statement in accordance with this rule, the Chairman may permit the witness to testify, or deny the witness the privilege of testifying before the Committee, or permit the witness to testify in response to questions from Senators without the benefit of giving an opening statement.

III. QUORUMS

1. Seven Members of the Committee, actually present, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of discussing business. Nine Members of the Committee, including at least two Members of the minority, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of transacting business. No bill, matter, or nomination shall be ordered reported from the Committee, however, unless a majority of the Committee is actually present at the time such action is taken and a majority of those present support the action taken.

2. For the purpose of taking down sworn testimony, a quorum of the Committee and each Subcommittee thereof, now or hereafter appointed, shall consist of one Senator.

IV. BRINGING A MATTER TO A VOTE

The Chairman shall entertain a non-debatable motion to bring a matter before the Committee to a vote. If there is objection to bring the matter to a vote without further debate, a roll call vote of the Committee shall be taken, and debate shall be terminated if the motion to bring the matter to a vote without further debate passes with eleven votes in the affirmative, one of which must be cast by the minority.

V. AMENDMENTS

1. Provided at least seven calendars days' notice of the agenda is given, and the text of the proposed bill or resolution has been made available at least seven calendar days in advance, it shall not be in order for the Committee to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee unless such amendment has been delivered to the office of the Committee and circulated via e-mail to each of the offices by at least 5:00 p.m. the day prior to the scheduled start of the meeting.

2. It shall be in order, without prior notice, for a Member to offer a motion to strike a single section of any bill, resolution, or amendment under consideration.

3. The time limit imposed on the filing of amendments shall apply to no more than three bills identified by the Chairman and included on the Committee's legislative agenda.

4. This section of the rule may be waived by agreement of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member.

VI. PROXY VOTING

When a recorded vote is taken in the Committee on any bill, resolution, amendment, or any other question, a quorum being present, Members who are unable to attend the meeting may submit votes by proxy, in writing or by telephone, or through personal instructions. A proxy must be specific with respect to the matters it addresses.

VII. SUBCOMMITTEES

1. Any Member of the Committee may sit with any Subcommittee during its hearings or any other meeting, but shall not have the authority to vote on any matter before the Subcommittee unless a Member of such Subcommittee.

2. Subcommittees shall be considered de novo whenever there is a change in the Subcommittee chairmanship and seniority on the particular Subcommittee shall not necessarily apply.

3. Except for matters retained at the full Committee, matters shall be referred to the appropriate Subcommittee or Subcommittees by the Chairman, except as agreed by a majority vote of the Committee or by the agreement of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member.

4. Provided all members of the Subcommittee consent, a bill or other matter may be polled out of the Subcommittee. In order to be polled out of a Subcommittee, a majority of the members of the Subcommittee who vote must vote in favor of reporting the bill or matter to the Committee.

VIII. ATTENDANCE RULES

1. Official attendance at all Committee business meetings of the Committee shall be kept by the Committee Clerk. Official attendance at all Subcommittee business meetings shall be kept by the Subcommittee Clerk.

2. Official attendance at all hearings shall be kept, provided that Senators are notified by the Committee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, in the case of Committee hearings, and by the Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, in the case of Subcommittee Hearings, 48 hours in advance of the hearing that attendance will be taken; otherwise, no attendance will be taken. Attendance at all hearings is encouraged.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the committee and to publish those rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. Today, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs adopted Committee Rules of Procedure.

Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

PURSUANT TO RULE XXVI, SEC. 2, STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

RULE 1. MEETINGS AND MEETING PROCEDURES OTHER THAN HEARINGS

A. Meeting dates. The Committee shall hold its regular meetings on the first Wednesday of each month, when the Congress is in session, or at such other times as the Chairman shall determine. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as he/she deems necessary to expedite Committee business. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 3, Standing Rules of the Senate.)

B. Calling special Committee meetings. If at least three Members of the Committee desire the Chairman to call a special meeting, they may file in the offices of the Committee a written request therefor, addressed to the Chairman. Immediately thereafter, the clerk of the Committee shall notify the Chairman of such request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of such request, the Chairman fails to call the requested special meeting, which is to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of such request, a majority of the Committee Members may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special Committee meeting will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the Committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of such notice, the Committee chief clerk shall notify all Committee Members that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 3, Standing Rules of the Senate.)

C. Meeting notices and agenda. Written notices of Committee meetings, accompanied by an agenda, enumerating the items of business to be considered, shall be sent to all Committee Members at least 5 days in advance of such meetings, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays in which the Senate is not in session. The written notices required by this Rule may be provided by electronic mail. In the event that unforeseen requirements or Committee business prevent a 5-day notice of either the meeting or agenda, the Committee staff shall communicate such notice and agenda, or any revisions to the agenda, as soon as practicable by telephone or otherwise to Members or appropriate staff assistants in their offices.

D. Open business meetings. Meetings for the transaction of Committee or Subcommittee business shall be conducted in open session, except that a meeting or series of meetings on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in clauses (1) through (6) below would require the meeting to be closed, followed immediately by a record vote in open session by a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee Members when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of foreign relations of the United States;

(2) will relate solely to matters of Committee or Subcommittee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(3) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(4) will disclose the identity of an informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(5) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets of financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(A) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(B) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(6) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(b), Standing Rules of the Senate.) Notwithstanding the foregoing, whenever disorder arises during a Committee or Subcommittee meeting that is open to the public, or any demonstration of approval or disapproval is indulged in by any person in attendance at any such meeting, it shall be the duty of the Chairman to enforce order on his or her own initiative and without any point of order being made by a Member of the Committee or Subcommittee; provided, further, that when the Chairman finds it necessary to maintain order, he/she shall have the power to clear the room, and the Committee or Subcommittee may act in closed session for so long as there is doubt of the assurance of order. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(d), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

E. Prior notice of first degree amendments. It shall not be in order for the Committee, or a Subcommittee thereof, to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee or Subcommittee unless a written copy of such amendment has been delivered to each Member of the Committee or Subcommittee, as the case may be, and to the office of the Committee or Subcommittee, by no later than 5:00 p.m. two days before the meeting of the Committee or Subcommittee at which the amendment is to be proposed. The written copy of amendments in the first degree required by this Rule may be provided by electronic mail. This subsection may be waived by a majority of the Members present, or by consent of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or Subcommittee. This subsection shall apply only when at least 72 hours written notice of a session to mark-up a measure is provided to the Committee or Subcommittee.

F. Meeting transcript. The Committee or Subcommittee shall prepare and keep a complete transcript or electronic recording adequate to fully record the proceeding of each meeting whether or not such meeting or any part thereof is closed to the public, unless a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee Members vote to forgo such a record. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(e), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

RULE 2. QUORUMS

A. Reporting measures and matters. A majority of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for reporting to the Senate any measures, matters or recommendations. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(a)(1), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

B. Transaction of routine business. One-third of the membership of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of routine business, provided that one Member of the Minority is present. For the purpose of this paragraph, the term ''routine business'' includes the convening of a meeting and the consideration of any business of the Committee other than reporting to the Senate any measures, matters or recommendations. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(a)(1), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

C. Taking testimony. One Member of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for taking sworn or unsworn testimony. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(a)(2) and 7(c)(2), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

D. Subcommittee quorums. Subject to the provisions of sections 7(a)(1) and (2) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Subcommittees of this Committee are authorized to establish their own quorums for the transaction of business and the taking of sworn testimony.

E. Proxies prohibited in establishment of quorum. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

RULE 3. VOTING

A. Quorum required. Subject to the provisions of subsection (E), no vote may be taken by the Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, on any measure or matter unless a quorum, as prescribed in the preceding section, is actually present.

B. Reporting measures and matters. No measure, matter or recommendation shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee Members are actually present, and the vote of the Committee to report a measure or matter shall require the concurrence of a majority of those Members who are actually present at the time the vote is taken. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(a)(1) and (3), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

C. Proxy voting. Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, except that, when the Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, is voting to report a measure or matter, proxy votes shall be allowed solely for the purposes of recording a Member's position on the pending question. Proxy voting shall be allowed only if the absent Committee or Subcommittee Member has been informed of the matter on which he or she is being recorded and has affirmatively requested that he or she be so recorded. All proxies shall be filed with the chief clerk of the Committee or Subcommittee thereof, as the case may be. All proxies shall be in writing and shall contain sufficient reference to the pending matter as is necessary to identify it and to inform the Committee or Subcommittee as to how the Member establishes his or her vote to be recorded thereon. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(a)(3) and 7(c)(1), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

D. Announcement of vote. (1) Whenever the Committee by roll call vote reports any measure or matter, the report of the Committee upon such a measure or matter shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to such measure or matter by each Member of the Committee. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(c), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

(2) Whenever the Committee by roll call vote acts upon any measure or amendment thereto, other than reporting a measure or matter, the results thereof shall be announced in the Committee report on that measure unless previously announced by the Committee, and such announcement shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to each such measure and amendment thereto by each Member of the Committee who was present at the meeting. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(b), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

(3) In any case in which a roll call vote is announced, the tabulation of votes shall state separately the proxy vote recorded in favor of and in opposition to that measure, amendment thereto, or matter. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(b) and (c), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

E. Polling. (1) The Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, may poll (a) internal Committee or Subcommittee matters including the Committee's or Subcommittee's staff, records and budget; (b) steps in an investigation, including issuance of subpoenas, applications for immunity orders, and requests for documents from agencies; and (c) other Committee or Subcommittee business other than a vote on reporting to the Senate any measures, matters or recommendations or a vote on closing a meeting or hearing to the public.

(2) Only the Chairman, or a Committee Member or staff officer designated by him/her, may undertake any poll of the Members of the Committee. If any Member requests, any matter to be polled shall be held for meeting rather than being polled. The chief clerk of the Committee shall keep a record of polls; if a majority of the Members of the Committee determine that the polled matter is in one of the areas enumerated in subsection (D) of Rule 1, the record of the poll shall be confidential. Any Committee Member may move at the Committee meeting following the poll for a vote on the polled decision, such motion and vote to be subject to the provisions of subsection (D) of Rule 1, where applicable.

F. Naming postal facilities. The Committee will not consider any legislation that would name a postal facility for a living person with the exception of bills naming facilities after former Presidents and Vice Presidents of the United States, former Members of Congress over 70 years of age, former State or local elected officials over 70 years of age, former judges over 70 years of age, or wounded veterans.

RULE 4. CHAIRMANSHIP OF MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

The Chairman shall preside at all Committee meetings and hearings except that he or she shall designate a temporary Chairman to act in his or her place if he or she is unable to be present at a scheduled meeting or hearing. If the Chairman (or his or her designee) is absent 10 minutes after the scheduled time set for a meeting or hearing, the Ranking Majority Member present shall preside until the Chairman's arrival. If there is no Member of the Majority present, the Ranking Minority Member present, with the prior approval of the Chairman, may open and conduct the meeting or hearing until such time as a Member of the Majority arrives.

RULE 5. HEARINGS AND HEARING PROCEDURES

A. Announcement of hearings. The Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, shall make public announcement of the date, time, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least 1 week in advance of such hearing, unless the Committee, or Subcommittee, determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 4(a), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

B. Open hearings. Each hearing conducted by the Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, shall be open to the public, except that a hearing or series of hearings on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in clauses (1) through (6) below would require the hearing to be closed, followed immediately by a record vote in open session by a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee Members when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such hearing or hearings—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of foreign relations of the United States;

(2) will relate solely to matters of Committee or Subcommittee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(3) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(4) will disclose the identity of an informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(5) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets of financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(A) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(B) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(6) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(b), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

Notwithstanding the foregoing, whenever disorder arises during a Committee or Subcommittee meeting that is open to the public, or any demonstration of approval or disapproval is indulged in by any person in attendance at any such meeting, it shall be the duty of the Chairman to enforce order on his or her own initiative and without any point of order being made by a Member of the Committee or Subcommittee; provided, further, that when the Chairman finds it necessary to maintain order, he or she shall have the power to clear the room, and the Committee or Subcommittee may act in closed session for so long as there is doubt of the assurance of order. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(d), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

C. Full Committee subpoenas. The Chairman, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, is authorized to subpoena the attendance of witnesses at a hearing or deposition or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials. The Chairman may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chairman has not received a letter of disapproval signed by the Ranking Minority Member within 72 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays in which the Senate is not in session, of the Ranking Minority Member's receipt of a letter signed by the Chairman providing notice of the Chairman's intent to issue a subpoena, including an identification of all individuals and items sought to be subpoenaed. Delivery and receipt of the signed notice and signed disapproval letters and any additional communications related to the subpoena may be carried out by staff officers of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, and may occur through electronic mail. If a subpoena is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided in this subsection, the subpoena may be authorized by vote of the Members of the Committee. When the Committee or Chairman authorizes subpoenas, subpoenas may be issued upon the signature of the Chairman or any other Member of the Committee designated by the Chairman.

D. Witness counsel. Counsel retained by any witness and accompanying such witness shall be permitted to be present during the testimony of such witness at any public or executive hearing or deposition to advise such witness while he or she is testifying, of his or her legal rights; provided, however, that in the case of any witness who is an officer or employee of the Government, or of a corporation or association, the Committee Chairman may rule that representation by counsel from the Government, corporation, or association or by counsel representing other witnesses, creates a conflict of interest, and that the witness may only be represented during interrogation by staff or during testimony before the Committee by personal counsel not from the Government, corporation, or association or by personal counsel not representing other witnesses. This subsection shall not be construed to excuse a witness from testifying in the event his or her counsel is ejected for conducting himself or herself in such manner so as to prevent, impede, disrupt, obstruct or interfere with the orderly administration of the hearings; nor shall this subsection be construed as authorizing counsel to coach the witness or answer for the witness. The failure of any witness to secure counsel shall not excuse such witness from complying with a subpoena or deposition notice.

E. Witness transcripts. An accurate electronic or stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in executive and public hearings. The record of his or her testimony whether in public or executive session shall be made available for inspection by the witness or his or her counsel under Committee supervision; a copy of any testimony given in public session or that part of the testimony given by the witness in executive session and subsequently quoted or made part of the record in a public session shall be provided to any witness at his or her expense if he or she so requests. Upon inspecting his or her transcript, within a time limit set by the chief clerk of the Committee, a witness may request changes in the transcript to correct errors of transcription and grammatical errors; the Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her shall rule on such requests.

F. Impugned persons. Any person whose name is mentioned or is specifically identified, and who believes that evidence presented, or comment made by a Member of the Committee or staff officer, at a public hearing or at a closed hearing concerning which there have been public reports, tends

to impugn his or her character or adversely affect his or her reputation may:

(a) File a sworn statement of facts relevant to the evidence or comment, which statement shall be considered for placement in the hearing record by the Committee;

(b) Request the opportunity to appear personally before the Committee to testify in his or her own behalf, which request shall be considered by the Committee; and

(c) Submit questions in writing which he or she requests be used for the cross-examination of other witnesses called by the Committee, which questions shall be considered for use by the Committee.

G. Radio, television, and photography. The Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, may permit the proceedings of hearings which are open to the public to be photographed and broadcast by radio, television or both, subject to such conditions as the Committee, or Subcommittee, may impose. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(c), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

H. Advance statements of witnesses. A witness appearing before the Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, shall provide electronically a written statement of his or her proposed testimony at least 48 hours prior to his or her appearance. This requirement may be waived by the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member following their determination that there is good cause for failure of compliance. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 4(b), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

I. Minority witnesses. In any hearings conducted by the Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, the Minority Members of the Committee or Subcommittee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of the Minority Members, to call witnesses of their selection during at least 1 day of such hearings. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 4(d), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

J. Swearing in witnesses. In any hearings conducted by the Committee, the Chairman or his or her designee may swear in each witness prior to their testimony.

K. Full Committee depositions. Depositions may be taken prior to or after a hearing as provided in this subsection.

(1) Notices for the taking of depositions shall be authorized and issued by the Chairman, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. The Chairman may initiate depositions without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chairman has not received a letter of disapproval of the deposition signed by the Ranking Minority Member within 72 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays in which the Senate is not in session, of the Ranking Minority Member's receipt of a letter signed by the Chairman providing notice of the Chairman's intent to issue a deposition notice, including identification of all individuals sought to be deposed. Delivery and receipt of the signed notice and signed disapproval letter and any additional communications related to the deposition may be carried out by staff officers of the Chairman and Ranking Member, and may occur through electronic mail. If a deposition notice is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided in this subsection, the deposition notice may be authorized by a vote of the Members of the Committee. Committee deposition notices shall specify a time and place for examination, and the name of the Committee Member or Members or staff officer or officers who will take the deposition. Unless otherwise specified, the deposition shall be in private. The Committee shall not initiate procedures leading to criminal or civil enforcement proceedings for a witness' failure to appear or produce unless the deposition notice was accompanied by a Committee subpoena.

(2) Witnesses may be accompanied at a deposition by counsel to advise them of their legal rights, subject to the provisions of Rule 5D.

(3) Oaths at depositions may be administered by an individual authorized by local law to administer oaths. Questions shall be propounded orally by a Committee Member or Members or staff. If a witness objects to a question and refuses to testify, the objection shall be noted for the record and the Committee Member or Members or staff may proceed with the remainder of the deposition.

(4) The Committee shall see that the testimony is transcribed or electronically recorded (which may include audio or audio/video recordings). If it is transcribed, the transcript shall be made available for inspection by the witness or his or her counsel under Committee supervision. The witness shall sign a copy of the transcript and may request changes to it, which shall be handled in accordance with the procedure set forth in subsection (E). If the witness fails to sign a copy, the staff shall note that fact on the transcript. The individual administering the oath shall certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn in his or her presence, the transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true record of the testimony, and the transcript shall then be filed with the chief clerk of the Committee. The Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her may stipulate with the witness to changes in the procedure; deviations from this procedure which do not substantially impair the reliability of the record shall not relieve the witness from his or her obligation to testify truthfully.

RULE 6. COMMITTEE REPORTING PROCEDURES

A. Timely filing. When the Committee has ordered a measure or matter reported, following final action, the report thereon shall be filed in the Senate at the earliest practicable time. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 10(b), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

B. Supplemental, Minority, and additional views. A Member of the Committee who gives notice of his or her intention to file supplemental, Minority, or additional views at the time of final Committee approval of a measure or matter shall be entitled to not less than 3 calendar days in which to file such views, in writing, with the chief clerk of the Committee. Such views shall then be included in the Committee report and printed in the same volume, as a part thereof, and their inclusion shall be noted on the cover of the report. In the absence of timely notice, the Committee report may be filed and printed immediately without such views. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 10(c), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

C. Notice by Subcommittee Chairmen. The Chairman of each Subcommittee shall notify the Chairman in writing whenever any measure has been ordered reported by such Subcommittee and is ready for consideration by the full Committee.

D. Draft reports of Subcommittees. All draft reports prepared by Subcommittees of this Committee on any measure or matter referred to it by the Chairman shall be in the form, style, and arrangement required to conform to the applicable provisions of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and shall be in accordance with the established practices followed by the Committee. Upon completion of such draft reports, copies thereof shall be filed with the chief clerk of the Committee at the earliest practicable time.

E. Impact statements in reports. All Committee reports, accompanying a bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by the Committee, shall contain (1) an estimate, made by the Committee, of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out the legislation for the then current fiscal year and for each of the next 5 years thereafter (or for the authorized duration of the proposed legislation, if less than 5 years); and (2) a comparison of such cost estimates with any made by a Federal agency; or (3) in lieu of such estimate or comparison, or both, a statement of the reasons for failure by the Committee to comply with these requirements as impracticable, in the event of inability to comply therewith. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 11(a), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

Each such report shall also contain an evaluation, made by the Committee, of the regulatory impact which would be incurred in carrying out the bill or joint resolution. The evaluation shall include (a) an estimate of the numbers of individuals and businesses who would be regulated and a determination of the groups and classes of such individuals and businesses, (b) a determination of the economic impact of such regulation on the individuals, consumers, and businesses affected, (c) a determination of the impact on the personal privacy of the individuals affected, and (d) a determination of the amount of paperwork that will result from the regulations to be promulgated pursuant to the bill or joint resolution, which determination may include, but need not be limited to, estimates of the amount of time and financial costs required of affected parties, showing whether the effects of the bill or joint resolution could be substantial, as well as reasonable estimates of the recordkeeping requirements that may be associated with the bill or joint resolution. Or, in lieu of the forgoing evaluation, the report shall include a statement of the reasons for failure by the Committee to comply with these requirements as impracticable, in the event of inability to comply therewith. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 11(b), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

RULE 7. SUBCOMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEE PROCEDURES

A. Regularly established Subcommittees. The Committee shall have three regularly established Subcommittees. The Subcommittees are as follows:

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SPENDING OVERSIGHT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

B. Ad hoc Subcommittees. Following consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman shall, from time to time, establish such ad hoc Subcommittees as he/she deems necessary to expedite Committee business.

C. Subcommittee membership. Following consultation with the Majority Members, and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, the Chairman shall announce selections for membership on the Subcommittees referred to in paragraphs A and B, above.

(1) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall serve as nonvoting *ex officio* members of the subcommittees on which they do not serve as voting members.

(2) Any Member of the Committee may attend hearings held by any subcommittee and question witnesses testifying before that Subcommittee, subject to the approval of the Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Member.

D. Subcommittee meetings and hearings. Each Subcommittee of this Committee is authorized to establish meeting dates and adopt rules not inconsistent with the rules of the Committee except as provided in Rules 2(D) and 7(E).

E. Subcommittee subpoenas. Each Subcommittee is authorized to adopt rules concerning subpoenas which need not be consistent with the rules of the Committee; provided, however, that in the event the Subcommittee authorizes the issuance of a subpoena pursuant to its own rules, a written notice of intent to issue the subpoena shall be provided to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, or staff officers designated by them, by the Subcommittee Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her immediately upon such authorization, and no subpoena shall be issued for at least 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, from delivery to the appropriate offices, unless the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member waive the 48-hour waiting period or unless the Subcommittee Chairman certifies in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member that, in his or her opinion, it is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

F. Subcommittee budgets. During the first year of a new Congress, each Subcommittee that requires authorization for the expenditure of funds for the conduct of inquiries and investigations, shall file with the chief clerk of the Committee, by a date and time prescribed by the Chairman, its request for funds for the two (2) 12-month periods beginning on March 1 and extending through and including the last day of February of the 2 following years, which years comprise that Congress. Each such request shall be submitted on the budget form prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and shall be accompanied by a written justification addressed to the Chairman of the Committee, which shall include (1) a statement of the Subcommittee's area of activities, (2) its accomplishments during the preceding Congress detailed year by year, and (3) a table showing a comparison between (a) the funds authorized for expenditure during the preceding Congress detailed year by year, (b) the funds actually expended during that Congress detailed year by year, (c) the amount requested for each year of the Congress, and (d) the number of professional and clerical staff members and consultants employed by the Subcommittee during the preceding Congress detailed year by year and the number of such personnel requested for each year of the Congress. The Chairman may request additional reports from the Subcommittees regarding their activities and budgets at any time during a Congress. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 9, Standing Rules of the Senate.)

RULE 8. CONFIRMATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

A. Standards. In considering a nomination, the Committee shall inquire into the nominee's experience, qualifications, suitability, and integrity to serve in the position to which he or she has been nominated. The Committee shall recommend confirmation, upon finding that the nominee has the necessary integrity and is affirmatively qualified by reason of training, education, or experience to carry out the functions of the office to which he or she was nominated.

B. Information concerning the Nominee. Each nominee shall submit the following information to the Committee:

(1) A detailed biographical resume which contains information relating to education, employment, and achievements;

(2) Financial information, in such specificity as the Committee deems necessary, including a list of assets and liabilities of the nominee and tax returns for the 3 years preceding the time of his or her nomination, and copies of other relevant documents requested by the Committee, such as a proposed blind trust agreement, necessary for the Committee's consideration; and,

(3) Copies of other relevant documents the Committee may request, such as responses to questions concerning the policies and programs the nominee intends to pursue upon taking office. At the request of the Chairman or the Ranking Minority Member, a nominee shall be required to submit a certified financial statement compiled by an independent auditor. Information received pursuant to this subsection shall be made available for public inspection; provided, however, that tax returns shall, after review by persons designated in subsection (C) of this rule, be placed under seal to ensure confidentiality.

C. Procedures for Committee inquiry. The Committee shall conduct an inquiry into the experience, qualifications, suitability, and integrity of nominees, and shall give particular attention to the following matters:

(1) A review of the biographical information provided by the nominee, including, but not limited to, any professional activities related to the duties of the office to which he or she is nominated;

(2) A review of the financial information provided by the nominee, including tax returns for the 3 years preceding the time of his or her nomination;

(3) A review of any actions, taken or proposed by the nominee, to remedy conflicts of interest; and

(4) A review of any personal or legal matter which may bear upon the nominee's qualifications for the office to which he or she is nominated. For the purpose of assisting the Committee in the conduct of this inquiry, a Majority investigator or investigators shall be designated by the Chairman and a Minority investigator or investigators shall be designated by the Ranking Minority Member. The Chairman, Ranking Minority Member, other Members of the Committee, and designated investigators shall have access to all investigative reports on nominees prepared by any Federal agency, except that only the Chairman, the Ranking Minority Member, or other Members of the Committee, upon request, shall have access to the report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Committee may request the assistance of the U.S. Government Accountability Office and any other such expert opinion as may be necessary in conducting its review of information provided by nominees.

D. Report on the Nominee. After a review of all information pertinent to the nomination, a confidential report on the nominee shall be made in the case of judicial nominees and may be made in the case of non-judicial nominees by the designated investigators to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member and, upon request, to any other Member of the Committee. The report shall summarize the steps taken by the Committee during its investigation of the nominee and the results of the Committee inquiry, including any unresolved matters that have been raised during the course of the inquiry.

E. Hearings. The Committee shall conduct a public hearing during which the nominee shall be called to testify under oath on all matters relating to his or her suitability for office, including the policies and programs which he or she will pursue while in that position. No hearing shall be held until at least 72 hours after the following events have occurred: The nominee has responded to prehearing questions submitted by the Committee; and, if applicable, the report described in subsection (D) has been made to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, and is available to other Members of the Committee, upon request.

F. Action on confirmation. A mark-up on a nomination shall not occur on the same day that the hearing on the nominee is held. In order to assist the Committee in reaching a recommendation on confirmation, the staff may make an oral presentation to the Committee at the mark-up, factually summarizing the nominee's background and the steps taken during the pre-hearing inquiry.

G. Application. The procedures contained in subsections (C), (D), (E), and (F) of this rule shall apply to persons nominated by the President to positions requiring their full-time service. At the discretion of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, those procedures may apply to persons nominated by the President to serve on a part-time basis.

RULE 9. PERSONNEL ACTIONS AFFECTING COMMITTEE STAFF

I. accordance with Rule XLII of the Standing Rules of the Senate and the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (P.L. 104–1), all personnel actions affecting the staff of the Committee shall be made free from any discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, state of physical handicap, or disability.

RULE 10. APPRAISAL OF COMMITTEE BUSINESS

The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall keep each other apprised of hearings, investigations, and other Committee business.

INDIAN TRIBAL ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AND SELF-DETERMINATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2015

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2015.

In recent years, the Committee on Indian Affairs has received concerns from Indian tribes and the energy industry that the Federal laws governing the development of tribal energy resources are complex and often lead to significant costs, delays and uncertainty for all parties. These costs, delays and uncertainties discourage development of tribal energy resources and drive investments away from tribal lands.

According to the National Congress of American Indians, Indian tribes hold nearly a quarter of American onshore oil and gas reserves. Yet, existing tribal energy production represents less than 5 percent of the current national production. If we can remove the costs and delays of developing energy on Indian lands, we could potentially see the country's energy production, and thus energy independence, increase significantly.

Nearly 10 years ago, Congress passed the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act. This act created a new, alternative process for Indian tribes to take control of developing their energy resources on their own lands without the burdens of administrative review, approval, and oversight.

This approach gives Indian tribes the option to enter into tribal energy resource agreements with the Secretary of the Interior. Once an Indian tribe enters into this agreement, it has the authority to enter into subsequent leases, business agreements, and rights-of-way affecting energy development, without further review and approval by the Secretary—a significant

departure from the standard laws, and consequent bureaucracy, applicable to tribal contracts.

That law was a step in the right direction. However, these agreements have not been utilized to the extent that they could be, primarily because the implementation of the act has been made more complex than it should be.

It is past time we make key improvements to the law so that Indian tribes can take advantage of these agreements and significantly reduce bureaucratic burdens to energy development. Years of consultation and outreach to Indian tribes have produced targeted solutions to address the concerns about the process for entering these agreements. The bill that I am introducing today would streamline the process for approving the tribal energy resource agreements and make it more predictable for Indian tribes.

I would like to highlight some of the key provisions in this bill. This bill includes a number of amendments to improve the review and approval process for the tribal energy resource agreements. For example, the bill provides clarity regarding the specific information required for tribal applications for these agreements.

In addition, the bill sets forth specific time frames for Secretarial determinations on the agreement applications. Moreover, if an application is disapproved, this bill would require the Secretary of the Interior to provide detailed explanations to the Indian tribe and steps for addressing the reasons for disapproval.

The bill has various provisions that would improve technical assistance and consultation with Indian tribes during their energy planning and development stages. It also includes an amendment to the Federal Power Act that would put Indian tribes on a similar footing with States and municipalities for preferences when preliminary permits or original licenses for hydroelectric projects are issued.

Additionally, this bill would allow Indian tribes and third parties to perform appraisals to help expedite the Secretary's approval process for tribal agreements for mineral resource development.

My bill does not focus on only traditional resource development, but includes renewal resource development components as well. For example, the bill would create tribal biomass demonstration projects to provide Indian tribes with more reliable and potentially long-term supplies of woody biomass materials.

This bill is intended to provide Indian tribes with the tools to develop and use energy more efficiently. In passing this bill, Congress will enhance the ability of Indian tribes to exercise self-determination over the development of energy resources located on tribal lands, thereby improving the lives and economic well-being of Native Americans.

Before I conclude, I would like to thank Senators TESTER, MCCAIN, HOEVEN, ENZI, and FISCHER for joining me in cosponsoring this bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in advancing this bill expeditiously.

IT'S TIME TO FIX NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks at yesterday's Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee hearing be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S TIME TO FIX NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

Since this is the first hearing of the committee in this 114th Congress, I have some preliminary remarks.

This committee touches almost every American.

No committee is more ideologically diverse and none is more productive. In the last Congress, 25 bills passed out of this committee became laws.

That's because we worked with Chairman Harkin on areas of agreement.

I look forward to working in the same way with Ranking Member Murray in this Congress. She is direct, well-respected, she cares about people and is results-oriented.

We are going to have an open process, which means we're going to have a full opportunity for discussion and for amendments. Not just in the committee, but on the floor. In the last two congresses, we reported a bill, but it didn't make it to the floor.

This congress, we hope to have a bipartisan bill coming out of committee—but even if we don't, the bill will go to the floor and it will have to get 60 votes on the floor, 60 votes to go to conference, 60 votes to get out of conference, and then the president will have his say. We hope to get his signature and get a result.

Next, the schedule:

Let me start with some unfinished business:

Fixing NCLB: This is way overdue, it expired more than 7 years ago. We posted a working draft on the website last week, already feedback is coming in—not just from Congress but from around the country. We have several more weeks of hearings and meetings. We hope to have a bill ready for floor by end of February. The House expects to have its bill on the floor by the end of February.

Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: This is, for me, about deregulating higher education making rules simpler and more effective. Also, finishing the work we did on student loans in the last congress. Our first hearing on the deregulation task force formed by Senators Mikulski, Burr, and Bennet and me is on Tuesday, February 24.

As rapidly and responsibly as we can, we want to repair the damage of Obamacare and provide more Americans with health insurance that fits their budgets. Our first hearing is tomorrow on the 30 to 40 hour workweek—the bill introduced by Senators Collins, Donnelly, Murkowski and Manchin. We will report our opinions to the Finance committee.

Then, some new business:

Let's call it 21st Century Cures—that's what the House calls it, as it finishes its work this spring. The president is also interested. What we're talking about is getting to market more rapidly, while still safe, medicines, treatments and medical devices. There is a lot of interest in this and we'll start staff working groups soon.

There will be more in labor, pensions, education, health but those are major priorities and that is how we start.

The president has also made major proposals on early childhood education and community college. These are certainly relevant to K–12, but we've always dealt with them separately. It's difficult for me to see how we make these issues part of this reauthorization.

Now to today's hearing: Last week Secretary Duncan called for law to be fixed. Almost everyone seems to agree with that—it's more than 7 years overdue.

We've been working on it for more than 6 years. When we started, former Rep. George Miller said, Pass a lean bill to fix No Child Left Behind, and we identified a small number of problems.

Since then, we've had 24 hearings, and in each of the last two Congresses we've reported bills out of committee.

Senators should know issues by now, 20 of 22 were here in the last congress, 16 of 22 were here in the previous congress.

One reason it needs to be fixed is that NCLB has become unworkable.

Under its original provisions, almost all of America's 100,000 public schools would be labeled a ''failing school.''

To avoid this unintended result, the U. S. Secretary of Education has granted waivers from the law's provisions to 43 states—including Washington, which has since had its waiver revoked—as well as the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

This has created a second unintended result, at least unintended by Congress, which stated in law that no federal official should ''exercise any direction, supervision or control over curriculum, program or instruction or administration of any educational institution.''

Nevertheless, in exchange for the waivers, the Secretary has told states what their academic standards should be, how states should measure the progress of students toward those standards, what constitutes failure for schools and what the consequences of failure are, how to fix low-performing schools, and how to evaluate teachers. The Department has become, in effect, a national school board. Or, as one teacher told me, it has become a national Human Resources Department for 100,000 public schools.

At the center of the debate about how to fix No Child Left Behind is what to do about the federal requirement that states annually administer 17 standardized tests with high-stakes consequences. Educators call this an accountability system.

Are there too many tests? Are they the right tests? Are the stakes for failing them too high? What should Washington, D.C. have to do with all this?

Many states and school districts require schools to administer additional tests.

This is called a hearing for a reason. I have come to listen.

The Chairman's staff discussion draft I have circulated includes two options on testing:

Option 1 gives flexibility to the states to decide what to do on testing.

Option 2 maintains current law testing requirements.

Both options would continue to require annual reporting of student achievement, disaggregated by subgroups of children.

Washington sometimes forgets—but governors never do—that the federal government has limited involvement in elementary and secondary education, contributing only 10 percent of the money that public schools receive.

For 30 years the real action has been in the states.

I have seen this first hand.

I was Governor in 1983 when President Reagan's Education Secretary, Terrell Bell, issued a report called: ''A Nation at Risk,'' which said that: ''If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war.''

The next year Tennessee became the first state to pay teachers more for teaching well.

In 1985 and 1986, every Governor spent an entire year focused on improving schools the first time in the history of the National Governors Association that it happened. I was chairman of the association that year and the Governor of Arkansas, Bill Clinton, was the vice chairman.

In 1989, the first President Bush held a national meeting of Governors in Charlottesville, Virginia, and established national education goals.

Then in 1991–1992, President Bush announced America 2000 to help move the nation voluntarily toward those goals, state by state, community by community. I was the Education Secretary at that time.

Since then states have worked together voluntarily to develop academic standards, develop tests, to create their own accountability systems, find fair ways to evaluate teacher performance—and then adopted those that fit their states.

I know members of this committee must be tired of hearing me talk until I am blue in the face about a ''national school board.'' I know it is tempting to try to fix classrooms from Washington. I also hear from governors and school superintendents who say that if ''Washington doesn't make us do it, the teachers unions and opponents from the right will make it impossible to have higher standards and better teachers.''

And I understand that there can be short term gains from Washington's orders—but my experience is that long term success can't come that way. In fact, today Washington's involvement, in effect mandating Common Core and teacher evaluation, is creating a backlash, making it harder for states to set higher standards and evaluate teaching.

As one former Democratic governor told me recently, ''We were doing pretty well until Washington got involved. If they will get out of the way we can get back on track.''

So rather than turn blue in the face one more time about the national school board let me conclude with the remarks of Carol Burris, New York's High School principal of the Year. She responded last week to our committee working draft this way:

. . . I ask that your committee remember that the American public school system was built on the belief that local communities cherish their children and have the right and responsibility, within sensible limits, to determine how they are schooled.

While the federal government has a very special role in ensuring that our students do not experience discrimination based on who they are or what their disability might be, Congress is not a National School Board.

Although our locally elected school boards may not be perfect, they represent one of the purest forms of democracy that we have. Bad ideas in the small do damage in the small and are easily corrected. Bad ideas at the federal level result in massive failure and are harder to fix.

Please understand that I do not dismiss the need to hold schools accountable. The use and disaggregation of data has been an important tool that I use regularly as a principal to improve my own school. However, the unintended, negative consequences that have arisen from mandated, annual testing and its high stakes uses have proven testing not only to be an ineffective tool, but a destructive one as well.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP CHAD W. ZIELINSKI

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. In November, Father Chad Zielinski, the deputy wing chaplain at Eielson Air Force Base near Fairbanks, received what he regarded as an odd early morning telephone call. The call came from the Apostolic Nuncio, the Vatican's ambassador to the United States. The Nuncio informed Father Zielinski that he had been selected by Pope Francis to serve as the Catholic bishop of Fairbanks.

His immediate reaction: This makes no sense; how can this be? There must be some mistake. But there was no mistake. In December, Bishop Zielinski was ordained and installed to lead the Diocese of Fairbanks. The Catholic Anchor newspaper reports that Bishop Zielinski is the first active duty military chaplain in recent history to shepherd a diocese. At age 50 he is also the 11th youngest of the 267 active U.S. Catholic bishops.

The selection was met with great enthusiasm throughout interior Alaska and especially in our military community. Before being called to the priesthood, Bishop Zielinski served on active duty in the Air Force. He was ordained a priest for the Catholic Diocese of Gaylord, MI, in 1996. But after the events of September 11 he saw a need for Catholic chaplains in the military and rejoined the Air Force.

His Air Force career was varied. Bishop Zielinski served as Roman Catholic cadet chaplain at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs and as a chaplain recruiter assigned to the Air Force Recruiting Service. He also served at Grand Forks Air Force Base in North Dakota and at RAF Mildenhall in Suffolk, England.

And he served three tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan—his first in Baghdad in 2003 and his last in Afghanistan where he served 18 forward combat positions, where religious services were punctuated by the sound of live gun fire. On one sad day, the convoy in which he was traveling was hit by a rocket, killing one of the drivers, who also happened to be a parishioner. That day ended with the bishop conducting a funeral. Needless to say, Bishop Zielinski was regarded as an exemplary chaplain and I have no doubt that he will be an exemplary bishop.

The Diocese of Fairbanks, the most northern and geographically diverse in the United States, covers some 410,000 square miles. It holds 46 parishes, most of which are in the Alaska Native villages. I am excited about Bishop Zielinski's elevation and I look forward to working closely with him in his new and important role as a leader in our faith community.●

TRIBUTE TO FATHER FERNANDO ''FRED'' BUGARIN

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. On January 25, 1975, Father Fred Bugarin was ordained as a priest in the Archdiocese of Anchorage by Archbishop Joseph T. Ryan. This week marks the 40th anniversary of Father Fred's ordination. On Saturday evening, friends of Father Fred will gather in St. Anthony's parish hall to celebrate his 40 years of faith and service. I join with the Anchorage community in expressing my appreciation to Father Fred for his good works.

Father Fred was born in the Philippines and migrated to Anchorage with his family in 1963. He was age 14 at the time. He graduated from West High School in 1967 and went on to study humanities and theology at the University of Dallas/Holy Trinity Seminary. Following his ordination, Father Fred was assigned to St. Benedict's parish as an assistant pastor. In 1978 he was selected as the first resident pastor of Sacred Heart parish in Wasilla and served there until 1981. He was subsequently promoted to direct the permanent diaconate and ministries program for the archdiocese.

Five years later, while on sabbatical, Father Fred set out on a new direction—to reconnect with his roots in the Philippines and enrolled at the East Asian Pastoral Institute in Manila where he became immersed in East Asian thought and culture. Father Fred signed up for the Maryknoll Associate Priests Program and upon completion of the training he was sent off to Mindanao in the southern Philippines. Father Fred had much to learn. He grew up in the northern Philippines and the language and culture of the southern Philippines was much different. Yet he was determined to connect with the people he served no matter how steep the learning curve. It was the right fit—a 5-year contract turned into an 8-year experience. What was to have been a short sabbatical turned into a life changing event.

Upon his return to the United States, the Archdiocese of Anchorage assigned Father Fred to Kodiak Island, a diverse community with an economy revolving around the fishing industry. Blue collar workers, mainly from the canneries, made up the bulk of the parish. During fishing season the population includes Filipinos, Salvadorans, Mexicans, Vietnamese, Samoans and Laotians among others. Father Fred regarded Kodiak as a laboratory for incorporating what he learned through his work in the Philippines.

After 5 years in Kodiak, Father Fred was reassigned to St. Anthony's parish where he remains today. He is known throughout Alaska for his work in building inclusive parishes and is active in interreligious activities in Anchorage. Since 2003, Father Fred has been involved with Alaska Faith and Action Congregations Together, has taught foundations of Christianity at Alaska Pacific University and has facilitated fatherhood workshops for the Alaska native community. In 2011, Father Fred was awarded the doctor of ministry degree from the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, CA.

Father Fred has left a very powerful impression on every community he has served. He is an inspiration to his fellow pastors. I am honored to recognize Father Fred for his good works and wish him many long years of continued service to his faith and to his community.●

RECOGNIZING BOYETT PRINTING & GRAPHICS, INC.

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, the expansion of a small business can refer to the size of the building, customers, as well as inventory, but sometimes expansion can lead a small business toward a much more extensive track than its original direction. For this week's Small Business of the Week, I would like to recognize a Louisiana business that has broadened its scope and impact far beyond the size of its storefront. Boyett Printing & Graphics, Inc. of Shreveport, LA, is well-known for its printing and also offers an immense variety of services and products to the customers of northwest Louisiana.

In March 1994, John and Janet Boyett founded their printing business right in their home office. Their first official project was to print the church bulletins for the local Broadmoor Baptist Church. Five years later, the Boyetts' flourishing business outgrew their home, and they moved to the heart of Shreveport, hiring seven full-time employees in the process. The Boyetts' commitment to extraordinary service and quality products has buoyed their success for over 20 years.

These days, Boyett Printing & Graphics, Inc. provides printing on items such as brochures, business cards, newsletters, and stationery. Printing is also available on over 30,000 promotional products, which includes a vast variety of items from apparel to party favors to first aid kits. Their services, however, go far beyond what their printing label might suggest. Boyett Printing & Graphics, Inc. supplies creative graphic design services, as well as mailing services, booklet binding, letterpress, as well as bindery and finishing services. This broad array of operations truly allows this small business to be a ''one stop shop.''

Another way the Boyetts have set themselves apart is through their efforts to have a low impact on the environment. They prioritize recycling, using biodegradable inks and water soluble chemicals, and purchasing their paper from decades-old tree farms—even when it is more expensive. That is why their website is innovative and user friendly. Customers can submit an order or request price estimates. They can also sift through helpful ideas, business news, constructive tips, printing terms, as well as the latest versions of graphic art software. It is no wonder they were awarded an A-plus rating with the Better Business Bureau.

Their philosophy is founded on trust, reasonable prices, quality work, and friendliness, and clearly, it works. I am honored to recognize a business that anticipates its customer's needs, works with urgency and enthusiasm, and provides necessary services to the community with such dedication and convenience. Congratulations to Boyett Printing & Graphics, Inc. for being selected as this week's Small Business of the Week, and thank you for all of your service to the northwest region of Louisiana.●

TRIBUTE TO VINCENT PETRARCA

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I am honored to congratulate Mr. Vincent Petrarca of West Warwick, RI, a proud American veteran and beloved family man, on the occasion of his 90th birthday.

Vin enlisted in the U.S. Navy at age 18 and served in the Pacific Fleet. He was a crewmember of the destroyer USS *Newcomb* when, in April 1945, that ship encountered heavy air bombardment from Japanese forces off the west coast of Okinawa. Although struck multiple times by kamikaze attackers and sustaining heavy casualties, the *Newcomb* drove off or shot down several aircraft. ''Nelson's accolade to his sailors, 'They fought as one man, and that man a hero,''' wrote historian Samuel Eliot Morison, ''could well be applied to her crew,'' which earned the Navy Unit Commendation.

Vin married Jeanne Lesniak, and their union, now in its 62nd year, has been blessed with 7 children, 12 grandchildren, and 4 great grandchildren. Vin remains active, continuing a formidable amateur golf career. His tournament victories span a half-century, from the 1962 West Warwick Country Club Championship to the 2012 Rhode Island Father/Daughter State Championship.

On behalf of the State of Rhode Island and the Senate of the United States, I congratulate Vincent Petrarca on 90 remarkable years, and wish him health and happiness in the years to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:26 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 161. An act to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects.

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–362. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Flupyradifurone; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9914–77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–363. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fosetyl-Al; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9920–54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–364. 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; Oregon: Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter'' (FRL No. 9921–69–Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–365. 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; North Carolina; Inspection and Maintenance Program Updates'' (FRL No. 9921–83–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–366. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District'' (FRL No. 9920–52–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–367. 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; Virginia; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan Approved by EPA through Letter Notice Actions'' (FRL No. 9921–71–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–368. 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 Colorado; Second Ten-Year PM10 Maintenance Plan for Steamboat Springs.'' (FRL No. 9921–54–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–369. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Georgia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions'' (FRL No. 9921–90–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–370. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of New Mexico; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; General Definitions'' (FRL No. 9921–79–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 33. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. Res. 34. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. Res. 36. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security.

*Earl L. Gay, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Michael Greco, of New York, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York for the term of four years.

Ronald Lee Miller, of Kansas, to be United States Marshal for the District of Kansas for the term of four years.

*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. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 231. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 523 East Railroad Street in Knox, Pennsylvania, as the ''Specialist Ross A. McGinnis Memorial Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 232. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in the State of Nevada except by express authorization of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BURR, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 233. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 234. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to confirm the scope of the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or restrict the use of defined areas as disposal sites; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 235. A bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 236. A bill to amend the Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 to create an expedited procedure to enact recommendations of the Government Accountability Office for consolidation and elimination to reduce duplication; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 237. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify the circumstances in which a person may acquire geolocation information and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 238. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to issue oleoresin capsicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 239. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to apportionments under the Airport Improvement Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 240. A bill to promote competition, to preserve the ability of local governments to provide broadband capability and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 241. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of temporary compensation to a surviving spouse of a veteran upon the death of the veteran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 242. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide leave to any new Federal employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 243. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the contribution limit for Coverdell education savings accounts from $2,000 to $5,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 244. A bill to require an independent comprehensive review of the process by which the Department of Veterans Affairs assesses cognitive impairments that result from traumatic brain injury for purposes of awarding disability compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand personal saving and retirement savings coverage by enabling employees not covered by qualifying retirement plans to save for retirement through automatic IRA arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. THUNE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 246. A bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 247. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 248. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 249. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing hazardous humanitarian services in West Africa to combat the spread of the 2014 Ebola virus outbreak shall be entitled to tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. Res. 33. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. Res. 34. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Finance; from the Committee on Finance; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KIRK):

S. Res. 35. A resolution commemorating the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. Res. 36. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary; from the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. Res. 37. A resolution supporting women's reproductive health care decisions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 38. A resolution relative to the death of Wendell H. Ford, former United States Senator for the Commonwealth of Kentucky; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 48

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 48, a bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex or gender, and for other purposes.

S. 149

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 149, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 167, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 167, supra.

S. 183

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 198

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 198, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations.

S. 201

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 201, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to restore Americans' individual liberty by striking the Federal mandate to purchase insurance.

S. 207

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 207, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use existing authorities to furnish health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities to veterans who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department that furnishes the care sought by the veteran, and for other purposes.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 214, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes.

S. 229

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 229, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 5, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

AMENDMENT NO. 27

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 27 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 28

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 28 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 49

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 49 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 74

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 74 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 78

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 78 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 87

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of amendment No. 87 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 92

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 92 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 96

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 96 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 235. A bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act of 2015 with a bipartisan group of my colleagues, to ensure that Federal agencies have the resources and funding they need to not only fight the wildfires that erupt yearly in our Nation's forests, but to effectively manage forests to prevent future infernos.

For decades, our country has experienced tragic and costly wildfire seasons. Year after year, communities are displaced, natural treasures are destroyed, and the brave men and women who fight these fires risk their lives, and some don't come home. Due to climate change, drought, and overstocked and under-managed forests, the risks from these infernos continues to grow.

As the Forest Service needs to direct more and more resources to fighting fires, and less to managing the forests, it is transforming itself into the ''Fire Service.'' Over the past 20 years, substantial spending on Federal wildfire suppression activities has grown. In 2013, the Forest Service devoted 41 percent of its total budget to wildfire management, compared to just 13 percent of its total budget in 1991. In 8 of the past 10 years, the Forest Service has exceeded its budget for wildfire suppression, requiring the Agency to conduct what's known as ''fire borrowing'' to cover wildfire suppression costs. The funds being borrowed come from accounts that should be used for hazardous fuels treatment and other forest management activities, and are unfortunately rarely, if ever, paid back.

This ''fire robbery'' is disruptive, unproductive, and undermines the core mission of the Forest Service, particularly as forest management program budgets continue to get slashed. Hazardous fuels treatments have been proven to reduce fire risk, yet Federal agencies don't even have the opportunity or the funding to conduct these treatments when fires are breaking out and threatening lives and property for months on end.

Today I am reintroducing the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act, to help our Nation find a better way to manage our forests, prevent future wildfires, and fund wildfire fighting activities, both small and catastrophic. Major wildfire events should be treated as the natural disasters that they are, and should be funded as such. This bill establishes parity for wildfire funding, putting it on equal footing with other natural disasters like floods and hurricanes. Whether it's water, wind, earth, or fire, the earth's natural disasters can all cause devastation and should be addressed equally.

A Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture analysis shows that 1 percent of wildfires represent 30 percent of agency costs. To ensure that fighting the largest infernos doesn't cripple agency budgets, the bill would fund the largest fire even under disaster programs, leaving funds available for routine wildfire fighting and forest management activities. It does this by moving any spending above 70 percent of the 10-year rolling average for fire suppression outside of the agencies' baseline budget and makes these additional costs eligible to be funded under a separate disaster account. This should free up discretionary funds that can now go toward hazardous fuels projects that will improve the health of our forests and ultimately prevent future wildfires.

I am pleased to be joined again by Senator CRAPO in introducing the bill today, as well as Senators CANTWELL, RISCH, BENNET, GARDNER, BALDWIN, and DAINES. I look forward to working with my colleagues toward enactment of the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act in the 114th Congress.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. THUNE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 246. A bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, for those of us who are parents, we should want to make sure all of our children have the same opportunities as other children. This starts with a quality education, a safe and secure home, access to quality health care, and a community free of violence. These are deeply important issues. But too often, talk about protecting our Native children is left out of the conversation. Native children are too often considered ''them'' and not part of ''us.'' That needs to change—in fact, it must change. Unfortunately, for children in our nation's tribal communities, opportunities for success are often out of reach. As a result, Native children are sadly the most at-risk population in the country and face serious disparities.

The Federal Government has a trust responsibility to provide for the education, health, and safety of Native children. But for far too long, we have failed to live up to this promise. We are failing by not keeping them safe, healthy, or providing them with educational opportunities necessary to reach their full potential.

Native children have the third highest rate of being abused. They are overrepresented in foster care, more than 2.1 times the general population. Child mortality has increased 15 percent among Native children, while the rate among all American children has decreased by 9 percent since 2000. Suicide is the second leading cause of death among Native young adults ages 15 to 24 years old, 2.5 times the national average. The graduation rate for Native high school students hovers around 50 percent compared to 75 percent for white students. These numbers are simply staggering arid they are the direct result of growing up in communities that face significant challenges, high rates of poverty, staggering unemployment, child abuse and domestic violence, crime, substance abuse, and few economic opportunities.

I have spent a great deal of time on Indian reservations in North Dakota. I

am humbled to always be welcomed with open arms and treated like family. The tribes have a cultural sense about the need to defend their children. But because of the lack of resources, the stories are still incredibly jarring. I have seen firsthand the obstacles tribal governments confront in responding to the needs of Native children. Existing program rules and the volume of resources required to access current grant opportunities stymie efforts of tribes to tackle the underlying issues impacting our Native children. At the same time, federal agencies lack clear guidance about the direction that should be taken to best address the needs of Native children to fulfill our nation's treaty and trust responsibility to tribal nations. It is clear that Native children are suffering as a result.

Too many times I have heard stories about Native children in North Dakota placed in juvenile detention centers for offenses that would likely not result in incarceration, except for the fact that they are Native American. I heard a story about a teenage girl in detention because of substance addiction. She wants to get the health counseling she needs, but hasn't been given enough support, as too often there aren't enough resources available. She wants to go to school and get to the correct grade level, but is now already two grades behind and is continuing to fall further back while in detention. Without anyone looking to help, she will likely fall further back. This is just one story. But there are too many like it. Unless we act, we are turning our backs on Native children throughout the country.

I am determined to work to reverse these trends and end these terrible stories. We need to strive for a day when Native children no longer live in third-world conditions; where they don't face the threat of abuse on a daily basis; where they receive the good health care and education that help them grow and succeed. I will pledge to work to give these to today's Native children and future generations.

To begin this effort, I am proud to introduce the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children. Since joining the Senate, I have talked about the importance of working across the aisle to get things done. That's why this is a bipartisan bill, as Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska has joined me in this effort, along with 20 of our colleagues. Our bill aims to address the sweeping challenges that Native Americans face by creating a Federal Commission on Native Children. It would begin a national conversation about the state of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian children. It is a conversation that is long overdue.

The commission will be directed to complete a comprehensive study on the programs, grants, and support available for Native children, both at the federal level and on the ground in Native communities. Right now, so many of these details are lacking, which makes it more difficult for the Federal Government to determine what kind of support is needed. Then, the 11 member Commission will issue a report on how to address the series of challenges currently facing Native children. It is my hope that the recommendations will lead to the development of a sustainable system to provide wrap-around services and support our Native children, and also reverse the troubling statistics that have become all too familiar.

I believe it is telling that this bill has received a great deal of support. I want to thank the National Congress of American Indians, the National Indian Health Board, the National Indian Child Welfare Association, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, and the National Indian Education Association, which have endorsed the bill, as has the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association, and the five tribes in my state of North Dakota.

Additionally, this Commission is named in part after my dear friend, the late Dr. Alyce Spotted Bear, who passed away in 2013 after a hard fought battle with cancer—and Walter Soboleff from the Tlingit tribe in Alaska. Alyce was a member of the Mandan, Hidatsa, and Ankara Nation in North Dakota and served as Chairwoman from November 1982 to March 1987. She was an inspiration to all who knew her and a great leader—in North Dakota and throughout the country. She was an educator dedicated to enabling Native students to succeed academically and making sure Native American cultures thrive. She was a mother, to her children, as well as her students and her community. In recognition of her expertise in the field, President Obama appointed her as a member to the National Advisory Council on Indian Education. And at the time of her passing, Alyce served as Vice President of Native American Studies and Tribal Relations at the Fort Berthold Community College in New Town, North Dakota. I hope this Commission will be able to live up to the great legacy she left behind, and also help complete some of her work for Native children.

As Sitting Bull once said ''Let us put our minds together to see what we can build for our children.'' That is exactly what this Commission will do, and I hope my colleagues will join us in supporting this important effort.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 33—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 33

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules and S. Res. 445, agreed to October 9, 2004 (108th Congress), including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs (in this resolution referred to as the ''committee'') is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed $5,591,653, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this section shall not exceed $9,585,691, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this section shall not exceed $3,994,038, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee

under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for ''Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations'' of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SEC. 5. INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee, is authorized to study or investigate—

(1) the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corruption, or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government, and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public;

(2) the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities;

(3) organized criminal activity which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions and the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activity have infiltrated lawful business enterprise, and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against such practices or activities;

(4) all other aspects of crime and lawlessness within the United States which have an impact upon or affect the national health, welfare, and safety, including but not limited to investment fraud schemes, commodity and security fraud, computer fraud, and the use of offshore banking and corporate facilities to carry out criminal objectives;

(5) the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to—

(A) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(B) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge and talents;

(C) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relations between the United States and international organizations principally concerned with national security of which the United States is a member; and

(D) legislative and other proposals to improve these methods, processes, and relationships;

(6) the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of all agencies and departments of the Government involved in the control and management of energy shortages including, but not limited to, their performance with respect to—

(A) the collection and dissemination of accurate statistics on fuel demand and supply;

(B) the implementation of effective energy conservation measures;

(C) the pricing of energy in all forms;

(D) coordination of energy programs with State and local government;

(E) control of exports of scarce fuels;

(F) the management of tax, import, pricing, and other policies affecting energy supplies;

(G) maintenance of the independent sector of the petroleum industry as a strong competitive force;

(H) the allocation of fuels in short supply by public and private entities;

(I) the management of energy supplies owned or controlled by the Government;

(J) relations with other oil producing and consuming countries;

(K) the monitoring of compliance by governments, corporations, or individuals with the laws and regulations governing the allocation, conservation, or pricing of energy supplies; and

(L) research into the discovery and development of alternative energy supplies; and

(7) the efficiency and economy of all branches and functions of Government with particular references to the operations and management of Federal regulatory policies and programs.

(b) EXTENT OF INQUIRIES.—In carrying out the duties provided in subsection (a), the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee of the committee shall not be construed to be limited to the records, functions, and operations of any particular branch of the Government and may extend to the records and activities of any persons, corporation, or other entity.

(c) SPECIAL COMMITTEE AUTHORITY.—For the purposes of this subsection, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman is authorized, in its, his, her, or their discretion—

(1) to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents;

(2) to hold hearings;

(3) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recess, and adjournment periods of the Senate;

(4) to administer oaths; and

(5) to take testimony, either orally or by sworn statement, or, in the case of staff members of the Committee and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, by deposition in accordance with the Committee Rules of Procedure.

(d) AUTHORITY OF OTHER COMMITTEES.—Nothing contained in this section shall affect or impair the exercise of any other standing committee of the Senate of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

(e) SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.—All subpoenas and related legal processes of the committee and any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee authorized under S. Res. 253, agreed to October 3, 2013 (113th Congress) are authorized to continue.

SENATE RESOLUTION 34—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. HATCH submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Finance; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 34

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Finance is authorized from March 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015; October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016; and October 1, 2016, through February 28, 2017, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2a. The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, under this resolution shall not exceed $4,710,670, of which amount (1) not to exceed $17,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $5,833 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(b) For the period October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $8,075,434, of which amount (1) not to exceed $30,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(c) For the period October 1, 2016, through February 28, 2017, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $3,364,764, of which amount (1) not to exceed $12,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $4,166 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from March 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015; October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016; and October 1, 2016, through February 28, 2017, to be paid from the Appropriations account for Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 35—COMMEMORATING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF THE AUSCHWITZ EXTERMINATION CAMP IN NAZI-OCCUPIED POLAND

Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KIRK) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 35

Whereas on January 27, 1945, the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland was liberated by Allied Forces during World War II after almost 5 years of murder, rape, and torture at the camp;

Whereas 1,100,000 innocent civilians were murdered at the Auschwitz extermination camp;

Whereas nearly 1,300,000 innocent civilians were deported to Auschwitz from their homes across Eastern and Western Europe, particularly from Hungary, Poland, and France;

Whereas 1,000,000 of the civilians who perished at the camp were Jews, along with 100,000 non-Jewish Poles, Roma and Sinti individuals, Soviet prisoners of war, Jehovah's Witnesses, gay men and women, and other ethnic minorities;

Whereas these civilians included farmers, tailors, seamstresses, factory hands, accountants, doctors, teachers, small-business owners, clergy, intellectuals, government officials, and political activists;

Whereas these civilians were subjected to torture, forced labor, starvation, rape, medical experiments, and being separated from loved ones;

Whereas the names of many of these civilians who perished have been lost forever;

Whereas the Auschwitz extermination camp symbolizes the extraordinary brutality of the Holocaust;

Whereas the people of the United States must never forget the terrible crimes against humanity committed at the Auschwitz extermination camp;

Whereas the people of the United States must educate future generations to promote understanding of the dangers of intolerance in order to prevent similar injustices from happening again; and

Whereas commemoration of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp will instill in all people of the United States a greater awareness of the Holocaust: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates January 27, 2015, as the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp by Allied Forces during World War II;

(2) calls on all people of the United States to remember the 1,100,000 innocent victims murdered at the Auschwitz extermination camp as part of the Holocaust;

(3) honors the legacy of the survivors of the Holocaust and of the Auschwitz extermination camp; and

(4) calls on the people of the United States to continue to work toward tolerance, peace, and justice and to end all genocide and persecution.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to bring to my Senate colleagues' attention the most momentous day that will occur next week.

Next week, on January 27, it will be the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz concentration camp—70 years since the liberation of the Auschwitz concentration camp. It was a triumph for the allies, but a melancholy day as the world began to see the films and photographs coming out of this hellhole.

I stand here today to remember and remind us all that, more than any other word, Auschwitz is synonymous with evil.

As someone who is very proud of her Polish-American heritage, I visited Auschwitz. I wanted to see it when I had the chance to learn more about my own heritage, and I wanted to see what happened there so that I would remember. I rise today so that the world remembers what happened there, and then the heroic effort of the allied forces, joined together, to be able to save Europe and save Western civilization.

I have submitted a resolution honoring those who survive even today, and those who were lost, that would remind us that we need to work always for tolerance, peace, and justice, and, always, to end genocide.

The harms of Auschwitz are incomprehensible and indescribable. The numbers are grim and even ghoulish. Over 1 million people—men, women, and children—lost their lives at Auschwitz. Ninety percent were Jews, hundreds of thousands were children, and it was the largest of any of the death camps.

Auschwitz was first created as an internment camp for Polish dissidents, for hundreds of thousands of Poles who were not Jewish but were murdered alongside the Jews of Auschwitz.

In occupied Poland, a Nazi governor named Hans Frank proclaimed that, ''Poles will become slaves of the Third Reich.''

But Auschwitz went far beyond the Poles, because the German authorities brought in people from throughout Europe. Who were the people who came? They were teachers, they were politicians, they were professors, they were artists—they were even Catholic priests. They were executed or barely survived. These are the stories of heroism that arise from the horrors.

Many Poles risked their lives to save Jews. I am reminded of the story of Irena Sendler, who was a young social worker in Warsaw. She smuggled 200 Jewish children out of the ghetto into a safe house. The Gestapo arrested her in 1943. They first tortured her and then condemned her to death.

Jan Karski, working for the Polish Government, went on to be a leader of solidarity in the founding of the new Polish democratic government. In working, he visited the Warsaw ghetto and did much to liberate people.

But this is not a story of numbers or statistics or naming of heroes. It is a story I am going to tell about myself.

In the late 1970s, as a brandnew Congresswoman, I traveled to Poland. I wanted to see my heritage, and I visited the small—really small—village that my family came from, where my great-grandmother left Poland as a 16-year-old girl to come to the United States to meet up with her brother and begin a new life, with little money in her pocket but big dreams in her heart. The story of America is the story of our family. Landing in Baltimore when women didn't even have the right to vote, she came in 1886—exactly 100 years to the year I became a U.S. Senator. So I wanted to go back to see where we came from to really know our story even better. But I also wanted to see the dark side of the history of Poland, and I went to Auschwitz.

Touring the concentration camp was an experience for me that was searing. Even today I carry it not only in my mind's eye, but I carry it in my heart. I could not believe the experience. The Presiding Officer knows me. I am a fairly strong, resilient person. I think we have even shared stories that I was a child abuse worker. I have seen tough things. But I wasn't prepared for what I saw that day.

As I walked through the gate of Auschwitz, to see the sign—that despicable sign—of welcome there. And then we toured—well, you don't tour. It is not a tourist site, it is a memorial. It is sacred ground. It is not a tourist site. But as we walked through, we saw the chambers where people had died.

I even went to a particular cell of a Father Kolbe, a Catholic priest who in the death camp gave his life to protect a Jewish member there. When they were ready to shoot him, Father Kolbe stepped forward to offer his life instead. Father Kolbe, in my faith tradition, has been canonized a saint for his heroic effort to show that he was willing to martyr himself for another human being, and in the belief that God was there in what he wanted to do.

But as I walked through there—and I saw hard things, tough things, wrenching things, repulsive, repugnant things. But then I got to the part that really broke my heart. I got to the part about the children. Pictures of children—little children. Not that any child's age is there. And then I saw the bins—the bins of the children's shoes: bins piled up with little shoes size 2, size 3, size 4, lace-up shoes, because they were the shoes they had in the 1930s and 1940s. And then I saw their suitcases. Then over in another corner I saw the eyeglasses that were taken from them and broken into pieces. Then I saw the pictures of the mothers.

I will tell you, I became unglued. I had to step away. Even today, when I tell this story, my voice chokes up because it shook my very soul.

So as we move into this commemoration—because it is both a celebration and a commemoration—a celebration of the liberation but a commemoration of what went on. I knew when I left Auschwitz—I knew and I understood why, first of all, we should never have genocide in the world again.

The second thing, and also so crucial to my views, is that there always needed to be a homeland for the Jewish people—why we always need an Israel, why it has to be there, survivable for the ages, and for all who will seek a home there and seek refuge there. This is why I worked so hard on these issues in terms of the support for Israel, the end of genocide, and also the gratitude for all the people who fought—for the people who fought in the underground, for people who fought in the resistance, for people who tried to participate in the famous uprisings; to thank God also for the other fighters—the ones who in the camp gave whatever they could to keep other camp members going; and then, for the allied troops, led by the United States of America—there, where we stood together, we stood and stared evil down; and then, when we opened up the doors of Auschwitz, for freedom and the ability to come out, though barely alive—that it was indeed an historic moment.

We don't want that history ever to repeat itself, where there has to be a liberation of a death camp.

I would also take this opportunity to salute the allies and all the American people who made us victorious in World War II.

Let's say God bless the United States of America. And let's work together for a safe and secure Middle East.

SENATE RESOLUTION 36—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRASSLEY submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on the Judiciary; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 36

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary (in this resolution referred to as the ''committee'') is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed $5,461,388, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this resolution shall not exceed $9,362,379, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this resolution shall not exceed $3,900,991, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for ''Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations'' of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 37—SUPPORTING WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH CARE DECISIONS

Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 37

Whereas access to comprehensive reproductive health care is critical to improving the health and well-being of women and their families and is an essential part of their economic security;

Whereas access to affordable contraceptives, including emergency contraceptives, and medically accurate information prevents unintended pregnancies, thereby improving the health of women, children, families, and society as a whole;

Whereas Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), was decided 42 years ago and clarifies that women have a constitutional right to plan their families and futures;

Whereas private reproductive health care decisions should be decided by women and their health care providers;

Whereas the requirement under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) that all insurance plans cover contraception without cost sharing has

saved women at least $483,000,000, and more than 30,000,000 women are eligible for this benefit;

Whereas research suggests that increasing the rate of contraceptive use may be associated with the decline in teen pregnancy by 50 percent since 1990;

Whereas elected officials in many States and Congress have attempted to block or curtail women's access to medical care and information in order to fulfill a political agenda, and they have often succeeded in such attempts;

Whereas there have been numerous attempts, both legal and legislative, to allow insurance companies and employers to deny women coverage for all contraceptive methods approved by the Food and Drug Administration, even though the law requires such coverage, and such methods are based on a foundation of scientific evidence;

Whereas since the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, States have enacted hundreds of laws restricting access to women's reproductive health care and 24 States have enacted laws that reduce abortion coverage in plans that are offered through the Exchanges established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; and

Whereas 24 States have laws or policies that interfere with women's health care providers in a way that undermines, instead of strengthens, patient safety: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports efforts to—

(1) ensure that all women have access to the best available, scientifically-based health care and information;

(2) ensure that women can make their own private health care decisions with access to comprehensive, unbiased information and confidentiality;

(3) ensure that women and families, not their employers, make their own decisions about their health care;

(4) prohibit employers or government entities from interfering with or denying reproductive health care services guaranteed by law, including access to contraception without cost;

(5) promote preventive health care services and wellness for women;

(6) guarantee the constitutionally protected right to safe, legal abortion services;

(7) ensure that women have access to health care that fosters safe childbearing, with resources available to reduce maternal and infant morbidity and mortality;

(8) ensure that all women have access to comprehensive, affordable insurance coverage that includes pregnancy-related care, such as prenatal care, miscarriage management, family planning services, abortions, labor and delivery services, and postnatal care; and

(9) enact legislation that improves and expands women's access to reproductive health care regardless of the State within which they reside.

SENATE RESOLUTION 38—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF WENDELL H. FORD, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was:

S. RES. 38

Whereas Wendell H. Ford was born in Daviess County, Kentucky in 1924, and attended the University of Kentucky;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford served in the United States Army during World War II, earning the rank of Technical Sergeant, the American Campaign Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the Good Conduct Medal, and the Expert Infantryman Badge;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford served in the Kentucky Army National Guard from 1949 to 1962, earning the rank of First Lieutenant;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford served as the Lieutenant Governor of Kentucky from 1967 to 1971 and the Governor of Kentucky from 1971 to 1974;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford was first elected to the United States Senate in 1974 and served four terms as a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky with honor and distinction;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford, when he was elected to his fourth term in the Senate on November 3, 1992, received the largest number of votes for elected office ever recorded in the Commonwealth of Kentucky up to that time;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford served the Senate as the Majority Whip from 1991 to 1995 and as the Democratic Whip from 1995 to 1999;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford was the only Kentuckian to ever win election to consecutive terms as Lieutenant Governor, Governor, and Senator;

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Wendell H. Ford, former member of the United States Senate;

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Wendell H. Ford.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 99. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

SA 100. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 101. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 102. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 103. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 104. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 105. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 106. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 107. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 108. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 109. Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 110. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE,

Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 111. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 112. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 113. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 114. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 115. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 116. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 117. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 118. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 119. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 120. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 121. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 122. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 123. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 124. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 125. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 126. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 127. Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 128. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 129. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 130. Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 131. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 132. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 133. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 134. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 135. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 136. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 137. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 138. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 139. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 140. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 141. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 142. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 143. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 99. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the opinion of virtually

the entire worldwide scientific community and a growing number of top national security experts, economists, and others that—

(1) climate change is real;

(2) climate change is caused by human activities;

(3) climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world;

(4) the Energy Information Administration projects that fossil fuels will continue to produce 68 percent of the electricity in the United States through 2040; and

(5) it is imperative that the United States invest in research and development for clean fossil fuel technology.

SA 100. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2015''.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title the following definitions apply:

(1) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''economic development''—

(i) means taking private property, without the consent of the owner, and conveying or leasing such property from one private person or entity to another private person or entity for commercial enterprise carried on for profit, or to increase tax revenue, tax base, employment, or general economic health; and

(ii) does not include—

(I) conveying private property—

(aa) to public ownership, such as for a road, hospital, airport, or military base;

(bb) to an entity, such as a common carrier, that makes the property available to the general public as of right, such as a railroad or public facility;

(cc) for use as a road or other right of way or means, open to the public for transportation, whether free or by toll; or

(dd) for use as an aqueduct, flood control facility, pipeline, or similar use;

(II) removing blighted property;

(III) leasing property to a private person or entity that occupies an incidental part of public property or a public facility, such as a retail establishment on the ground floor of a public building;

(IV) acquiring abandoned property;

(V) clearing defective chains of title;

(VI) taking private property for use by a utility, including a utility providing electric, natural gas, telecommunications, water and wastewater services, either directly to the public or indirectly through provision of such services at the wholesale level for resale to the public; or

(VII) redeveloping of a brownfield site, as defined in section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601).

(B) BLIGHTED PROPERTY.—In subparagraph (A)(ii)(II), the term ''blighted property'' means a structure—

(i) that was inspected by the appropriate local government and cited for one or more enforceable housing, maintenance, or building code violations that—

(I) affect the safety of the occupants or the public; and

(II) involve one or more of the following:

(aa) a roof or roof framing element;

(bb) support walls, beams, or headers;

(cc) foundation, footings, or subgrade conditions;

(dd) light or ventilation;

(ee) fire protection, including egress;

(ff) internal utilities, including electricity, gas, and water;

(gg) flooring or flooring elements; or

(hh) walls, insulation, or exterior envelope;

(ii) in which the cited housing, maintenance, or building code violations have not been remedied within a reasonable time after 2 notices to cure the noncompliance; and

(iii) that the satisfaction of those enforceable, cited and uncured housing, maintenance, and building code violations cost more than 50 percent of the assessor's taxable market value for the building, excluding land value, for property taxes payable in the year in which the condemnation is commenced.

(C) ABANDONED PROPERTY.—In subparagraph (A)(ii)(IV), the term ''abandoned property'' means property—

(i) that has been substantially unoccupied or unused for any commercial or residential purpose for at least 1 year by a person with a legal or equitable right to occupy the property;

(ii) that has not been maintained; and

(iii) for which property taxes have not been paid for at least 2 years.

(2) FEDERAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUNDS.—The term ''Federal economic development funds'' means any Federal funds distributed to or through States or political subdivisions of States under Federal laws designed to improve or increase the size of the economies of States or political subdivisions of States.

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any other territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 203. PROHIBITION ON EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE BY FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No State or political subdivision of a State shall delegate its power of eminent domain to a foreign corporation over property—

(1) that is—

(A) to be used for economic development; or

(B) used for economic development within 7 years after that exercise; and

(2) if that State or political subdivision receives Federal economic development funds during any fiscal year in which the property is so used or intended to be used.

(b) INELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c), a violation of subsection (a) by a State or political subdivision of a State shall render such State or political subdivision ineligible for any Federal economic development funds for a period of 2 fiscal years following a final judgment on the merits by a court of competent jurisdiction that such subsection has been violated.

(2) AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.—An agency charged with distributing Federal economic development funds to a State or political subdivision of a State that violates subsection (a) shall withhold such funds for such 2-year period and any such funds distributed to such State or political subdivision shall be returned or reimbursed by such State or political subdivision to the appropriate agency or authority of the Federal Government, or component thereof.

(c) OPPORTUNITY TO CURE VIOLATION.—A State or political subdivision shall not be ineligible for Federal economic development funds under subsection (b) if such State or political subdivision—

(1) returns all real property the taking of which was found by a court of competent jurisdiction to have constituted a violation of subsection (a);

(2) replaces any other property destroyed and repairs any other property damaged as a result of such violation; and

(3) pays applicable penalties and interest.

SEC. 204. PROHIBITION ON EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE BY STATES.

No State or political subdivision of a State shall exercise its power of eminent domain, or allow the exercise of such power by any person or entity to which such power has been delegated, over property—

(1) that is—

(A) to be used for economic development; or

(B) used for economic development within 7 years after that exercise; and

(2) if that State or political subdivision receives Federal economic development funds during any fiscal year in which the property is so used or intended to be used.

SEC. 205. PROHIBITION ON EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

The Federal Government, including any authority of the Federal Government, shall not exercise its power of eminent domain over property that is to be used for economic development.

SEC. 206. RELIGIOUS AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON STATES.—No State or political subdivision of a State shall exercise its power of eminent domain, or allow the exercise of such power by any person or entity to which such power has been delegated, over property of a religious or other nonprofit organization by reason of the nonprofit or tax-exempt status of such organization, or any quality related thereto, if that State or political subdivision receives Federal economic development funds during any fiscal year in which it does so.

(b) INELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A violation of subsection (a) by a State or political subdivision of a State shall render such State or political subdivision ineligible for any Federal economic development funds for a period of 2 fiscal years following a final judgment on the merits by a court of competent jurisdiction that such subsection has been violated.

(2) AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.—An agency charged with distributing Federal economic development funds to a State or political subdivision of a State that violates subsection (a) shall withhold such funds for such 2-year period and any such funds distributed to such State or political subdivision shall be returned or reimbursed by such State or political subdivision to the appropriate agency or authority of the Federal Government, or component thereof.

(c) PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—The Federal Government or any authority of the Federal Government shall not exercise its power of eminent domain over property of a religious or other nonprofit organization by reason of the nonprofit or tax-exempt status of such organization, or any quality related thereto.

SEC. 207. PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.

(a) CAUSE OF ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An owner of private property whose property is subject to eminent domain who suffers injury as a result of a violation of any provision of this title with respect to that property, or tenant of property that is subject to eminent domain who

suffers injury as a result of a violation of any provision of this title with respect to that property, may bring a civil action to enforce any provision of this title in the appropriate Federal or State court, which may include seeking appropriate relief through a preliminary injunction or a temporary restraining order.

(2) NO IMMUNITY.—A State shall not be immune under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States from a civil action brought under paragraph (1) in a Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction.

(3) BURDEN OF PROOF.—In a civil action brought under paragraph (1), the defendant has the burden to show by clear and convincing evidence that the taking is not for economic development.

(b) LIMITATION ON BRINGING ACTION.—A civil action brought by a property owner or tenant under this section may be brought if the property is used for economic development following the conclusion of any condemnation proceedings condemning the property of such property owner or tenant, but shall not be brought later than 7 years following the conclusion of any such proceedings.

(c) ATTORNEYS' FEE AND OTHER COSTS.—In any action or proceeding under this section, the court shall award a prevailing plaintiff costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expert fees.

SEC. 208. REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.

(a) SUBMISSION OF REPORT TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—An owner of private property whose property is subject to eminent domain who suffers injury as a result of a violation of any provision of this title with respect to that property, or tenant of property that is subject to eminent domain who suffers injury as a result of a violation of any provision of this title with respect to that property, may report the violation to the Attorney General.

(b) INVESTIGATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Upon receiving a report of an alleged violation of a provision of this title, the Attorney General shall conduct an investigation to determine whether a violation exists.

(c) NOTIFICATION OF VIOLATION.—If the Attorney General concludes that a violation of this title does exist, the Attorney General shall notify the applicable authority of the Federal Government, State, or political subdivision of a State that—

(1) the Attorney General has determined there is a violation of this title;

(2) the authority of the Federal Government, State, or political subdivision of a State has 90 days from the date of the notification to demonstrate to the Attorney General that—

(A) it is not in violation of this title; or

(B) it has cured the violation by returning all real property the taking of which the Attorney General finds to have constituted a violation of this title and replacing any other property destroyed and repairing any other property damaged as a result of such violation.

(d) ATTORNEY GENERAL'S BRINGING OF ACTION TO ENFORCE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, at the end of the 90-day period described in subsection (c), the Attorney General determines that the applicable authority of the Federal Government, State, or political subdivision of a State is still in violation of this title or has not cured its violation as described in subsection (c)(2)(B), the Attorney General shall bring a civil action in an appropriate Federal or State court to enforce this title, which may include seeking appropriate relief through a preliminary injunction or a temporary restraining order, unless the property owner or tenant who reported the violation has already brought a civil action to enforce this title.

(2) INTERVENTION.—If a property owner or tenant has brought a civil action as described in paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall seek to intervene if the Attorney General determines that intervention is necessary in order to enforce this title.

(3) NO IMMUNITY.—A State shall not be immune under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States from a civil action brought under paragraph (1) in a Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction.

(4) BURDEN OF PROOF.—In a civil action brought under paragraph (1), the defendant has the burden to show by clear and convincing evidence that the taking is not for economic development.

(e) LIMITATION ON BRINGING ACTION.—An action brought by the Attorney General under this section may be brought if the property is used for economic development following the conclusion of any condemnation proceedings condemning the property of an owner or tenant who reports a violation of this title to the Attorney General, but shall not be brought later than 7 years following the conclusion of any such proceedings.

(f) ATTORNEYS' FEE AND OTHER COSTS.—In any action or proceeding under this section, if the Attorney General is a prevailing plaintiff, the court shall award the Attorney General costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expert fees.

SEC. 209. NOTIFICATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.

(a) NOTIFICATION TO STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—

(1) STATUTE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall provide to the chief executive officer of each State the text of this title and a description of the rights of property owners and tenants under this title.

(2) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Attorney General shall compile a list of the Federal laws under which Federal economic development funds are distributed.

(B) NOTIFICATION.—The Attorney General shall—

(i) provide each list compiled under subparagraph (A) to—

(I) the chief executive officer of each State; and

(II) the authorities in each State and political subdivisions of each State empowered to take private property and convert it to public use subject to just compensation for the taking; and

(ii) make each such list available on the Internet website maintained by the Department of Justice for use by the public.

(b) NOTIFICATION TO PROPERTY OWNERS AND TENANTS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall publish in the Federal Register and make available on the Internet website maintained by the Department of Justice a notice containing the text of this title and a description of the rights of property owners and tenants under this title.

SEC. 210. REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report identifying States and political subdivisions of States that have used eminent domain in violation of this title, which shall—

(1) identify each private civil action brought as a result of a State's or political subdivision's violation of this title;

(2) identify all violations reported by property owners and tenants under section 208(a);

(3) identify the percentage of minority residents compared to the surrounding nonminority residents and the median incomes of those impacted by a violation of this title;

(4) identify each civil action brought by the Attorney General under section 208(d);

(5) identify all States or political subdivisions that have lost Federal economic development funds as a result of a violation of this title, and describe the type and amount of Federal economic development funds lost in each State or political subdivision and the agency that is responsible for withholding such funds; and

(6) discuss all instances in which a State or political subdivision has cured a violation as described in section 203(c) or section 208(c)(2)(B).

(b) DUTY OF STATES.—Each State or political subdivision of a State that is a defendant in a private civil action brought under this title shall have the duty to report to the Attorney General such information with respect to such State and local authorities as the Attorney General needs to make the report required under subsection (a).

(c) REPORT BY FEDERAL AGENCIES ON REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES RELATING TO EMINENT DOMAIN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency shall review all rules, regulations, and procedures of the agency and submit to the Attorney General a report on the activities of that agency to bring its rules, regulations, and procedures into compliance with this title.

SEC. 211. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING RURAL AMERICA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The founders realized the fundamental importance of property rights when they codified the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which requires that private property shall not be taken ''for public use, without just compensation''.

(2) Rural lands are unique in that they are not traditionally considered high tax revenue-generating properties for State and local governments. In addition, farmland and forest land owners need to have long-term certainty regarding their property rights in order to make the investment decisions to commit land to these uses.

(3) Ownership rights in rural land are fundamental building blocks for our Nation's agriculture industry, which continues to be one of the most important economic sectors of our economy.

(4) In the wake of the Supreme Court's decision in Kelo v. City of New London, abuse of eminent domain is a threat to the property rights of all private property owners, including rural land owners.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The use of eminent domain for the purpose of economic development is a threat to agricultural and other property in rural America and that Congress should protect the property rights of the people of the United States, including those who reside in rural areas.

(2) Property rights are central to liberty in this country and to its economy.

(3) The use of eminent domain to take farmland and other rural property for economic development threatens liberty, rural economies, and the economy of the United States.

(4) The taking of farmland and rural property will have a direct impact on existing irrigation and reclamation projects.

(5) The use of eminent domain to take rural private property for private commercial uses will force increasing numbers of activities from private property onto this Nation's public lands, including its National forests, National parks, and wildlife refuges, which can overburden the infrastructure of these lands, reducing the enjoyment of such lands by the people of the United States.

(6) The people of the United States should not have to fear the taking their homes, farms, or businesses by the government to give to other persons.

(7) Governments should not abuse the power of eminent domain to force rural property owners from their land in order to develop rural land into industrial and commercial property.

(8) Congress has a duty to protect the property rights of rural Americans in the face of eminent domain abuse.

SEC. 212. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the policy of the United States to encourage, support, and promote the private ownership of property and to ensure that the constitutional and other legal rights of private property owners are protected by the Federal Government.

SEC. 213. BROAD CONSTRUCTION.

This title shall be construed in favor of a broad protection of private property rights, to the maximum extent permitted by the terms of this title and the Constitution.

SEC. 214. LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title may be construed to supersede, limit, or otherwise affect any provision of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.).

SEC. 215. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that any and all precautions shall be taken by the Federal Government, States, and political subdivisions of States to avoid the unfair or unreasonable taking of property away from survivors of Hurricane Katrina who own, were bequeathed, or assigned such property, for economic development purposes or for the private use of others.

SEC. 216. DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT ON MINORITIES.

If a court determines that a violation of this title has occurred, and that the violation has a disproportionately high impact on the poor or minorities, the Attorney General shall use reasonable efforts to locate and inform former owners and tenants of the violation and any remedies they may have.

SEC. 217. SEVERABILITY AND EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this title, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this title, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This title—

(1) shall take effect upon the first day of the first fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) shall not apply to any project for which condemnation proceedings have been initiated before the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 101. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR LOW-INCOME PERSONS.

Section 415 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6865) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State shall use up to 8 percent of any grant made by the Secretary under this part to track applicants for and recipients of weatherization assistance under this part to determine the impact of the assistance and eliminate or reduce reliance on the low-income home energy assistance program established under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.), over a period of not more than 3 years.

''(2) USE OF SAVINGS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of any savings obtained by the Secretary of Health and Human Services due to eliminated or reduced reliance on the low-income home energy assistance program established under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.) as a result of the weatherization assistance provided under this part, as determined under paragraph (1)—

''(A) 50 percent shall be transferred to the Secretary to provide assistance to States under this part; and

''(B) 50 percent shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury for purposes of reducing the annual Federal budget deficit.

''(3) ANNUAL STATE PLANS.—A State may submit to the Secretary for approval within 90 days an annual plan for the administration of assistance under this part in the State that includes, at the option of the State—

''(A) local income eligibility standards for the assistance that are not based on the formula that are used to allocate assistance under this part; and

''(B) the establishment of revolving loan funds for multifamily affordable housing units.''.

SA 102. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place. insert the following:

TITLE _____—ATLANTIC OCS ACCESS AND REVENUE SHARE ACT OF 2015

SEC. __01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Atlantic OCS Access and Revenue Share Act of 2015''.

SEC. __02. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) MID-ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATE.—The term ''Mid-Atlantic Producing State'' means each of the States of—

(A) Delaware;

(B) Maryland;

(C) North Carolina; and

(D) Virginia.

(2) MID-ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA.—The term ''Mid-Atlantic Planning Area'' means the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area of the outer Continental Shelf designated in the document entitled ''Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2012–17'' and dated June 2012.

(3) QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues'' means all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States from leases entered into on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ''qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues'' does not include—

(i) revenues from the forfeiture of a bond or other surety securing obligations other than royalties, civil penalties, or royalties taken by the Secretary in-kind and not sold; or

(ii) revenues generated from leases subject to section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) SOUTH ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATE.—The term ''South Atlantic Producing State'' means each of the States of—

(A) Florida;

(B) Georgia; and

(C) South Carolina.

(6) SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA.—The term ''South Atlantic Planning Area'' means the South Atlantic Planning Area of the outer Continental Shelf designated in the document entitled ''Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2012–17'' and dated June 2012.

SEC. __03. OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING IN MID-ATLANTIC AND SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(1) not later than July 15, 2016, publish and submit to Congress a new proposed oil and gas leasing program prepared under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) for the 5-year period beginning on July 15, 2017 and ending July 15, 2022; and

(2) not later than July 15, 2017, approve a final oil and gas leasing program under that section for that period.

(b) INCLUSION OF MID-ATLANTIC AND SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREAS.—The Secretary shall include in the program described in subsection (a) annual lease sales in both the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area and the South Atlantic Planning Area.

(e) PROHIBITION ON LEASING CERTAIN AREAS.—

(1) PETITION.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), the leasing of areas within the administrative boundaries of a Mid-Atlantic Producing State or South Atlantic Producing State that are 30 miles or less off the coast of the State shall be prohibited.

SEC. __04. DISPOSITION OF QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES FROM MID-ATLANTIC LEASING ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338) and subject to this section, for each applicable fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit—

(1) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area in the general fund of the Treasury; and

(2) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

(A) 75 percent to Mid-Atlantic Producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

(B) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200302 of that title.

(b) ALLOCATION AMONG MID-ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount made available under subsection

(a)(2)(A) from any lease entered into within the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area shall be allocated to each Mid-Atlantic producing State in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each Mid-Atlantic producing State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

(2) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a Mid-Atlantic Producing State each fiscal year under paragraph (1) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(A).

(c) TIMING.—The amounts required to be deposited under subsection (a)(2) for the applicable fiscal year shall be made available in accordance with that paragraph during the fiscal year immediately following the applicable fiscal year.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Amounts made available under subsection (a)(2) shall—

(1) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this section;

(2) remain available until expended; and

(3) be in addition to any amounts appropriated under—

(A) the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.);

(B) chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code; or

(C) any other provision of law.

(e) DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES SHALL BE NET OF RECEIPTS.—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2055, expenditures under subsection (a)(2) and shall be net of receipts from that fiscal year from qualified outer Continental shelf revenues from any area in the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area.

SEC. __05. DISPOSITION OF QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES FROM SOUTH ATLANTIC LEASING ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338) and subject to this section, for each applicable fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit—

(1) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the South Atlantic Planning Area in the general fund of the Treasury; and

(2) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the South Atlantic Planning Area in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

(A) 75 percent to South Atlantic producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

(B) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200302 of that title.

(b) ALLOCATION AMONG SOUTH ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount made available under subsection (a)(2)(A) from any lease entered into within the South Atlantic Planning Area shall be allocated to each South Atlantic producing State in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each South Atlantic producing State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

(2) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a South Atlantic Producing State each fiscal year under paragraph (1) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(A).

(c) TIMING.—The amounts required to be deposited under paragraph subsection (a)(2) for the applicable fiscal year shall be made available in accordance with that paragraph during the fiscal year immediately following the applicable fiscal year.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Amounts made available under subsection (a)(2) shall—

(1) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this section;

(2) remain available until expended; and

(3) be in addition to any amounts appropriated under—

(A) the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.);

(B) chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code; or

(C) any other provision of law.

(e) DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES SHALL BE NET OF RECEIPTS.—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2055, expenditures under subsection (a)(2) and shall be net of receipts from that fiscal year from qualified outer Continental shelf revenues from any area in the South Atlantic Planning Area.

SA 103. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

On page 3, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. 4___. EVALUATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE GREEN BUILDING PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The term ''administrative expenses'' has the meaning given the term by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under section 504(b)(2) of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (31 U.S.C. 1105 note; Public Law 111–85), except that the term shall include, for purposes of that section and this section, with respect to an agency—

(A) costs incurred by the agency and costs incurred by grantees, subgrantees, and other recipients of funds from a grant program or other program administered by the agency; and

(B) expenses related to personnel salaries and benefits, property management, travel, program management, promotion, reviews and audits, case management, and communication about, promotion of, and outreach for programs and program activities administered by the agency.

(2) APPLICABLE PROGRAMS.—The term ''applicable programs'' means the programs listed in Table 9 (pages 348-350) of the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled ''2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue''.

(3) APPROPRIATE SECRETARIES.—The term ''appropriate Secretaries'' means—

(A) the Secretary;

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(C) the Secretary of Defense;

(D) the Secretary of Education;

(E) the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(F) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

(G) the Secretary of Transportation;

(H) the Secretary of the Treasury;

(I) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(J) the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and

(K) the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(4) SERVICES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term ''services'' has the meaning given the term by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The term ''services'' shall be limited to activities, assistance, and aid that provide a direct benefit to a recipient, such as—

(i) the provision of medical care;

(ii) assistance for housing or tuition; or

(iii) financial support (including grants and loans).

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2015, the appropriate Secretaries shall submit to Congress and post on the public Internet websites of the agencies of the appropriate Secretaries a report on the outcomes of the applicable programs.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In reporting on the outcomes of each applicable program, the appropriate Secretaries shall—

(A) determine the total administrative expenses of the applicable program;

(B) determine the expenditures for services for the applicable program;

(C) estimate the number of clients served by the applicable program and beneficiaries who received assistance under the applicable program (if applicable);

(D) estimate—

(i) the number of full-time employees who administer the applicable program; and

(ii) the number of full-time equivalents (whose salary is paid in part or full by the Federal Government through a grant or contract, a subaward of a grant or contract, a cooperative agreement, or another form of financial award or assistance) who assist in administering the applicable program;

(E) describe the type of assistance the applicable program provides, such as grants, technical assistance, loans, tax credits, or tax deductions;

(F) describe the type of recipient who benefits from the assistance provided, such as individual property owners or renters, local governments, businesses, nonprofit organizations, or State governments; and

(G) identify and report on whether written program goals are available for the applicable program.

(c) PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than January 1, 2016, the appropriate Secretaries shall jointly submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) an analysis of whether any of the applicable programs should be eliminated or consolidated, including any legislative changes that would be necessary to eliminate or consolidate the applicable programs; and

(2) ways to improve the applicable programs by establishing program goals or increasing collaboration so as to reduce the overlap and duplication identified in—

(A) the 2011 report of the Government Accountability Office entitled ''Federal Initiatives for the NonFederal Sector Could Benefit from More Interagency Collaboration''; and

(B) the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled ''2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue''.

(d) PROGRAM ELIMINATIONS.—Not later than January 1, 2016, the appropriate Secretaries shall—

(1) identify—

(A) which applicable programs are specifically required by law; and

(B) which applicable programs are carried out under the discretionary authority of the appropriate Secretaries;

(2) eliminate those applicable programs that are not required by law; and

(3) transfer any remaining applicable projects and nonduplicative functions into another green building program within the same agency.

SA 104. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. GAO STUDY AND REPORT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on requests for proposals by Federal agencies for rebranding, including requests for proposals by Federal agencies to achieve strategic organizational transformation, identity clarification, and social purpose branding and branding management.

SA 105. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. MODIFICATION OF EXTENSION OF WIND PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 45(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014, is amended by striking ''begins before January 1, 2015'' and inserting ''begins before January 1, 2014, or during the period beginning on December 19, 2014, and ending on December 31, 2014''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 155 of the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014.

SA 106. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. INSTALLATION RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT DATABASE.

(a) LIMITATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a searchable database to uniformly report information regarding installation renewable energy projects undertaken since 2010.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The database established under subsection (a) shall include, for each installation energy project—

(1) the estimated project costs;

(2) estimated power generation;

(3) estimated total cost savings;

(4) estimated payback period;

(5) total project costs;

(6) actual power generation;

(7) actual cost savings to date;

(8) current operational status; and

(9) access to relevant business case documents, including the economic viability assessment.

(c) NON-DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, withhold from inclusion in the database established under subsection (a) information pertaining to individual projects if the Secretary determines that the disclosure of such information would jeopardize operational security.

(2) REQUIRED DISCLOSURE.—In the event the Secretary withholds information related to one or more renewable energy projects under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include in the database—

(A) a statement that information has been withheld; and

(B) an aggregate amount for each of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (b) that includes amounts for all renewable energy projects described under subsection (a), including those with respect to which information has been withheld under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(d) UPDATES.—The database established under subsection (a) shall be updated not less than quarterly.

SA 107. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPEAL OF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013) is repealed.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) takes effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Any amounts made available to carry out section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013) (as in effect before the amendment made by subsection (a)) that are not obligated as of the date of enactment of this Act are rescinded.

SA 108. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. CELLULOSIC BIOFUEL REQUIREMENT BASED ON ACTUAL PRODUCTION.

(a) PROVISION OF ESTIMATE OF VOLUMES OF CELLULOSIC BIOFUEL.—Section 211(o)(3)(A) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(3)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Not later than'' and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) ESTIMATION METHOD.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—In determining any estimate under clause (i), with respect to the following calendar year, of the projected volume of cellulosic biofuel production (as described in paragraph (7)(D)(i)), the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration shall—

''(aa) for each cellulosic biofuel production facility that is producing (and continues to produce) cellulosic biofuel during the period of January 1 through October 31 of the calendar year in which the estimate is made (in this clause referred to as the 'current calendar year')—

''(AA) determine the average monthly volume of cellulosic biofuel produced by such facility, based on the actual volume produced by such facility during such period; and

''(BB) based on such average monthly volume of production, determine the estimated annualized volume of cellulosic biofuel production for such facility for the current calendar year; and

''(bb) for each cellulosic biofuel production facility that begins initial production of (and continues to produce) cellulosic biofuel after January 1 of the current calendar year—

''(AA) determine the average monthly volume of cellulosic biofuel produced by such facility, based on the actual volume produced by such facility during the period beginning on the date of initial production of cellulosic biofuel by the facility and ending on October 31 of the current calendar year; and

''(BB) based on such average monthly volume of production, determine the estimated annualized volume of cellulosic biofuel production for such facility for the current calendar year.

''(II) TOTAL PRODUCTION.—An estimate under clause (i) with respect to the following calendar year of the projected volume of cellulosic biofuel production (as described in paragraph (7)(D)(i)), shall be equal to the total of the estimated annual volumes of cellulosic biofuel production for all cellulosic biofuel production facilities described in subclause (I) for the current calendar year.''.

(b) REDUCTION IN APPLICABLE VOLUME.—Section 211(o)(7)(D)(i) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(7)(D)(i)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''based on the'' and inserting ''using the exact'';

(2) in the second sentence—

(A) by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall''; and

(B) by striking ''same or a lesser volume'' and inserting ''same volume''.

SA 109. Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. RESIDENTIAL ENERGY-EFFICIENT PROPERTY CREDIT FOR BIOMASS FUEL PROPERTY EXPENDITURES.

(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—Subsection (a) of section 25D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (4),

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting '', and'', and

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

''(6) 30 percent of the qualified biomass fuel property expenditures made by the taxpayer during such year.''.

(b) QUALIFIED BIOMASS FUEL PROPERTY EXPENDITURES.—Subsection (d) of section 25D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) QUALIFIED BIOMASS FUEL PROPERTY EXPENDITURE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified biomass fuel property expenditure' means an expenditure for property—

''(i) which uses the burning of biomass fuel to heat a dwelling unit located in the United States and used as a residence by the taxpayer, or to heat water for use in such a dwelling unit, and

''(ii) which has a thermal efficiency rating of at least 75 percent (measured by the higher heating value of the fuel).

''(B) BIOMASS FUEL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'biomass fuel' means any plant-derived fuel available on a renewable or recurring basis, including agricultural crops and trees, wood and wood waste and residues, plants (including aquatic plants), grasses, residues, and fibers. Such term includes densified biomass fuels such as wood pellets.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to expenditures paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 4. INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT FOR BIOMASS HEATING PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 48(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''or'' at the end of clause (vi), by inserting ''or'' at the end of clause (vii), and by inserting after clause (vii) the following new clause:

''(viii) open-loop biomass (within the meaning of section 45(c)(3)) heating property, including boilers or furnaces which operate at thermal output efficiencies of not less than 65 percent (measured by the higher heating value of the fuel) and which provide thermal energy in the form of heat, hot water, or steam for space heating, air conditioning, domestic hot water, or industrial process heat, but only with respect to periods ending before January 1, 2017,''.

(b) 30 PERCENT AND 15 PERCENT CREDITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 48(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii),

(B) by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) except as provided in clause (i)(V), 15 percent in the case of energy property described in paragraph (3)(A)(viii), and'', and

(C) by inserting ''or (ii)'' after ''clause (i)'' in clause (iii), as so redesignated.

(2) INCREASED CREDIT FOR GREATER EFFICIENCY.—Clause (i) of section 48(a)(2)(A) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subclause (III) and by inserting after subclause (IV) the following new subclause:

''(V) energy property described in paragraph (3)(A)(viii) which operates at a thermal output efficiency of not less than 80 percent (measured by the higher heating value of the fuel),''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to periods after December 31, 2015, in taxable years ending after such date, under rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990).

SA 110. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE __—OFFSHORE WIND FACILITIES

SEC. __01. QUALIFYING OFFSHORE WIND FACILITY CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 46 is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (5),

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting '', and'', and

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

''(7) the qualifying offshore wind facility credit.''.

(b) AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—Subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after section 48D the following new section:

''SEC. 48E. CREDIT FOR OFFSHORE WIND FACILITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 46, the qualifying offshore wind facility credit for any taxable year is an amount equal to 30 percent of the qualified investment for such taxable year with respect to any qualifying offshore wind facility of the taxpayer.

''(b) QUALIFIED INVESTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), the qualified investment for any taxable year is the basis of eligible property placed in service by the taxpayer during such taxable year which is part of a qualifying offshore wind facility.

''(2) CERTAIN QUALIFIED PROGRESS EXPENDITURES RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (c)(4) and (d) of section 46 (as in effect on the day before the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990) shall apply for purposes of this section.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) QUALIFYING OFFSHORE WIND FACILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualifying offshore wind facility' means an offshore facility using wind to produce electricity.

''(B) OFFSHORE FACILITY.—The term 'offshore facility' means any facility located in the inland navigable waters of the United States, including the Great Lakes, or in the coastal waters of the United States, including the territorial seas of the United States, the exclusive economic zone of United States, and the outer Continental Shelf of the United States.

''(2) ELIGIBLE PROPERTY.—The term 'eligible property' means any property—

''(A) which is—

''(i) tangible personal property, or

''(ii) other tangible property (not including a building or its structural components), but only if such property is used as an integral part of the qualifying offshore wind facility, and

''(B) with respect to which depreciation (or amortization in lieu of depreciation) is allowable.

''(d) QUALIFYING CREDIT FOR OFFSHORE WIND FACILITIES PROGRAM.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Interior, shall establish a qualifying credit for offshore wind facilities program to consider and award certifications for qualified investments eligible for credits under this section to qualifying offshore wind facility sponsors.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The total amount of megawatt capacity for offshore facilities with respect to which credits may be allocated under the program shall not exceed 3,000 megawatts.

''(2) CERTIFICATION.—

''(A) APPLICATION PERIOD.—Each applicant for certification under this paragraph shall submit an application containing such information as the Secretary may require beginning on the date the Secretary establishes the program under paragraph (1).

''(B) PERIOD OF ISSUANCE.—An applicant which receives a certification shall have 5 years from the date of issuance of the certification in order to place the facility in service and if such facility is not placed in service by that time period, then the certification shall no longer be valid.

''(3) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In determining which qualifying offshore wind facilities to certify under this section, the Secretary shall—

''(A) take into consideration which facilities will be placed in service at the earliest date, and

''(B) take into account the technology of the facility that may lead to reduced industry and consumer costs or expand access to offshore wind.

''(4) REVIEW, ADDITIONAL ALLOCATIONS, AND REALLOCATIONS.—

''(A) REVIEW.—Periodically, but not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall review the credits allocated under this section as of the date of such review.

''(B) ADDITIONAL ALLOCATIONS AND REALLOCATIONS.—The Secretary may make additional allocations and reallocations of credits under this section if the Secretary determines that—

''(i) the limitation under paragraph (1)(B) has not been attained at the time of the review, or

''(ii) scheduled placed-in-service dates of previously certified facilities have been significantly delayed and the Secretary determines the applicant will not meet the timeline pursuant to paragraph (2)(B).

''(C) ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR ALLOCATIONS AND REALLOCATIONS.—If the Secretary determines that credits under this section are available for further allocation or reallocation, but there is an insufficient quantity of qualifying applications for certification pending at the time of the review, the Secretary is authorized to conduct an additional program for applications for certification.

''(5) DISCLOSURE OF ALLOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall, upon making a certification under this subsection, publicly disclose the identity of the applicant and the amount of the credit with respect to such applicant.

''(e) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—A credit shall not be allowed under this section with respect to any facility if—

''(1) a credit has been allowed to such facility under section 45 for such taxable year or any prior taxable year,

''(2) a credit has been allowed with respect to such facility under section 46 by reason of section 48(a) or 48C(a) for such taxable or any preceding taxable year, or

''(3) a grant has been made with respect to such facility under section 1603 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 49(a)(1)(C) is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (v),

(B) by striking the period at the end of clause (vi) and inserting '', and'', and

(C) by adding after clause (vi) the following new clause:

''(vii) the basis of any property which is part of a qualifying offshore wind facility under section 48E.''.

(2) Subparagraph (B) of section 50(a)(2) is amended by striking ''or 48D(b)(4)'' and inserting ''48D(b)(4), or 48E(b)(2)''.

(3) The table of sections for subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 48D the following new item:

''48E. Credit for offshore wind facilities.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to periods after the date of the enactment of this Act, under rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990).

SA 111. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _. FUEL SWITCHING UNDER WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 415(c)(1) of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6865(c)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (E) and inserting the following:

''(E) the cost of making heating and cooling modifications, including replacement (including, at the option of the State, nonrenewable fuel switching when replacing furnaces or appliances if the new unit is more efficient than the replaced unit).''.

SA 112. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _. TAX ON OIL TRANSPORTED THROUGH THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 4611 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) INCREASE IN THE CASE OF OIL TRANSPORTED THROUGH THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any crude oil received at a United States refinery that, at any point before reaching the refinery, travels through any portion of the Keystone XL pipeline, the rate of tax determined under paragraph (1) shall be increased by 8 cents a barrel.

''(B) KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'Keystone XL pipeline' means the pipeline described in section 2(a) of the Keystone XL Pipeline Act.

''(C) AMOUNTS NOT ATTRIBUTABLE TO TRUST FUNDS.—For purposes of any other provision of law, the increase under subparagraph (A) shall not be treated as attributable to the Hazardous Substance Superfund financing rate or the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund financing rate.''.

(b) TRANSFERS FROM GENERAL FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time transfer to the Secretary of Energy from the general fund of the Treasury amounts equal to the taxes collected under section 4611(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts transferred under paragraph (1) shall be available without further appropriation only for the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons established under part A of title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6861 et seq.).

(B) PRIORITIZATION.—In carrying out the program described in subparagraph (A) using the amounts described in that subparagraph, the Secretary of Energy shall prioritize funding projects focused on fuel switching.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to crude oil received at a United States refinery after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 113. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Presidents of both parties have designated public land to preserve the land for current and future generations and to honor the national heritage of the United States, and that designated public land includes—

(A) the Statue of Liberty;

(B) the Grand Canyon;

(C) Acadia National Park;

(D) African Burial Ground National Monument;

(E) the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park;

(F) Muir Woods National Monument;

(G) Arches National Park; and

(H) Devils Tower National Monument;

(2) outdoor recreation, including recreation within Federal land, adds over $600,000,000,000 into the economy of the United States and supports more than 6,000,000 jobs;

(3) Federal land, such as National Parks, National Monuments, or other federally designated land, conserves historic, cultural, environmental, scenic, recreational, and biological resources, and positive impacts include—

(A) economic opportunities and small business creation;

(B) local tourism in gateway communities;

(C) new direct and indirect employment opportunities;

(D) recreational opportunities; and

(E) environmental, historic, and educational opportunities; and

(4) regions surrounding National Monuments have seen continued growth or improvement in employment and person income.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should acknowledge the benefit that public land designations provide to local and regional communities and economies; and

(2) designations of federally protected land should continue where appropriate and with consultation by local communities, bipartisan elected leaders, and interested stakeholders.

SA 114. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) climate change is real and is caused by human activities;

(2) climate change is already impacting the United States with sea level rise, ocean acidification, and more frequent and intense extreme weather events such as droughts, floods, wildfires, and heat waves;

(3) climate change poses risks to multiple sectors of the economy of the United States, including national defense, agricultural systems, energy, and transportation, as well as human health and the environment;

(4) the impacts of climate change have significant economic costs that will occur year after year and increase with further delays in global action;

(5) the extent of future climate change is largely determined by the choices the United States and other nations make in the immediate future;

(6) the Federal Government, tribal nations, States, local communities, and the private sector must continue to take action to prepare and adapt communities to climate change;

(7) the United States has a responsibility to children and future generations of the United States to mitigate the harmful effects of climate change;

(8) the actions of the United States taken to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change cannot come at the expense of the prosperity of the United States;

(9) the actions of a single nation cannot solve the climate crisis, so solutions that address both mitigation and adaption must involve developed and developing nations around the world;

(10) investing in the development of innovative clean and renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies will—

(A) enhance the global leadership and competitiveness of the United States; and

(B) create and sustain short and long term job growth; and

(11) the United States should act immediately to address climate change because the longer the United States waits, the more severe and costly the impacts of climate change will be, and the harder it will be for future generations to address the crisis.

SA 115. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) climate change is already impacting the safety and reliability of the critical infrastructure systems of the United States, including buildings, roads, bridges, tunnels,

rail, ports, airports, levees, dams, and military installations through sea level rise, rising temperatures, and more frequent and intense extreme weather events such as droughts, floods, wildfires, and heat waves;

(2) significant energy, industrial and transportation infrastructure in the United States is located near the coast, in floodplains, or in other areas vulnerable to sea level rise;

(3) the impacts to infrastructure described in paragraph (1) have caused tangible economic costs that are likely to increase over time;

(4) it is fiscally prudent to prepare for and seek to mitigate the impacts described in paragraph (1), as it is estimated that every dollar spent on mitigation saves $4 in disaster relief;

(5) the Federal Government self-insures, offers insurance programs such as crop insurance and the national flood insurance program, and, in the case of extreme weather events, also serves as the insurer of last resort for public and private infrastructure;

(6) the Federal Government has a crucial role to play as a partner in working with State, local, tribal, and territorial jurisdictions to help ensure coordinated efforts to keep communities resilient;

(7) the role of the Federal Government should include prioritizing climate resilient projects when administering Federal grants, providing technical support, and sharing of data and information in user-friendly and accessible formats, among other actions;

(8) Federal agency climate change adaptation plans that assess the risk to physical assets and missions of the Federal agencies can help create savings for taxpayers; and

(9) Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, should quantify the economic value of the physical risks of the agencies from climate change.

SA 116. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ENERGY POLICIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) energy is central to a strong, diverse, and vibrant economy;

(2) the United States has benefitted greatly from abundant supplies of a range of energy resources throughout the history of the United States;

(3) the United States will continue to prosper by ensuring that balanced pathways are in place to develop energy resources that are clean, reliable, affordable, and secure;

(4) the United States must continue to transition to a lower carbon energy future;

(5) the United States should address that climate change is real and caused by human activities;

(6) climate change is already impacting the United States with sea level rise, ocean acidification, and more frequent and intense extreme weather events such as droughts, floods, wildfires, and heat waves;

(7) the United States has a responsibility to children and future generations of the United States to mitigate the harmful effects of climate change while producing and using ever-cleaner forms of energy from all sources;

(8) solutions that address the energy and climate challenges of the United States and the world must involve developed and developing nations around the world;

(9) there is no 1 pathway to address the challenges of climate change, but rather, different approaches must be employed to meet these challenges;

(10) energy policy approaches must take into account the reductions of greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide, methane and superpollutants, such as hydrofluorocarbons;

(11) a first beneficial step toward an improved energy policy is the establishment and implementation of a national Quadrennial Energy Review;

(12) investing in the development of innovative clean and renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies will enhance global leadership and competitiveness of the United States and can create and sustain short and long term job growth;

(13) breakthrough technology development requires more than simply investing in research and development, it requires bridging the lab-to-market gap with a variety of public private partnerships ranging from STEM education through workforce training to support for innovative business investment;

(14) effective clean energy innovation policy requires support throughout the entire innovation pipeline from basic research to early market transformation;

(15) economy-wide, regional and sectorial approaches have been demonstrated and are proving that reductions in emissions can be made while still growing the economy and providing high-paying jobs;

(16) the energy challenges of the United States can be addressed with smart responses which include—

(A) curbing emissions from the transportation sector;

(B) reducing carbon dioxide emissions from power plants;

(C) strengthening the infrastructure of the United States to be more resilient to climate change;

(D) encouraging the use of clean energy through tax cuts, credits, and deductions;

(E) reducing emissions of short-lived climate forcers;

(F) significantly improving energy efficiency solutions;

(G) investing in research, development, and demonstration;

(H) making the electric grid smarter and more reliable;

(I) improving land management planning;

(J) ensuring that a smart regulatory system is in place; and

(K) addressing the energy-water nexus challenges;

(17) responsible action requires putting a price on carbon and both mobilizing action domestically and negotiating bilateral and multilateral agreements to strengthen and spur international action; and

(18) the longer the United States waits, the more severe and costly the impacts of climate change will be, and the harder it will be for children of the United States to address this crisis.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should act responsibly to develop bipartisan energy policies that lead to a lower carbon future.

SA 117. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Energy Savings Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contracts were first authorized by Congress in 1986 and 1992 respectively and reduce energy costs and consumption at Federal buildings and facilities without relying on additional appropriations;

(2) the contracts described in paragraph (1) are financed by a third-party and realize sufficient energy savings to cover the cost of the financed improvements over the contract term;

(3) the contractor provides a guarantee of energy savings for the Energy Savings Performance Contract and the utility provides energy savings performance assurances or guarantees of the savings for the Utility Energy Service Contract;

(4) performance-based contracting is an opportunity for significant savings so much so that the Oak Ridge National Laboratory has determined that under an Energy Savings Performance Contract the total cost savings delivered to the Government is nearly twice the guaranteed amount;

(5) the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 required a Government-wide audit of facilities and, although to date only ½ of those buildings have been surveyed, it has been established that at least $9,000,000,000 worth of energy savings that could be achieved within a decade;

(6) the Office of Management and Budget first recognized savings from Energy Savings Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contracts on an annual basis throughout the term of the contract as far back as 1998;

(7) the Congressional Budget Office instead has determined that the full cost of the authority to enter into the long-term contracts for capital investments be scored upfront as new mandatory spending while the savings in energy costs that flow from these investments be realized over time as part of the annual appropriations process;

(8) the process described in paragraph (7) has continued to hinder the ability of Congress to pass legislation ensuring additional energy and cost savings to the Federal Government through utilization of these contracts despite the proven savings; and

(9) there is broad bipartisan and bicameral recognition in Congress of the value of these energy saving contracts.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that legislation regarding Energy Savings Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contracts, and legislation which may lead to the use of those contracts by the Federal Government, should receive Congressional scoring treatment that allows future year guaranteed discretionary savings to be counted against the mandatory spending attributed to undertaking such contracts.

SA 118. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____—WEATHERIZATION ENHANCEMENT AND LOCAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY INVESTMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. __01. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the State energy program established under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) (referred to in this section as ''SEP'') and the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons established under part A of title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6861 et seq.) (referred to in this section as ''WAP'') have proven to be beneficial, long-term partnerships among Federal, State, and local partners;

(2) the SEP and the WAP have been reauthorized on a bipartisan basis over many years to address changing national, regional, and State circumstances and needs, especially through—

(A) the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.);

(B) the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.);

(C) the State Energy Efficiency Programs Improvement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–440; 104 Stat. 1006);

(D) the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13201 et seq.);

(E) the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801 et seq.); and

(F) the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17001 et seq.);

(3) the SEP, also known as the ''State energy conservation program''—

(A) was first created in 1975 to implement a State-based, national program in support of energy efficiency, renewable energy, economic development, energy emergency preparedness, and energy policy; and

(B) has come to operate in every sector of the economy in support of the private sector to improve productivity and has dramatically reduced the cost of government through energy savings at the State and local levels;

(4) Federal laboratory studies have concluded that, for every Federal dollar invested through the SEP, more than $7 is saved in energy costs and almost $11 in non-Federal funds is leveraged;

(5) the WAP—

(A) was first created in 1976 to assist low-income families in response to the first oil embargo;

(B) has become the largest residential energy conservation program in the United States, with more than 7,100,000 homes weatherized since the WAP was created;

(C) saves an estimated 35 percent of consumption in the typical weatherized home, yielding average annual savings of $437 per year in home energy costs;

(D) has created thousands of jobs in both the construction sector and in the supply chain of materials suppliers, vendors, and manufacturers who supply the WAP;

(E) returns $2.51 in energy savings for every Federal dollar spent in energy and nonenergy benefits over the life of weatherized homes;

(F) serves as a foundation for residential energy efficiency retrofit standards, technical skills, and workforce training for the emerging broader market and reduces residential and power plant emissions of carbon dioxide by 2.65 metric tons each year per home; and

(G) has decreased national energy consumption by the equivalent of 24,100,000 barrels of oil annually;

(6) the WAP can be enhanced with the addition of a targeted portion of the Federal funds through an innovative program that supports projects performed by qualified nonprofit organizations that have a demonstrated capacity to build, renovate, repair, or improve the energy efficiency of a significant number of low-income homes, building on the success of the existing program without replacing the existing WAP network or creating a separate delivery mechanism for basic WAP services;

(7) the WAP has increased energy efficiency opportunities by promoting new, competitive public-private sector models of retrofitting low-income homes through new Federal partnerships;

(8) improved monitoring and reporting of the work product of the WAP has yielded benefits, and expanding independent verification of efficiency work will support the long-term goals of the WAP;

(9) reports of the Government Accountability Office in 2011, the Inspector General of the Department of Energy, and State auditors have identified State-level deficiencies in monitoring efforts that can be addressed in a manner that will ensure that WAP funds are used more effectively;

(10) through the history of the WAP, the WAP has evolved with improvements in efficiency technology, including, in the 1990s, many States adopting advanced home energy audits, which has led to great returns on investment; and

(11) as the home energy efficiency industry has become more performance-based, the WAP should continue to use those advances in technology and the professional workforce

SEC. __02. WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION OF WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 422 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6872) is amended by striking ''appropriated—'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''appropriated $450,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.''.

(b) GRANTS FOR NEW, SELF-SUSTAINING LOW-INCOME, SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS TO ELIGIBLE MULTISTATE HOUSING AND ENERGY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—The Energy Conservation and Production Act is amended by inserting after section 414B (42 U.S.C. 6864b) the following:

''SEC. 414C. GRANTS FOR NEW, SELF-SUSTAINING LOW-INCOME, SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTIFAMILY HOUSING ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS TO ELIGIBLE MULTISTATE HOUSING AND ENERGY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

''(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

''(1) to expand the number of low-income, single-family and multifamily homes that receive energy efficiency retrofits;

''(2) to promote innovation and new models of retrofitting low-income homes through new Federal partnerships with covered organizations that leverage substantial donations, donated materials, volunteer labor, homeowner labor equity, and other private sector resources;

''(3) to assist the covered organizations in demonstrating, evaluating, improving, and replicating widely the model low-income energy retrofit programs of the covered organizations; and

''(4) to ensure that the covered organizations make the energy retrofit programs of the covered organizations self-sustaining by the time grant funds have been expended.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) COVERED ORGANIZATION.—The term 'covered organization' means an organization that—

''(A) is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under 501(a) of that Code; and

''(B) has an established record of constructing, renovating, repairing, or making energy efficient a total of not less than 250 owner-occupied, single-family or multifamily homes per year for low-income households, either directly or through affiliates, chapters, or other direct partners (using the most recent year for which data are available).

''(2) LOW-INCOME.—The term 'low-income' means an income level that is not more than 200 percent of the poverty level (as determined in accordance with criteria established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget) applicable to a family of the size involved, except that the Secretary may establish a higher or lower level if the Secretary determines that a higher or lower level is necessary to carry out this section.

''(3) WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR LOW-INCOME PERSONS.—The term 'Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons' means the program established under this part (including part 440 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, or successor regulations).

''(c) COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall make grants to covered organizations through a national competitive process for use in accordance with this section.

''(d) AWARD FACTORS.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary shall consider—

''(1) the number of low-income homes the applicant—

''(A) has built, renovated, repaired, or made more energy efficient as of the date of the application; and

''(B) can reasonably be projected to build, renovate, repair, or make energy efficient during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the application;

''(2) the qualifications, experience, and past performance of the applicant, including experience successfully managing and administering Federal funds;

''(3) the number and diversity of States and climates in which the applicant works as of the date of the application;

''(4) the amount of non-Federal funds, donated or discounted materials, discounted or volunteer skilled labor, volunteer unskilled labor, homeowner labor equity, and other resources the applicant will provide;

''(5) the extent to which the applicant could successfully replicate the energy retrofit program of the applicant and sustain the program after the grant funds have been expended;

''(6) regional diversity;

''(7) urban, suburban, and rural localities; and

''(8) such other factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(e) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall request proposals from covered organizations.

''(2) ADMINISTRATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an applicant shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(3) AWARDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of a request for proposals, the Secretary shall award grants under this section.

''(f) ELIGIBLE USES OF GRANT FUNDS.—A grant under this section may be used for—

''(1) energy efficiency audits, cost-effective retrofit, and related activities in different climatic regions of the United States;

''(2) energy efficiency materials and supplies;

''(3) organizational capacity—

''(A) to significantly increase the number of energy retrofits;

''(B) to replicate an energy retrofit program in other States; and

''(C) to ensure that the program is self-sustaining after the Federal grant funds are expended;

''(4) energy efficiency, audit and retrofit training, and ongoing technical assistance;

''(5) information to homeowners on proper maintenance and energy savings behaviors;

''(6) quality control and improvement;

''(7) data collection, measurement, and verification;

''(8) program monitoring, oversight, evaluation, and reporting;

''(9) management and administration (up to a maximum of 10 percent of the total grant);

''(10) labor and training activities; and

''(11) such other activities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(g) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant provided under this section shall not exceed—

''(1) if the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year is $225,000,000 or more, $5,000,000; and

''(2) if the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year is less than $225,000,000, $1,500,000.

''(h) GUIDELINES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue guidelines to implement the grant program established under this section.

''(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The guidelines—

''(A) shall not apply to the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons, in whole or major part; but

''(B) may rely on applicable provisions of law governing the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons to establish—

''(i) standards for allowable expenditures;

''(ii) a minimum savings-to-investment ratio;

''(iii) standards—

''(I) to carry out training programs;

''(II) to conduct energy audits and program activities;

''(III) to provide technical assistance;

''(IV) to monitor program activities; and

''(V) to verify energy and cost savings;

''(iv) liability insurance requirements; and

''(v) recordkeeping requirements, which shall include reporting to the Office of Weatherization and Intergovernmental Programs of the Department of Energy applicable data on each home retrofitted.

''(i) REVIEW AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall review and evaluate the performance of any covered organization that receives a grant under this section (which may include an audit), as determined by the Secretary.

''(j) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND LOCAL LAW.—Nothing in this section or any program carried out using a grant provided under this section supersedes or otherwise affects any State or local law, to the extent that the State or local law contains a requirement that is more stringent than the applicable requirement of this section.

''(k) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress annual reports that provide—

''(1) findings;

''(2) a description of energy and cost savings achieved and actions taken under this section; and

''(3) any recommendations for further action.

''(l) FUNDING.—Of the amount of funds that are made available to carry out the Weatherization Assistance Program for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 under section 422, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020—

''(1) 2 percent of the amount if the amount is less than $225,000,000;

''(2) 5 percent of the amount if the amount is $225,000,000 or more but less than $260,000,000;

''(3) 10 percent of the amount if the amount is $260,000,000 or more but less than $400,000,000; and

''(4) 20 percent of the amount if the amount is $400,000,000 or more.''.

(c) STANDARDS PROGRAM.—Section 415 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6865) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) STANDARDS PROGRAM.—

''(1) CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATION.—Effective beginning January 1, 2016, to be eligible to carry out weatherization using funds made available under this part, a contractor shall be selected through a competitive bidding process and be—

''(A) accredited by the Building Performance Institute;

''(B) an Energy Smart Home Performance Team accredited under the Residential Energy Services Network; or

''(C) accredited by an equivalent accreditation or program accreditation-based State certification program approved by the Secretary.

''(2) GRANTS FOR ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under section 414C, a covered organization (as defined in section 414C(b)) shall use a crew chief who—

''(i) is certified or accredited in accordance with paragraph (1); and

''(ii) supervises the work performed with grant funds.

''(B) VOLUNTEER LABOR.—A volunteer who performs work for a covered organization that receives a grant under section 414C shall not be required to be certified under this subsection if the volunteer is not directly installing or repairing mechanical equipment or other items that require skilled labor.

''(C) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall use training and technical assistance funds available to the Secretary to assist covered organizations under section 414C in providing training to obtain certification required under this subsection, including provisional or temporary certification.

''(3) MINIMUM EFFICIENCY STANDARDS.—Effective beginning October 1, 2016, the Secretary shall ensure that—

''(A) each retrofit for which weatherization assistance is provided under this part meets minimum efficiency and quality of work standards established by the Secretary after weatherization of a dwelling unit; and

''(B) at least 10 percent of the dwelling units are randomly inspected by a third party accredited under this subsection to ensure compliance with the minimum efficiency and quality of work standards established under subparagraph (A); and

''(C) the standards established under this subsection meet or exceed the industry standards for home performance work that are in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.''.

SEC. __03. STATE ENERGY PROGRAM.

Section 365(f) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6325(f)) is amended by striking ''$125,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2012'' and inserting ''$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020''.

SA 119. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. EXTENSION OF PUBLICLY TRADED PARTNERSHIP OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE TO ENERGY POWER GENERATION PROJECTS, TRANSPORTATION FUELS, AND RELATED ENERGY ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (E) of section 7704(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''income and gains derived from the exploration'' and inserting ''income and gains derived from the following:

''(i) MINERALS, NATURAL RESOURCES, ETC.—The exploration'',

(2) by inserting ''or'' before ''industrial source'',

(3) by inserting a period after ''carbon dioxide'', and

(4) by striking '', or the transportation or storage'' and all that follows and inserting the following:

''(ii) RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The generation of electric power exclusively utilizing any resource described in section 45(c)(1) or energy property described in section 48 (determined without regard to any termination date), or in the case of a facility described in paragraph (3) or (7) of section 45(d) (determined without regard to any placed in service date or date by which construction of the facility is required to begin), the accepting or processing of such resource.

''(iii) ELECTRICITY STORAGE DEVICES.—The receipt and sale of electric power that has been stored in a device directly connected to the grid.

''(iv) COMBINED HEAT AND POWER.—The generation, storage, or distribution of thermal energy exclusively utilizing property described in section 48(c)(3) (determined without regard to subparagraphs (B) and (D) thereof and without regard to any placed in service date).

''(v) RENEWABLE THERMAL ENERGY.—The generation, storage, or distribution of thermal energy exclusively using any resource described in section 45(c)(1) or energy property described in clause (i) or (iii) of section 48(a)(3)(A).

''(vi) WASTE HEAT TO POWER.—The use of recoverable waste energy, as defined in section 371(5) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6341(5)) (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this clause).

''(vii) RENEWABLE FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE.—The storage or transportation of any fuel described in subsection (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 6426.

''(viii) RENEWABLE FUELS.—The production, storage, or transportation of any renewable fuel described in section 211(o)(1)(J) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)(J)) (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this clause) or section 40A(d)(1).

''(ix) RENEWABLE CHEMICALS.—The production, storage, or transportation of any renewable chemical (as defined in paragraph (6)).

''(x) ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDINGS.—The audit and installation through contract or

other agreement of any energy efficient building property described in section 179D(c)(1).

''(xi) GASIFICATION WITH SEQUESTRATION.—The production of any product from a project that meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 48B(c)(1) and that separates and sequesters in secure geological storage (as determined under section 45Q(d)(2)) at least 75 percent of such project's total qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)).

''(xii) CARBON CAPTURE AND SEQUESTRATION.—The generation or storage of electric power produced from any facility which is a qualified facility described in section 45Q(c) and which disposes of any captured qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)) in secure geological storage (as determined under section 45Q(d)(2)).''.

(b) RENEWABLE CHEMICAL.—Section 7704(d) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) RENEWABLE CHEMICAL.—The term 'renewable chemical' means a monomer, polymer, plastic, formulated product, or chemical substance produced from renewable biomass (as defined in section 9001(12) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8101(12)), as in effect on the date of the enactment of this paragraph).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.

SA 120. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR NEW QUALIFIED FUEL CELL MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 30B(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''December 31, 2014'' and inserting ''December 31, 2019''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property purchased after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLE REFUELING PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) of section 30C, as amended by the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2014'' and inserting ''December 31, 2019''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 5. OFFSET.

(a) 100 PERCENT CONTINUOUS LEVY ON PAYMENT TO MEDICARE PROVIDERS AND SUPPLIERS.—Paragraph (3) of section 6331(h) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting '', or to a Medicare provider or supplier under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to payments made on or after the date which is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 121. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the end of section 2, add the following:

(f) FEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A fee of 8 cents shall be imposed on each barrel of oil transported through the pipeline referred to in subsection (a).

(2) USE OF FEE REVENUE.—Revenue from the fee imposed under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the land and water conservation fund established under section 200302 of title 54, United States Code.

SA 122. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) climate change is real;

(2) worldwide scientific opinion is not settled on the extent to which human activities may be causing climate change;

(3) projections by models of catastrophic increases in global temperatures have not been validated by measured temperature data;

(4) fossil fuels are critical to the health of the world economy and low-cost electricity and other energy forms have dramatically improved the health and quality of life of millions the world over; and

(5) the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Keystone XL Project issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, found that construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline will not significantly impact global greenhouse gas emissions.

SA 123. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING THE OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Congress should approve a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(2) it is necessary for Congress to approve a bill described in paragraph (1) because the Internal Revenue Service determined in 2011 that certain forms of petroleum are not subject to the per-barrel excise tax;

(3) under article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, the Senate may not originate a bill to raise new revenue, and thus may not originate a bill to close the legitimate and unintended loophole described in paragraph (2);

(4) if the Senate attempts to originate a bill described in paragraph (1), it would provide a substantive basis for a ''blue slip'' from the House of Representatives, which would prevent advancement of the bill; and

(5) the House of Representatives, consistent with article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, should consider and refer to the Senate a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SA 124. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _. NO EFFECT ON INDIAN TREATIES.

Nothing in this Act may change, suspend, supersede, or abrogate any trust obligation or treaty requirement of the United States with respect to any Indian nation, Indian tribe, individual Indian, or Indian tribal organization, including the Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868, without consultation with, and the informed and express consent of, the applicable Indian nation, Indian tribe, individual Indian, or Indian tribal organization as required under Executive Order 13175 (67 Fed. Reg. 67249) (November 6, 2000).

SA 125. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Rebuilding America's Infrastructure Act of 2015''.

TITLE I—REPEAL OF OIL AND GAS SUBSIDIES

Subtitle A—Close Big Oil Tax Loopholes

SEC. 101. MODIFICATIONS OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT RULES APPLICABLE TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

''(n) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, any amount paid or accrued by a dual capacity taxpayer which is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)) to a foreign country or possession of the United States for any period shall not be considered a tax—

''(A) if, for such period, the foreign country or possession does not impose a generally applicable income tax, or

''(B) to the extent such amount exceeds the amount (determined in accordance with regulations) which—

''(i) is paid by such dual capacity taxpayer pursuant to the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession, or

''(ii) would be paid if the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession were applicable to such dual capacity taxpayer.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to imply the proper treatment of any such amount not in excess of the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

''(2) DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'dual capacity taxpayer' means, with respect to any foreign country or possession of the United States, a person who—

''(A) is subject to a levy of such country or possession, and

''(B) receives (or will receive) directly or indirectly a specific economic benefit (as determined in accordance with regulations) from such country or possession.

''(3) GENERALLY APPLICABLE INCOME TAX.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'generally applicable income tax' means an income tax (or a series of income taxes) which is generally imposed under the laws of a foreign country or possession on income derived from the conduct of a trade or business within such country or possession.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include a tax unless it has substantial application, by its terms and in practice, to—

''(i) persons who are not dual capacity taxpayers, and

''(ii) persons who are citizens or residents of the foreign country or possession.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxes paid or accrued in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTRARY TREATY OBLIGATIONS UPHELD.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to the extent contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

SEC. 102. LIMITATION ON SECTION 199 DEDUCTION ATTRIBUTABLE TO OIL, NATURAL GAS, OR PRIMARY PRODUCTS THEREOF.

(a) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION.—Paragraph (4) of section 199(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN OIL AND GAS INCOME.—In the case of any taxpayer who is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)) for the taxable year, the term 'domestic production gross receipts' shall not include gross receipts from the production, refining, processing, transportation, or distribution of oil, gas, or any primary product (within the meaning of subsection (d)(9)) thereof.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 103. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS; AMORTIZATION OF DISALLOWED AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 263(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(c) INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS IN THE CASE OF OIL AND GAS WELLS AND GEOTHERMAL WELLS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), and except as provided in subsection (i), regulations shall be prescribed by the Secretary under this subtitle corresponding to the regulations which granted the option to deduct as expenses intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells and which were recognized and approved by the Congress in House Concurrent Resolution 50, Seventy-ninth Congress. Such regulations shall also grant the option to deduct as expenses intangible drilling and development costs in the case of wells drilled for any geothermal deposit (as defined in section 613(e)(2)) to the same extent and in the same manner as such expenses are deductible in the case of oil and gas wells. This subsection shall not apply with respect to any costs to which any deduction is allowed under section 59(e) or 291.

''(2) EXCLUSION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)).

''(B) AMORTIZATION OF AMOUNTS NOT ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS UNDER SUBPARAGRAPH (A).—The amount not allowable as a deduction for any taxable year by reason of subparagraph (A) shall be allowable as a deduction ratably over the 60-month period beginning with the month in which the costs are paid or incurred. For purposes of section 1254, any deduction under this subparagraph shall be treated as a deduction under this subsection.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 104. LIMITATION ON PERCENTAGE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR OIL AND GAS WELLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—In the case of any taxable year in which the taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)), the allowance for percentage depletion shall be zero.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 105. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR TERTIARY INJECTANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 193 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)).

''(2) AMORTIZATION OF AMOUNTS NOT ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS UNDER PARAGRAPH (1).—The amount not allowable as a deduction for any taxable year by reason of paragraph (1) shall be allowable as a deduction ratably over the 60-month period beginning with the month in which the costs are paid or incurred.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 106. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (5) of section 167(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) CERTAIN SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'major integrated oil company' includes any successor in interest of a company that was described in subparagraph (B) in any taxable year, if such successor controls more than 50 percent of the crude oil production or natural gas production of such company.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 167(h)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''except as provided in subparagraph (C),'' after ''For purposes of this paragraph,''.

(2) TAXABLE YEARS TESTED.—Clause (iii) of section 167(h)(5)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''does not apply by reason of paragraph (4) of section 613A(d)'' and inserting ''did not apply by reason of paragraph (4) of section 613A(d) for any taxable year after 2004'', and

(B) by striking ''does not apply'' in subclause (II) and inserting ''did not apply for the taxable year''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

Subtitle B—Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Natural Gas

SEC. 111. REPEAL OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF DEEP WATER AND DEEP GAS ROYALTY RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 344 and 345 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15904, 15905) are repealed.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to provide for royalty relief in the lease sale terms beginning with the first lease sale held on or after the date of enactment of this Act for which a final notice of sale has not been published.

TITLE II—INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

SEC. 201. INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TRANSFERS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer an amount equal to the net amount of any savings realized as a result of the enactment of this Act and the amendments made by this Act (after any expenditures authorized by this Act and the amendments made by this Act)—

(A) in accordance with subsections (b) and (c); and

(B) in the case of any additional savings after the application of such subsections, into the Highway Trust Fund in the following manner:

(i) 75 percent of such additional savings shall be transferred into the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account).

(ii) 25 percent of such additional savings shall be transferred into the Mass Transit Account.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.—Subsection (f) of section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8) and by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

''(7) 2015 INCREASE.—Out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is hereby appropriated to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) and the Mass Transit Account in the Highway Trust Fund amounts equal to the amounts determined under section 201(a)(1)(B) of the Rebuilding America's Infrastructure Act of 2015.''.

(b) WATER INFRASTRUCTURE INNOVATIVE FINANCING PILOT PROJECTS.—Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency jointly, $2,000,000,000 to carry out the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.) through 2019.

(c) TIGER DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.—

(1) DEFINITION OF TIGER DISCRETIONARY GRANT.—In this section, the term ''TIGER discretionary grant'' means a grant awarded and administered by the Secretary of Transportation using funds made available for—

(A) supplemental discretionary grants for a national surface transportation system under title XII of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5; 123 Stat. 203);

(B) the national infrastructure investments discretionary grant program under title I of division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–17; 123 Stat. 3035);

(C) national infrastructure investments under section 2202 of division B of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112–10; 125 Stat. 191);

(D) national infrastructure investments under title I of division C of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–55; 125 Stat. 641);

(E) national infrastructure investments under title VIII of division F of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6; 127 Stat. 432);

(F) national infrastructure investments under title I of division L of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76; 128 Stat. 574); or

(G) national infrastructure investments under title I of division K of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235).

(2) APPROPRIATION.—Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary of Transportation, $2,000,000,000 to provide TIGER discretionary grants for fiscal year 2016.

(d) MAINTENANCE OF FUNDING.—The funding provided under this section shall supplement (and not supplant) other Federal funding for the programs and accounts funded under this section.

SEC. 202. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

TITLE III—STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

SEC. 301. STATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REVOLVING FUNDS.

Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, $1,500,000,000 for State water pollution control revolving funds established in accordance with title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.).

SEC. 302. STATE DRINKING WATER TREATMENT REVOLVING LOAN FUNDS.

Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, $1,000,000,000 for State drinking water treatment revolving loan funds established in accordance with section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j–12).

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 401. ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

The Office of Management and Budget shall not include amounts made available under subsections (b) or (c) of section 201 or title III during a fiscal year in determining whether there has been a breach of the discretionary spending limits under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) during the fiscal year.

SA 126. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

In section 2 of the amendment, strike subsection (e) and insert the following:

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—Land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) may only be acquired consistently with the Constitution.

SA 127. Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE II—LEASE SALES

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

(2) QUALIFIED REVENUES.—The term ''qualified revenues'' means all bonus bids, rentals, royalties, and other sums due and payable to the United States from all leases entered into after the date of enactment of this Act that cover an area in the South Atlantic planning area.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA.—The term ''South Atlantic planning area'' means the area of the outer Continental Shelf (as defined in section 2 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331)) that is located between the northern lateral seaward administrative boundary of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the southernmost lateral seaward administrative boundary of the State of Georgia.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means any of the following States:

(A) Georgia.

(B) North Carolina.

(C) South Carolina.

(D) Virginia.

SEC. 202. ENHANCING STATE RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations that establish management of the surface occupancy of each portion of the South Atlantic planning area for the applicable coastline of a State for any lease sale authorized under this Act to the effect that—

(1) the applicable State shall have sole authority to restrict or allow surface facilities above the waterline for the purpose of production of oil or gas resources in any area that is within 12 nautical miles seaward from the coastline of the State;

(2) unless permanent surface occupancy is authorized by a State, only sub-surface production facilities may be installed in areas that are located between the point that is 12 nautical miles from seaward from the coastline of the State and the point that is 20 nautical miles seaward from the coastline of the State;

(3) new offshore production facilities are encouraged and the impacts on coastal vistas are minimized, to the maximum extent practical; and

(4) onshore facilities that facilitate the development and production of the oil and gas resources of the South Atlantic planning area within 12 nautical miles seaward of the coastline of a State are allowed.

(b) TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in the regulations described in subsection (a) shall restrict, or give the States authority to restrict, temporary surface activities related to operations associated with outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leases.

SEC. 203. REINSTATEMENT OF VIRGINIA LEASE SALE 220.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct Lease Sale 220 (as described in the notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement dated November 13, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 67201)).

SEC. 204. SOUTH CAROLINA LEASE SALE.

Notwithstanding the exclusion of the South Atlantic planning area in the outer Continental Shelf leasing program for fiscal years 2012-2017 prepared under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344), the Secretary shall conduct a lease sale not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act in areas off the coast of the State of South Carolina—

(1) determined by the Secretary to have the most geologically promising hydrocarbon resources; and

(2) that constitute not less than 25 percent of the leasable area located within the offshore administrative boundaries of the State of South Carolina depicted in the notice entitled ''Federal Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Administrative Boundaries Extending from the Submerged Lands Act Boundary seaward to the Limit of the United States Outer Continental Shelf'', published January 3, 2006 (71 Fed. Reg. 127).

SEC. 205. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

The Secretary shall complete a multisale environmental impact statement for each lease sale conducted under this title.

SEC. 206. SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA LEASE SALES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct 3 lease sales in the South Atlantic planning area before June 30, 2017, in areas—

(1) to be determined by the Secretary based on—

(A) analysis by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management; and

(B) industry nomination; and

(2) determined by the Secretary to contain the most hydrocarbon resource potential.

(b) 2017-2022 LEASING PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall—

(1) include the South Atlantic planning area in the outer Continental Shelf leasing program for fiscal years 2017-2022 prepared under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344); and

(2) conduct 1 lease sale in the South Atlantic planning area during each year of the program, for a total of 5 lease sales.

SEC. 207. BALANCING OF MILITARY AND ENERGY PRODUCTION GOALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In recognition that the outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing program and the domestic energy resources produced under the program are integral to national security, the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense shall work jointly in implementing lease sales under this Act—

(1) to preserve the ability of the Armed Forces of the United States to maintain an optimum state of readiness through the continued use of the outer Continental Shelf; and

(2) to allow effective exploration, development, and production of the oil, gas, and renewable energy resources of the United States.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONFLICTS WITH MILITARY OPERATIONS.—No person may engage in any exploration, development, or production of oil or natural gas on the outer Continental Shelf under a lease issued under this Act that would conflict with any military operation, as determined in accordance with—

(1) the agreement entitled ''Memorandum of Agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior on Mutual Concerns on the Outer Continental Shelf'' signed July 20, 1983; and

(2) any revision or replacement for the agreement described in paragraph (1) that is agreed to by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary after that date but before the date of issuance of the lease under which the exploration, development, or production is conducted.

SEC. 208. REVENUE SHARING AND DEFICIT REDUCTION.

Notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338), each fiscal year the Secretary shall deposit—

(1) 37.5 percent of the qualified revenues in a special account in the Treasury, from which the Secretary shall allocate amounts in accordance with section 209;

(2) 12.5 percent of the qualified revenues dedicated towards deficit reduction; and

(3) 50 percent of the qualified revenues in the general fund of the Treasury.

SEC. 209. ALLOCATION TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the qualified revenues deposited in the account under section 208(1), 37.5 percent shall be distributed to each State—

(1) using the formula established under subsection (b); and

(2) in amounts that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

(b) FORMULA.—The formula used to make the calculation under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) established by the Secretary by regulation; and

(2) modeled after the final rule entitled ''Allocation and Disbursement of Royalties, Rentals, and Bonuses—Oil and Gas, Offshore'', dated December 23, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 78622).

(c) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—Each State shall be entitled to an amount equal to not less than 10 percent of the qualified revenues allocated under subsection (a).

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—A State receiving amounts under this section may use the amounts in accordance with State law.

SA 128. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect until the President determines that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with other relevant Federal agencies, has completed a comprehensive study analyzing the human health impacts of the pipeline described in section 2(a), including—

(1) increased air pollution in communities near refineries that will process the up to 830,000 barrels per day of tar sands crude that will be transported through the pipeline, including assessment of the cumulative air pollution impacts on the communities;

(2) increased exposure of communities to particulate matter and heavy metals from the disposal, storage, and use of petroleum coke that results from the refining of the tar sands crude that will be transported through the pipeline; and

(3) increased exposures in communities to benzene, volatile organic compounds, hydrogen sulfide, and other toxic substances that may result from spills or the contamination of water supplies from tar sands crude transported through the pipeline.

SA 129. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2, strike subsection (b) and insert the following:

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(A) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a))) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(2) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in paragraph (1) relieves any Federal agency of the obligation of the Federal agency to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), including the obligation of the Federal agency to prepare a supplement to the final supplemental environmental impact statement described in paragraph (1) in connection with the issuance of any permit or authorization needed to construct, connect, operate, or maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) if there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the environmental impacts resulting from the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of the pipeline and cross-border facilities, including from greenhouse gas emissions associated with the crude oil being transported by the pipeline.

SA 130. Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, strike lines 20 through 23 and insert the following:

(c) PERMIT SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act shall affect the status of any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a).

SA 131. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2(a), strike the period at the end and insert the following:

, subject to—

(1) all applicable laws (including regulations);

(2) all mitigation measures that are required in permits issued by permitting agencies; and

(3) all project-specific special conditions listed in Appendix Z of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014.

SA 132. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

It is the sense of Congress that the designation of National Monuments should be subject to—

(1) consultation with each unit of local government within the boundaries of which the proposed National Monument is to be located; and

(2) the approval by the Governor and legislature of each State within the boundaries of which the proposed National Monument is to be located.

SA 133. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING 5-YEAR EXTENSION OF CREDITS WITH RESPECT TO FACILITIES PRODUCING ENERGY FROM CERTAIN RENEWABLE RESOURCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the energy policy of the United States is based on an all-of-the-above approach to production sources;

(2) an all-of-the-above approach reduces dependence on foreign oil, increases national security and creates jobs;

(3) smart investments in renewable resources are critical to increase the energy independence of the United States, reduce emissions, and create jobs;

(4) wind energy is a critical component of an all-of-the-above energy policy and has a proven track record of creating jobs, reducing emissions, and provides an alternative and compatible energy resource to the existing generation infrastructure of the United States;

(5) the wind energy industry and utilities require long-term certainty regarding the Production Tax Credit for project planning in order to continue build out of this valuable natural resource; and

(6) the stop-start unpredictability of short-term Production Tax Credit extensions should be avoided, as short-term extensions have disrupted the wind industry, slowing the ability of the wind industry to cut costs,

as compared to what would have occurred with a long-term, predictable policy in place.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) section 45(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 should be amended by striking ''January 1, 2015'' each place it appears and inserting ''January 1, 2020'' in—

(A) paragraph (1);
(B) paragraph (2)(A);
(C) paragraph (3)(A);
(D) paragraph (4)(B);
(E) paragraph (6);
(F) paragraph (7);
(G) paragraph (9); and
(H) paragraph (11)(B);

(2) clause (ii) of section 48(a)(5)(C) should be amended by striking ''January 1, 2015'' and inserting ''January 1, 2020''; and

(3) the amendments that would be made by paragraphs (1) and (2) should take effect on January 1, 2015.

SA 134. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. EXTENSION OF THE WIND PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT.

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that, pursuant to an Act of Congress, the credit allowed under section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is extended for a period of not less than 5 years for facilities described in subsection (d)(1) of such section.

SA 135. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EXTENSION OF SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITION OF FULL FUNDING AMOUNT.—Section 3(11) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102(11)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking ''fiscal year 2012 and each fiscal year thereafter'' and inserting ''each of fiscal years 2012 and 2013''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter, the amount that is equal to the full funding amount for fiscal year 2013.''.

(b) SECURE PAYMENTS FOR STATES AND COUNTIES CONTAINING FEDERAL LAND.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS.—Section 101 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111) is amended by striking ''2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''2014''.

(2) ELECTIONS.—Section 102(b) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''by August 1, 2013 (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable), and August 1 of each second fiscal year thereafter'' and inserting ''by August 1 of each applicable fiscal year (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''2014''.

(3) ELECTION AS TO USE OF BALANCE.—Section 102(d)(1) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(d)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''not more than 7 percent of the total share for the eligible county of the State payment or the county payment'' and inserting ''any portion of the balance''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) COUNTIES WITH MAJOR DISTRIBUTIONS.—In the case of each eligible county to which $350,000 or more is distributed for any fiscal year pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) or (2)(B) of subsection (a), the eligible county shall elect to do 1 or more of the following with the balance of any funds not expended pursuant to subparagraph (A):

''(i) Reserve any portion of the balance for projects in accordance with title II.

''(ii) Reserve not more than 7 percent of the total share for the eligible county of the State payment or the county payment for projects in accordance with title III.

''(iii) Return the portion of the balance not reserved under clauses (i) and (ii) to the Treasury of the United States.''.

(4) NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION.—Section 102(d)(3)(A) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(d)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''2012,'' and inserting ''2014 (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable)''.

(5) FAILURE TO ELECT.—Section 102(d)(3)(B)(ii) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(d)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking ''purpose described in section 202(b)'' and inserting ''purposes described in section 202(b), 203(c), or 204(a)(5)''.

(6) DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—Section 103(d)(2) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7113(d)(2)) is amended by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(c) CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT SPECIAL PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LAND.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS.—Section 203(a)(1) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7123(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''September 30 for fiscal year 2008 (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable), and each September 30 thereafter for each succeeding fiscal year through fiscal year 2013'' and inserting ''September 30 of each applicable fiscal year (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable)''.

(2) EVALUATION AND APPROVAL OF PROJECTS BY SECRETARY CONCERNED.—Section 204(e) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7124(e)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(3) RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—Section 205(a)(4) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7125(a)(4)) is amended by striking ''2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''2015''.

(4) AVAILABILITY OF PROJECT FUNDS.—Section 207(a) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7127(a)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2008 (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable), and each September 30 thereafter for each succeeding fiscal year through fiscal year 2013'' and inserting ''September 30 of each applicable fiscal year (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable)''.

(5) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 208 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7128) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014 (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable)''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2016''.

(d) CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO RESERVE AND USE COUNTY FUNDS.—Section 304 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7144) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014 (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable)''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''September 30, 2014, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States'' and inserting ''September 30, 2015, may be retained by the counties for the purposes identified in section 302(a)(2)''.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 402 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7152) is amended by inserting ''and fiscal year 2015 for payments to States and counties for fiscal year 2014'' before the period at the end.

(f) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(1) TITLE II FUNDS.—Any funds that were not obligated as required by section 208 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7128) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) shall be available for use in accordance with title II of that Act (16 U.S.C. 7121 et seq.).

(2) TITLE III FUNDS.—Any funds that were not obligated as required by section 304 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7144) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) shall be available for use in accordance with title III of that Act (16 U.S.C. 7141 et seq.).

SA 136. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. RESTORING MANDATORY FUNDING STATUS TO PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES.

(a) PERMANENT PAYMENT.—Section 6906 of title 31, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''of fiscal years 2008 through 2014'' and inserting ''fiscal year''.

SA 137. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that, pursuant to an Act of Congress, the limit on liability with respect to offshore oil spills is modified to be unlimited.

SA 138. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that, pursuant to an Act of Congress, the following tax breaks are repealed for major integrated oil companies (as that term is defined in section 167(h)(5)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986):

(1) Percentage depletion allowances under sections 613 and 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) The domestic production activities deduction under section 199 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SA 139. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding subsections (2)(a) and (2)(b), this Act shall not take effect until any consultation, analysis or review required by the National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, or any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review, is completed with respect to whether increased greenhouse gas emissions, including the indirect greenhouse gas emissions over the lifecycle of oil sands crude oil production, and transportation from the diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands transported through the pipeline, described in section 2(a), are likely to contribute to any of the following:

(1) Increased water temperatures.

(2) Significant migration of economically important species from United States waters.

(3) A decrease in the productivity of United States fisheries and ecosystems.

(4) An increase in diseases affecting United States fisheries and humans.

SA 140. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding subsections (2)(a) and (2)(b), this Act shall not take effect until any consultation, analysis or review required by the National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, or any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review, is completed with respect to whether increased greenhouse gas emissions, including the indirect greenhouse gas emissions over the lifecycle of oil sands crude oil production, and transportation from the diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands transported through the pipeline, described in section 2(a), are likely to contribute to higher sea levels.

SA 141. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding subsections (2)(a) and (2)(b), this Act shall not take effect until any consultation, analysis or review required by the National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, or any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review, is completed with respect to whether increased greenhouse gas emissions, including the indirect greenhouse gas emissions over the lifecycle of oil sands crude oil production, and transportation from the diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands transported through the pipeline, described in section 2(a), are likely to contribute to an increase in more extreme weather events.

SA 142. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. ___.

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that, pursuant to an Act of Congress, an adaptation fund is established for State and Indian tribes that funds projects to build resilience to the impacts of climate change, including—

(A) extreme weather events such as flooding and tropical cyclones;

(B) more frequent heavy precipitation events;

(C) loss of snowpack and Arctic land and sea ice;

(D) water scarcity and adverse impacts on water quality;

(E) stronger and longer heat waves;

(F) more frequent and severe droughts;

(G) rises in sea level;

(H) ecosystem disruption;

(I) increased air pollution; and

(J) effects on public health.

SA 143. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____. QUARTERLY JOBS REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once every 90 days thereafter during the period described in subsection (b), the Secretary of Labor shall prepare and submit to Congress a report that describes, for the period covered by the report, the quantity of construction, operations, and maintenance jobs—

(1) directly associated with the Keystone XL Pipeline described in section 1, in accordance with section ES4.3.1 of the final environmental impact statement issued by the Secretary of State referred to in section 1(c); or

(2) in the renewable energy development and production sectors (including wind energy, solar energy, geothermal energy, biomass and biofuels, and hydropower) of the United States.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PERIOD.—The period referred to in subsection (a) is the 6-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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 January 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 22, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Jobs and a Healthy Economy.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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 January 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Examining Job-Based Health Insurance and Defining Full-Time Work.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on January 22, 2015, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on January 22, 2015, at 10 a.m. in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 22, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to William Treadwell and Samin Peirovi effective today through June 1, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Paulina Rippere, a fellow in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for this session of the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF WENDELL H. FORD, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 38, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 38) relative to the death of Wendell H. Ford, former United States Senator for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 38) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4:30 p.m., Monday, January 26; 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, and the Senate resume consideration of S. 1. I further ask that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, the filing deadline for first-degree amendments be at 3 p.m. on Monday, with second degrees at 5 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the next vote will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday. If Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL can reach an agreement for additional votes on amendments, those could be scheduled for Monday night as well.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2015, AT 4:30 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the provisions of S. Res. 38 as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator Wendell H. Ford of Kentucky.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:21 a.m., adjourned until Monday, January 26, 2015, at 4:30 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT AND CAREER OF JAMES ''JIM'' NISSEN

HON. RON KIND
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the career and retirement of James ''Jim'' Nissen. After twenty-six years as La Crosse District Manager of the Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge and nearly 39 years with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mr. Nissen announced his retirement on January second 2015.

Nissen held seasonal positions with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Nebraska, Illinois, Missouri, Minnesota, and South Dakota. He also held permanent positions in Indiana, Vermont, Utah, and Wisconsin. Each station offered new opportunities and challenges and developed his career from a student trainee to Refuge Manager.

Mr. Nissen is not a native of the La Crosse, WI area, but according to his colleagues, ''no one knows this refuge better than he does.'' Nissen grew up in a duck hunting family in northeastern Nebraska, not far from the Platte River and among the prairie pothole country that produces much of the continent's canvasback ducks. Jim's career followed this regal bird across the country and in 1989, Nissen came to the La Crosse District after two years of overseeing the Horicon National Wildlife Refuge on the eastern side of Wisconsin. The Horicon position marked his return to Wisconsin; Nissen had been there in 1976 for the Canada goose dispersal program, where he not only helped manage the goose population, but also met his wife Ruth.

The La Crosse position offered Nissen the chance to get back to a river-based assignment—his true passion. Nissen fell in love with the abundance of canvasbacks, also referred to as ''the king of ducks,'' that the Upper Mississippi River and La Crosse area boast during fall migration. ''I like rivers and canvasbacks and people,'' Nissen said, ''so it was a good fit.''

Each fall, the Upper Mississippi River allows Nissen to see nearly half of the world's canvasback population pass by his window during migration. ''It really is a world-class spectacle,'' Nissen said.

During his tenure at LaCrosse, Jim received numerous awards and accolades including the Meritorious Service Award of the Department of the Interior in 2007. He has overseen multi-million dollar habitat enhancement projects funded through the Environmental Management Program; he has acquired over 2,500 acres of lands for inclusion in the National Wildlife Refuge; he has overseen the construction of a LEED certified Visitor Center and office; and he is regarded as a leader in wetland and waterfowl ecology and management.

Jim's departure will create a profound void in the Upper Miss' institutional knowledge. His energy, wisdom, humor, innate ability to remember dates, and his many discussions will be missed terribly by all who worked alongside him. I wish both Jim, Ruth, and their son Travis all the best in the years to come.

MARGO NIELSEN—EMBODIMENT OF SERVICE

HON. JOHN RATCLIFFE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most rewarding parts of my job is seeing the extraordinary work that constituents do giving back to their communities every single day.

They don't do it for fame, and they don't do it for glory. They do it because they want to make a difference. No one person embodies this spirit of service better than Margo Nielsen.

During her 25 years at the helm of Helping Hands, the organization has seen tremendous growth and helped tens of thousands of people by ensuring that essential health and emergency services are available to everyone in Rockwall County.

Margo—congratulations on your remarkable career. Your leadership will be missed, but your legacy not soon forgotten. Thank you all for joining me in honoring Margo and supporting Helping Hands. God Bless.

CELEBRATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHILDREN ON THE GREEN

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Children on the Green located in Morristown, New Jersey as it celebrates its 20th Anniversary.

In 1994, twenty years ago, a special organization opened its doors with the goal of serving others. Not just serving others, but serving others who were not as fortunate as themselves, specifically children. Since its opening, Children on the Green of Morristown has met the childcare needs of nearly 400 families from area shelters. This was possible through the organizations longstanding partnerships with Homeless Solutions, the Jersey Battered Women's Services and Family Promise of Morris County.

Children on the Green, located behind the United Methodist Church, works to provide safe and nurturing care to children whose parents are struggling to provide for them because they are in need of housing, education, and/or employment. While the parents work to better their families' situation, Children on the Green is a safe place for the children to go where they're taken care of by people who truly care. Their mission is to support the developmental needs of each child and create an interdependent partnership between home, work, community, and the center.

Early childhood education has a value that cannot be measured. Research has shown significant gaps in early development between children of the lowest socioeconomic status and those in the highest, which have been shown to start as early as nine months of age. The main contribution to this problem is access to good quality early childhood education.

Children on the Green has a philosophy that states, ''Every child deserves access to a quality early education program like Children on the Green, irrespective of their means.'' This organization strives every day to lower the achievement gap by providing quality early childhood education to those children in need.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing 20 years of outstanding service by Children on the Green, their directors, board of trustees and staff. Organizations like this are bettering the lives of the children not just in Morristown, New Jersey, but across the country.

CONGRATULATING HARPER COLLEGE ON ITS NEW CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION CENTER

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am excited to recognize Harper Community College in Palatine, IL, which will be opening its new Career and Technical Education Center on January 23. This new building, with state-of-the-art classrooms and labs, will house some of Harper's fastest-growing technical programs such as manufacturing, welding, architectural technology, heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC), maintenance technology, law enforcement, and fire science.

Programs in this building will help provide students with the skills they will need in the future. These programs will help put people to work and support local employers who are seeking a highly-skilled workforce to compete in the 21st Century global economy.

The building will also house Harper's innovative Advanced Manufacturing Program. The program partners with 75 area manufacturing companies which offer paid internships to manufacturing students attending Harper College.

I applaud the Harper College community on the opening of its new Career and Technical Education Center, and I look forward to its continued leadership in bringing educational opportunities to students in the 10th District.

AGGIES IN WWI

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the trenches of the Argonne Forrest in northeastern France, sat thousands of allied troops. It was the fall of 1918, it was World War I. The battle was muddy, rainy and most of all it was bloody. It was one of the largest and deadliest battles in U.S. military history, involving over a million American soldiers. Among the masses, in the front line trenches, sat James Vernon ''Pinky'' Wilson, a marine from Texas, who amidst chaos felt called to write what would become one of the most famous songs in college history, the Aggie War Hymn.

Pinky Wilson grew up in the small Texas town of Florence, about 30 miles north of Austin. In 1917, he was a junior enrolled at Texas A&M University when he volunteered to serve our country in World War I.

Wilson fought with the 6th Marine Regiment and by choice he became buck private in the Marine Corps, turning down two commissions, remaining a buck private throughout his military career. Not long after joining his Marine outfit as a replacement, Wilson saw firsthand the rigorous and relentless fighting in the Champagne area of France.

In November of 1918, Wilson found himself right in the middle of the Battle of the Argonne Forrest. By the time Wilson took his first muddy spot in the trenches, the battle had been waging on for 37 days. For the remaining days, the Germans gave everything they had, fighting to the death. Knowing that the end was near, the Germans were desperate to try and steer the war in their favor.

They bombarded and pelted the Marines with infantry, artillery, and machine gun fire. While sitting in the foxhole watching this bloodbath unfold before him, Wilson was struck with an idea. In an interview with the San Antonio Express-News in 1975, Wilson recalled that it was during the Champagne battle he had a running idea of writing a song. A fight song that a quartet would sing for Texas A&M. He took out a pencil and some letters from home and began scribbling the lines of the song that would become one of the most recognizable songs in Texas history.

Wilson sat with his lyrics in the trenches until the war was over. Since he wrote the song and knew it perfectly in his head, melody, lyrics and all, he never bothered to keep the original copy he wrote. The tenor of the War Hymn as it was officially named, takes digs at the arch rival of Texas A&M, the University of Texas Longhorns.

By the time the Battle of the Argonne Forrest was over, it had been a 47 day nightmare that the allies were able to wake up from. And they woke up victorious, the war was over. The bloody battle that began on September 26, 1918, concluded World War I. It lasted until the Armistice, on November 11, 1918.

What is remarkable about the class of 1917 at Texas A&M University is that they all volunteered to serve our country. Some as officers and some as enlisted men. These men went on to fight in World War I to serve and protect America and her freedoms. They were the fathers of the Greatest Generation.

They came back and had families, instilling the same sense of selfless service in their sons and younger generation. When World War II started, the entire graduating classes of 1941 and 1942 at Texas A&M University did the exact same thing; they all volunteered to serve our country.

The Aggies at A&M have a long tradition of service to the military. A&M commissions so many officers into our military that the number rivals our service academies.

Much like the writing of our Star Spangled Banner, the Aggie War Hymn was born from a place of true patriotism during a time of pure terror and a fight for freedom. While the original version that Wilson wrote had a first verse, the second verse makes up the war hymn. And still, almost 100 years later, this second verse marks one of the most notable and famous A&M traditions. After the war, Wilson eventually returned to A&M to earn a degree and graduate with the class of 1920. He went on to become a successful Texas Rancher.

His alma mater will be forever grateful for his contribution to not only his school, but to the State of Texas and his country.

To quote the Aggie War Hymn, ''Rough tough, real stuff, Texas A&M,''—those Aggies who fought in WWI, WWII and those who have served and are currently serving our country embody this line to the fullest extent.

James Vernon ''Pinky'' Wilson is one of the remarkable men who answered the call of his country. There truly are none quite like the Texas A&M Aggies.

The Aggie spirit is engrained and rooted deep into Texas A&M. They are hard core patriots, committed cadets and forever rivals of the University of Texas. They are and will always be the pulse of Texas A&M. Gig 'em.

And that's just the way it is.

THE AGGIE WAR HYMN

(By Pinky Wilson)

Hullabaloo, Caneck! Caneck!
Hullabaloo, Caneck! Caneck!

FIRST VERSE

All hail to dear old Texas A&M
Rally around Maroon and White
Good luck to dear old Texas Aggies
They are the boys who show the real old fight
That good old Aggie spirit thrills us
And makes us yell and yell and yell
So let's fight for dear old Texas A&M
We're going to beat you all to
Chig-gar-roo-gar-rem
Chig-gar-roo-gar-rem
Rough Tough! Real Stuff! Texas A&M!

SECOND VERSE

Good-bye to Texas university
So long to the orange and the white
Good luck to dear old Texas Aggies
They are the boys that show the real old fight
''The eyes of Texas are upon you . . .''
That is the song they sing so well
So good-bye to Texas university
We're going to beat you all to
Chig-gar-roo-gar-rem
Chig-gar-roo-gar-rem
Rough Tough! Real Stuff! Texas A&M!

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF BERNARD ''BERNY'' BALKONIS

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the retirement of Bernard ''Berny'' Frank Balkonis, Jr. Mr. Balkonis was Vice President of Sales for Prairie Estates Genetics of Middleton, Wisconsin. Mr. Balkonis' retirement at the end of 2014 marked the conclusion of a 40 year career in the seed corn industry. The President of Prairie Estates Genetics, Ron Rogers, affirmed that Balkonis leaves a robust legacy as a fantastic mentor to forage managers and a valued member of the Prairie Estates Genetics team.

Mr. Balkonis graduated from University of Wisconsin-River Falls in 1975, working on dairy farms in the summer and during holiday breaks to make his way through school. After graduation and marriage to his high school sweetheart, Mr. Balkonis was recruited by Farm Supply (Growmark), and managed a store location in northern Illinois for five years. After his time with Farm Supply, he then joined PAG Seeds, a division of Cargill. During his time with PAG Seeds, Mr. Balkonis worked as a territory manager in southwest Michigan. After PAG Seeds, Paymaster, and Cargill combined to create Cargill Hybrid Seeds, Balkonis was moved to northern Michigan, where he became both territory manager and assistant district manager. While located throughout Michigan, Mr. Balkonis and his wife welcomed three sons into the world.

In 1992, Mr. Balkonis was promoted within Cargill Hybrid Seeds to area manager for the eastern United States. Then, in 1996, Mr. Balkonis assumed the position of area manager for the states of Minnesota, Wisconsin and Illinois and moved his family to Holmen, Wisconsin. In 2000, when Cargill Hybrid Seeds sold to Dow (becoming the entity Mycogen), Mr. Balkonis remained on as area manager. After his time as area manager with Mycogen, Mr. Balkonis took on the responsibilities of VP of Sales for Prairie Estates Genetics, where he would spend the rest of his career and begin the transition to the new role of grandparent with the birth of his first grandson Efraim.

Mr. Balkonis will retire with his wife of 40 years, Claudia, in Trempealeau, Wisconsin, just 10 miles north of Holmen where they raised their three sons, Adam, Scott and Wade. I wish to extend the best of wishes to Berny as he steps into retirement and that next great adventure.

IN HONOR OF MAJOR CHAD ERIN LAMPHERE

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Major Chad Erin Lamphere, an American hero who valiantly served his country while serving in the United States Army.

Chad was born on August 24, 1973 on a small family farm in Arkansaw, WI. Displaying a warm heart at a young age, Chad helped his family raise dogs, cats, pigs, and goats, while also contributing and giving back to his community through partaking in 4–H. Chad quickly rose to the top of his academic classes, graduating with two degrees and as Valedictorian from Hartnell College, and later attending UCLA for pre-medical courses, in which he graduated Summa Cum Laude.

Chad joined the U.S. Army in 2006 in pursuit of a degree in medicine. In 2009, Chad joined the American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP), and as a doctor, provided much needed care and services to his fellow comrades who he valiantly served next to. Additionally Chad's selflessness and can-do attitude shined while serving in the U.S. Army, receiving multiple awards during his Active Duty assignments: the Bronze Star Medal, Army Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal with Campaign Star, Army Service Ribbon, and Overseas Service Ribbon.

In addition, to serving his country, Chad was a caring friend, loving father, and husband, and dedicated family man. Chad leaves behind his wife, Lindsay Della Valla, daughter, Emma Lamphere and son, Chad Erin Lamphere Jr., three siblings: Kirk, Jarrod, and Nicole, and his loving parents: Suzanne and Brad du Verrier.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of an accomplished American hero and loving husband, Major Chad Erin Lamphere. His life, legacy, and service to the United States of America will never be forgotten.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI and I rise to congratulate the San Francisco County Transportation Authority, commonly referred to as the Transportation Authority, on its 25th anniversary and its many accomplishments.

Established in 1989, the Transportation Authority administers and oversees the delivery of the county's half-cent local transportation sales tax program and New Expenditure Plan. The agency was founded by the people of San Francisco to administer Proposition B, a half-cent transportation sales tax program, which began in 1990 and was reauthorized in 2003 when voters approved Proposition K.

For the last quarter-century, the Transportation Authority has been responsible for long-range transportation planning in San Francisco and has analyzed, designed, and funded vital improvements for San Francisco's roadways and public transportation networks. It has significantly increased the region's mobility.

Since 1990, the Transportation Authority has also been the designated Congestion Management Agency for San Francisco, and has served as the San Francisco Program Manager for grants from the Transportation Fund for Clean Air. When passed by voters in 2010, the agency also began serving as the administrator of Proposition AA, a $10 annual fee on motor vehicles registered in San Francisco.

In these capacities the Transportation Authority has embodied its mission of providing prudent financial management, planning expertise, and project delivery oversight to create a better city for residents, workers and visitors. Through innovation, the Transportation Authority continues to study, plan, and invest in transportation infrastructure that supports San Francisco's thriving economy and meets the needs of its diverse community. The agency serves as a steward to help fund major capital projects such as the Presidio Parkway, Central Subway and Transbay Transit Center, as well as neighborhood-scale improvements that impact everyday San Franciscans and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to recognize and honor the leaders of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority on its 25th anniversary. This agency, its Board, Community Advisory Committee members and staff deserve to be congratulated for their leadership during the last 25 years and we wish them continued success for the next 25 years.

HONORING MAINE'S OLDEST LIVING PEARL HARBOR VETERAN

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a constituent with a story that should be heard. At 95 years old, James Watson of South Portland, Maine, is our state's oldest living veteran who was present during the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

The morning of December 7, 1941, began like many others for Mr. Watson. At the time, he was a gunner's mate first class aboard the U.S.S. *Phoenix*, which was anchored across the harbor from Battleship Row. He was reading the Sunday paper below deck when he felt a vibration rock the ship, then heard a call over the loudspeaker to report to battle stations.

Once topside, he saw anti-aircraft explosions in the air and smelled thick clouds of burning fuel. He knew instantly that the country was at war. What followed after was a blur. ''You're too busy to be scared. You're just mad. You're angry,'' Mr. Watson recently recounted to a local newspaper.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt called December 7, 1941, ''a date which will live in infamy.'' And, indeed, from books, films, and photos, we can still get a sense of that day's incredible devastation and terrible loss of the life. But as the days go by, there are fewer and fewer living veterans who saw it through their own eyes and can recall what it was like to go through such an experience. Their stories are critical to ensuring that we never forget what happened there.

I appreciate that Mr. Watson has shared his memories so we can better understand and remember one of the most pivotal moments in our nation's history. And I thank him for his brave service that day, and the rest that followed.

CELEBRATING THE MORRIS HABITAT FOR HUMANITY'S 10TH ANNUAL HEARTS & HAMMERS GALA

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Morris Habitat for Humanity, located in Randolph, New Jersey as it celebrates 30 years of building homes and changing lives.

Habitat for Humanity, a nonprofit housing organization founded in 1976, implements Christian principles in the pursuit of building homes, communities, and hope. This organization wholeheartedly believes that every man, woman, and child should have a home that is safe and dignified. The members of Habitat for Humanity strive to achieve this goal every day, and are important members of every community.

For 30 years, members of the Morris Habitat for Humanity have selflessly worked toward ensuring that those people in need of housing assistance receive help. Officially created in October 1985, Habitat for Humanity's Morris County branch operated in the center of Morristown with a single computer and a phone. Its several founding members began to investigate the housing situation of Morristown, and learned the processes of selecting families for assistance. Since then, Morris Habitat for Humanity has successfully completed building over 60 houses in New Jersey and more than 140 houses in other countries. The members of this group voluntarily offer their time and efforts to ensure that any person seeking help, regardless of religious affiliation, may realize the American dream of homeownership.

This organization's most current project, in collaboration with the Morris County Affordable Housing Corporation, aims to construct a five-plex containing two 3-bedroom and three 2-bedroom townhomes on Carlton Street in Morris Township, New Jersey. These townhomes will be sold to low- and moderate-incomes households, and will feature the latest ENERGY STAR technology. In order to select families for this housing project, the Morris Habitat for Humanity uses a lottery system. Currently, the project is set for completion in December, 2015.

To celebrate 30 successful years of improving the housing situation for many members of the local community, the Morris Habitat for Humanity will host its 10th Annual Hearts & Hammers Gala on Saturday, February 28th, 2015 at the Meadow Wood Manor in Randolph, New Jersey. The Gala will feature dinner, a silent auction, wine pull, awards, and live music. All proceeds will be used to further the Morris Habitat for Humanity's mission of building affordable housing for those families in need.

At this year's Gala, the Morris Habitat for Humanity will honor Richard A. Sleece, President of Richard A. Sleece Associates, with the Founders Award, Ruth Ryan, Vice President of Chubb Insurance, with the Beth Everett Award, and Rick Ostberg, former ReStore Director, with the ReStore Pioneer Award.

I commend the members of the Morris Habitat for Humanity, especially Executive Director Blair Schleicher Bravo, for their dedication to improving the lives of many Morris County

residents. Habitat for Humanity has consistently demonstrated a dedication and commitment to advancing our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Morris Habitat for Humanity as it celebrates its 30th Anniversary.

IN HONOR OF JOHN COLLINS

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable public service career of Mr. John Collins, who is retiring from a 28 year career with Goodwill Industries as the Senior Vice President of Workforce Development Programs to Goodwill Industries for Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties. In that time John build a stellar reputation for compassionate service and insightful leadership. He is so well networked in the community that it seems that John can claim almost everybody in the Central Coast, including me, as a friend.

A native of Santa Cruz, California, John earned his Master of Public Health Degree from San Jose State University, and his Bachelor of Science Degree in Health and Human Services Administration from Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. John has held positions in both the private and non-profit sectors. Prior to joining Goodwill, John provided consultant services to companies regarding troubled employees and health issues; Program Director for Dominican Hospital's EAP; and Director of Human Organ Recovery at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

As Senior Vice President, Mr. Collins has been very active in the support and implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, The Workforce Investment Act, and many educational strategies. As a CARF Surveyor, he has ensured that organizations around the world follow the standards for quality employment and training programs. John's work has also included extensive outreach in the Central Coast community. He serves on the Workforce Investment Board as well as having served on The Monterey County Tourist and Travel Alliance, the Board of the Santa Cruz Chamber of Commerce and Monterey County Hospitality Boards of Directors. He served as an elected Trustee and president of the board of Santa Cruz City Schools.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the whole House in sharing our gratitude to John for a job well done and extend our best wishes to John and his family in this next chapter of life. I know that even in retirement, he will still find himself involved in the community and helping people in need and will continue to stand as an example for others.

HONORING ST. DANIEL THE PROPHET SCHOOL ON ITS 65TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor St. Daniel the Prophet School, an exemplary Catholic school in Chicago, Illinois, which is celebrating its 65th anniversary.

Part of the Archdiocese of Chicago school system, St. Daniel offers a quality education to its students and teaches them the core pillars of the Catholic faith. The school's administration believes that parents, students, and teachers share in the process and responsibility of education. Parents and teachers are co-learners with the students and are encouraged to teach through example to provide an environment that encourages growth, communication, and Christian acceptance of all individuals. The collaborative effort of the parents and teachers provides for a supportive and nurturing environment in which students have unlimited growth potential.

The school offers many extracurricular activities as well as community-building events. Students can participate in chess club, choir, band, or sports among various other activities. St. Daniel promotes an environmentally friendly lifestyle by offering a recycling program. I commend St. Daniel the Prophet for going above and beyond by expanding their teachings outside the classroom.

The hard work of Pastor John Noga and Principal Mary Frances Porod has not gone unnoticed. They are well deserving of praise along with the outstanding teachers and administrative staff who work tirelessly for the benefit of their students.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing St. Daniel the Prophet School and congratulate them as they celebrate their 65th anniversary. May St. Daniel continue to exhibit excellence and create an outstanding learning environment for our future leaders.

CONGRATULATING BERNARD ''BARNEY'' YOUNG FOR BEING AWARDED THE ARMY AIR CORPS DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Bernard ''Barney'' Young of Rock Island, Illinois, who has been awarded the Army Air Corps Distinguished Flying Cross.

During World War II, Barney served as a Flight Officer where he flew the treacherous route from India to China over the Himalayas, or the Hump, as Allied pilots called it. Shortly after the war, the Army Air Corps decided that flying the Hump qualified pilots for the Distinguished Flying Cross. However, by 1945, Barney had been reassigned to fly Merrill's Marauders from India to Africa. Because of this, Barney didn't learn of his eligibility for the award until years later.

When he went to apply, it was discovered his flight records had been destroyed in a fire at Fort Leonard Wood in Missouri. Barney believed he would never receive the award. Then about a year ago, Tim Goodbrake of Edwardsville, Illinois, approached Barney about this award. Tim was researching his father's service in the Army Air Corps. He sought out Barney who had served with his father in India and the two discovered Barney's flight records buried in a trunk.

Now, sixty-nine years after returning home from the war, Flight Officer Bernard Young is finally receiving this overdue honor for his service to our great nation.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank Bernard Young for his outstanding service to the United States and congratulate him on this noteworthy achievement.

RECOGNIZING DR. MANUEL TZAGOURNIS

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Manuel Tzagournis for his distinguished service and commitment to the State of Ohio and congratulate him on his retirement.

Dr. Tzagournis held a long, devoted career in the healthcare field. He became particularly focused on diabetes mellitus which led him to practice endocrinology and hold numerous positions at The Ohio State University. He became a prominent representative of OSU's College of Medicine by acting as the National Institute of Health's principal investigator for the General Clinical Research Center and serving as the Dean during his tenure. He also worked for the National Regulatory Research Institute in support of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners for 16 years.

Dr. Tzagournis served as the chief medical advisor for the Ohio Police and Fire Pension Fund since its inception. Dr. Tzagournis contributed significantly to the creation and continued development of the Disability Program at the OP&F, and has spent the end of his career devoted to the safety, health and welfare of Ohio's first responders, testifying on their behalf in the Ohio legislature on bills affecting specific occupational injuries.

On behalf of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I thank Dr. Manuel Tzagournis for his dedication and impeccable service to our community in the field of medicine and wish him happiness in his retirement.

IN SUPPORT OF H. RES. 44, TO RESTORE VOTING RIGHTS TO THE DELEGATES AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONER DURING COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE PROCEEDINGS

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 44, offered by my good friend and colleague, Democratic Whip STENY HOYER of Maryland, to restore the voting rights for the Delegates and Resident Commissioner during Committee of the Whole proceedings.

The ability to cast a vote is the most basic of rights in our representative democracy. In the people's House, votes cast by members of Congress make us accountable to our constituents and allow them to understand where we stand on important issues. The rules that have been adopted by the 114th Congress

once again deny voting rights for members from the territories and the District of Columbia, and continue to make this body less transparent and less responsive to the more than four million Americans who live in our districts.

Under the resolution, extending voting rights to the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner during Committee of the Whole proceedings would be wholly symbolic—our votes cannot change the outcome of legislation or amendments considered on the floor of this House. However these votes allow us to ensure that the needs of our constituents are addressed in legislation considered by this body.

Further, many of our nation's men and women in uniform are residents of the territories and the District of Columbia. These dedicated servicemembers sacrifice much for our country, and many have paid the ultimate sacrifice in service to our nation. In fact, the per capita death rate for servicemembers from the territories is higher than most states. Unfortunately the majority has decided that our constituents will be less represented in this House despite the sacrifices that servicemembers from our districts make to defend the basic rights and freedoms enjoyed by all Americans. Additionally beyond high levels of military service, residents from the territories and the District of Columbia contribute to and serve our nation in a wide range of areas. The inability to vote in the Committee of the Whole is unfortunate, but I appreciate that this resolution seeks to remedy this matter.

Mr. Speaker, giving the Delegates and Resident Commissioner the ability to vote during Committee of the Whole proceedings will allow our voices to be heard during legislation considered by the full House. It will give us parity with other members and strengthen the long-cherished values of this body. I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

IN MEMORY OF KELLY WALTERS

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to remember an exceptional young lady taken from us far too soon.

20-year-old Kelly Walters was killed in a tragic hit and run accident on January 16, 2015 as she crossed the street in her hometown of Arlington, Texas. While her death made headlines back home—today I want to focus on the way Kelly lived.

I met Kelly several years ago at one of my town hall meetings. When I asked the crowd if they had any questions, hers was the first hand that shot up. She couldn't vote yet, but her love of our community and interest in government was already on full display.

A few months later, I was proud to sponsor her for the prestigious House Page program. While in Washington, her love of the civic process and politics only grew.

She came by my office regularly to chat with me and my staff. She was too young at the time, but was already expressing interest in serving as an intern in my office.

I understand she wasn't shy about sharing her future political aspirations telling people she was going to run for my seat as soon as I retired. I do appreciate her waiting for my career in Congress to end before hers began. I have since learned she was aiming even higher. She wrote a letter to President Clinton in December of 2000, at the ripe old age of six, saying she wanted his job. Kelly said, "I think I would be a good President because I care about people and how they treat others . . . Please let me know when I need to come to Washington to begin my new assignment. I will need to let people know I will be out of school and have my work mailed to me."

Kelly possessed a rare understanding of the importance of American politics and the impact that it has on everyday life. She had a keen interest and genuine curiosity about the legislative process.

After her semester in the Nation's Capitol, she returned home where she continued to cultivate her deep dedication to civic duty. She volunteered in our community, worked on campaigns, interned for a state representative and excelled in the classroom.

Kelly was a junior at the University of Texas at Arlington and was days from leaving to study abroad in Morocco. She wanted to promote women's rights in the Arabic world.

So what drove this exceptional young woman? Kelly says it best in her own words. This is an excerpt from an essay she wrote a few years ago: "America is based on many beliefs, but they all boil down to one simple word: Freedom. Life in America is free, it is one most people take for granted, but it was not cheap. Freedom is bought on the back of soldiers who were willing to risk their lives to fight for their country and America's right to be free. Thus Freedom is built on service, on a willingness to give back for what has been given. I don't pretend to know or understand why others volunteer, but for me it is a need to give back for all the opportunities that are standing open for me simply because I am an American."

Profound words that everyone in this body should take to heart. It is rare to see someone so young so engaged. Kelly will be missed, but her love of our community and of our nation will not be forgotten.

RECOGNIZING KATHY NICKEL AS THE NOVATO CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Kathy Nickel on the occasion of her recognition as the Novato Citizen of the Year.

Ms. Nickel has been a longtime resident of Novato and is well known for her community involvement. She was an active public school supporter, serving as PTA President, chairman of Safe Grad Night at San Marin High School and member of curriculum planning teams, and she continued to support Novato public schools in an advisory capacity after her children had graduated. Ms. Nickel also served as a Troop Leader for Marin Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts and was a team parent for Novato Youth Soccer during this time.

Ms. Nickel's civic involvement has been a constant and positive force for the community, including her roles as Chair of the Novato Fourth of July Committee, member of the City of Novato's Birthday Steering Committee, and as a volunteer coordinator for the Art and Wine Festival for the Novato Chamber of Commerce.

Ms. Nickel has been an exemplary citizen of Novato, striving to improve the city for all its residents. Her inspiring commitment and dedication will have a lasting impact on her community for many years to come.

Please join me in expressing deep appreciation to Kathy Nickel for her long and impressive record of public service.

WORLD WAR I HISTORY LESSONS FOR TODAY'S RETURNING IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN SOLDIERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, with my colleagues SANFORD BISHOP and CHARLES RANGEL, rise to submit a report, written by Ron Armstead, of the 26th Annual Veterans Braintrust at the 44th Annual Congressional Black Caucus Annual Legislative Conference.

2014 is the beginning of the worldwide celebration of the centennial of World War I, known as the "war to end all wars." Although, the U.S. didn't join the war until 1917, we would like to point out one American Eugene Jacques Bullard, born in Columbus, GA, who enlisted on October 19, 1914 to fight for France. He later, became the first African American, combat aviator in history with the motto: "All Blood Runs Red" Also note, 33 years after his death, and 77 years after being denied entry into the U.S. Army Air Corps—Bullard was posthumously commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the U.S. Air Force.

Nearly 5 million Americans served during the war, and 116,516 Americans died in defense of democracy overseas. World War I also marked the first time in the nation's history that American soldiers went abroad to defend foreign soil against aggression. During the war to end all wars, the U.S. enlisted 367,710 African American men as soldiers—most from the south—into the Armed Forces. About 200,000 were sent to France and about 50,000 of those saw combat. The vast majority served in the Service of Supply (SOS) units in Europe with the American Expeditionary Force (AEF) on the Western Front, while also encountering French civilians and colonial African troops alike.

U.S. World War I veterans have moved from memory to history. We are reminded that the last American soldier to die in World War I was Private Wayne Miner of Kansas City, and he was but one of the many African Americans, who participated in Black Regiments during the war. This included the celebrated 369th, formerly New York 15th National Guard "Harlem Hellfighters," made up of volunteers, who served more days under continuous fire (181 days) than any other regiment in the AEF during the entire war, and the first American unit to reach the Rhine River, while suffering 40% killed and wounded—with 171 African Americans from the 369th alone being awarded the Croix de Guerre, or French Legion of

Merit for heroism in battle, as well as the entire unit.

Regarding the Black American in the World War for Democracy, are the historic words of Emmett Scott, Special Assistant to the Secretary of War Newton D. Baker. ''The Negro, in the Great War for Freedom and Democracy, had proved to be a notable and inspiring figure. The record and achievements of this racial group as brave soldiers and loyal citizens, furnish one of the brightest chapters in American history.'' American Negroes in the World War, 1919.

This stands in sharp contrast to what Maj. Gen. Robert L. Bullard, Commander of the American 2nd Army during World War I, and an Alabama racist who wrote in 1923 ''Poor Negroes! They are hopelessly inferior . . .'' ''If you need combat soldiers, and especially if you need them in a hurry, don't put your time upon Negroes.''

Thus, the framework for the 26th Annual Veterans Braintrust Forum was African Americans, history, advocacy and legacy. The invocation and benediction was presented by Rev. Dr. Grainer Browning, Jr., setting the tone and sending a message of hope and faith for the discussions to come. Harlem's own Rep. CHARLES RANGEL (D–NY), senior Member of the House Ways and Means Committee led the remarks by describing veterans as a special fraternity of men and women. While also recognizing WWI icon Capt. Hamilton Fish, and historic places such as Hellfighter Square and the Harlem Armory, home of the 369th Veterans Association and Museum. As he said, ''when the flag goes up, we fight.'' But, for many economically it is their only choice, or chance. He also cautioned that there is a lack of confidence in our government (or trust deficit), despite the arguable threat to national security. And amid White House pronouncements there will be no American boots on the ground, versus the fact that between 1600 to 2000 troops are already on the ground. Equally important, he said, the challenge sent to Congress is whether ''we are at war'' and determining ''what is the actual threat to America.'' Additionally, shouldn't we set aside enough money for those returning from harm's way, and shouldn't everybody be ''on call,'' including those children of those most politically and economically powerful.

Rep. BISHOP, in joining with his colleagues BROWN, RANGEL and EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON in thanking Ron Armstead for his continued support, said to the veterans in the audience—''we owe you an immeasurable debt, for without your sacrifices, our freedom and liberties would not be as secure.'' Further, ''this year marks the 100th anniversary of WWI, and we must remember the many sacrifices made during WWI and African Americans that served during this dark period.''

On May 18, 1917, the Selective Service Act was passed by Congress requiring all male citizens between the ages of 21 and 31 to register for the draft. However, even before the act was passed, African American males from all over the country eagerly joined the war effort. They viewed the conflict as an opportunity to prove their loyalty, patriotism and worthiness for equal treatment in the United States. This is still true today, WWI veterans and the veterans of today give selflessly of themselves for the love of their country, yet some still have to fight to receive the recognition for their actions and earned benefits.

''It is said 'those who forget the lessons of the past are bound to repeat them.' War has always been full of unplanned consequences for our service members; we must be vigilant in responding to the needs of our veterans, and our obligations in sharing the same passion for defending our nation. We must learn from the past, work on progress for the future, and continue to work on areas that need improvement. I hope that when you leave today's discussion, the information you have heard will build a lasting bond, and help us work together, improving service members and their families quality of life, as well as expanding the opportunities to our service member's still on active duty, and to our veterans.''

Finally, BISHOP emphasized this point as we focus on WWI and the impact it had on those African Americans returning from war, ''A people without the knowledge of their past history, origin and culture is like a tree without roots.''

Rep. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON expressed her disappointment at seeing the President's issuing of 24 medals of honor, that did not include a certain individual who truly deserves to be honored—specifically, Petty Officer Doris 'Dorie' Miller. Petty Officer Miller was awarded the Navy Cross by President Roosevelt before his death in 1943, although he was never awarded the Medal of Honor, the Navy has concluded that the Navy Cross appropriately recognizes his actions, however, she and many others have always believed this to be distinctly untrue.

Rep. CORRINE BROWN, who has served on the House Committee on Veterans Affairs for over twenty-two years, announced that she was seeking the Ranking Member position for the House Veterans Affairs Committee in the 114th Congress. She noticed that when the Democrats were in charge, they passed the largest veterans health care budget in the history of this country; passed the largest increase of the GI Bill since World War II; and tried to insure veterans against a Republican government shutdown by providing advanced appropriations for health care programs. ''These advanced appropriations provide veterans with much needed security in the future.''

BROWN looks forward to bringing veterans issues back to the forefront of policy in the House of Representatives along with working together with those veterans and veterans advocates represented here today to present a strong voice for our deserving veterans. She finished by quoting President George Washington, who said, ''The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional as to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their country.''

The keynote speaker was the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs Sloan Gibson. Deputy Secretary Gibson was confirmed as Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs on February 11, 2014—and on May 30, 2014, was appointed Acting Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The Deputy Secretary stated, one hundred years ago the first shots were fired that would lead our nation into World War I. The first step in fulfilling President Lincoln's charge to care for those ''who shall have borne the battle . . .'' And on April 6, 1917, the nation called, and Henry Johnson, Needham Roberts and thousands of others answered the call. Their unit was the 369th Infantry Regiment, known as the ''Harlem Hellfighters,'' who served with the French 16th Division in the Argonne Forest on the Western Front. Pvt. Johnson suffered 21 combat injuries, and Pvt. Roberts a grenade wound in hand-to-hand combat. For their valor they were the first Americans to earn the Croix de Guerre, France's highest military honor. Yet, few details are recorded about Needham Roberts, who died in an asylum in 1949. But, much more is known about Sgt. Henry Johnson's transition from military service, discharge records fail to account for his severe wounds—no Purple Heart, no Pension. Debilitating injuries cost him his job, his family, and he died destitute in 1939, only 32 years old. The VA was not there for him.

Even 75 years later we find that still shocks the conscience, prompting the question the Veterans Braintrust asks: a century after sending our national treasure ''Over There,'' are we doing any better supporting their transitions over here?

First, in any effort we have to make sure every veteran, regardless of social and economic circumstances, has the opportunity for a happy and fulfilling life. Second, to really do better, the VA has to look at everything we do through the eyes of those we serve—our veterans. And that is where Secretary Bob McDonald is leading us—to a veteran-centric organization that measures performance by veterans' outcomes and impacts, as opposed to inputs, activity, outputs, or good intentions. The metrics that matter are Veteran outcomes and impacts. We won't attempt to recite all the examples, or accomplishments he cited, of the VA doing better such as Veterans Treatment Courts, Vet Centers. . . .

But here are a number of unfortunate facts: homelessness for veterans of color is disproportionately high. While 20% of veterans are minorities nearly half of homeless veterans in temporary shelters are minorities. Another fact is, a disproportionate number of criminal justice involved veterans are minorities. These and similar health disparities led to establishing VA's Office of Health Equity (OHE) in 2012 under the leadership of Dr. Uhenna Uchendu. With OHE's singular mission being to help ensure all veterans receive effective and equitable health care—regardless of race, gender, age, geography, and culture or sexual orientation. In closing, Gibson said, ''So are we doing better in supporting warfighters' transitions? The short answer is, yes, we're doing better. But we still have lots to do. All of us, together.

The other very special guest speaker was Three Star Gen. Ronald Bailey, USMC, originally from St. Augustine, Florida. In his remarks, he spoke about the 100th Anniversary of World War I being a rare opportunity to reflect on where we have come from, share stories such as Leo C. Chase, the first soldier to die from St. Augustine as a consequence of Vietnam fighting in the battle of the Ia Drang Valley (which story is vividly told in the 1992 book, ''We Were Soldiers Once and Young: Ia Drang—The Battle that Changed the War in Vietnam''). We were also able to extrapolate important lessons, and offer long overdue recognition as part of the healing process. Lastly, he called the Hon. CORRINE BROWN, the 'Lion of the Marine Corps,' for her unwavering efforts in honoring the Montford Point Marines with the Congressional Gold Medal.

PANELISTS

Mike Betz spoke highly about the recent report, which was part of the Million Records Project, an initiative of Student Veterans of America (SVA), which measured for the first-time ever veterans' performance in higher education; D. Wayne Robinson, a retired Command Sergeant Major spoke about Student Veterans of America (SVA) Chapters across the country, student veterans return on investment (ROI) to America and his way of giving back as President/CEO; Col. David Sutherland spoke about the importance of connecting with families and community. He also briefly told the story of Staff Sgt. Donnie Dixon, a career soldier who was killed on his second tour of duty in Baloor, Iraq, and the Easter Seals Center that is named after him to address the urgent needs of military service members, veterans and their families, or the homecoming; Sgt. DeMarqus Townsend spoke about his personal struggles with coming home from combat and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Prof. Pellom McDaniels, author of the forthcoming ''Memoir of Royal Christian, a Black World War I Soldier'' (2015), spoke passionately about the importance of WWI, for African Americans social, political and economic advancement; Prof Adriane Lentz-Smith, author of ''Freedom Struggles: African Americans and World War I'' (2009), spoke of African American soldiers returning home to join activist working to gain full citizenship rights as recompense for military service; Prof. Joel Beeson spoke about the striking and uncanny parallels between our present moment in history and the time before, during and after WWI. Journalist Yvonne Latty, spoke about the pride that emerged from writing ''We Were There: Voices of African American Veterans, From World War II to the War in Iraq'' (2004), and later her ambivalence resulting from writing ''In Conflict: Iraq War Veterans Speak Out on Duty, Loss, and the Fight to Stay Alive'' (2006), and last, but not least Dr. Linda Lagemann spoke out about the flood of mind-altering psychiatric drugs being administered by military physicians for service personnel, and veterans.

Afterward during the comments period Tara Johnson, the granddaughter of Sgt. Henry Johnson, WWI Hero, daughter of famed Tuskegee Airman Herman Johnson of WWII, and mother of Sgt. DeMarqus Townsend, USMC, a Iraq combat veteran spoke with heartfelt emotion that her grandfather died alone and destitute never receiving help for his mental and health-related issues from WWI. Saying, while government has made great strides in the care of returning troops, much more work is still needed, particularly at the family, friends and community level—because we can't afford to throw them (returnees) away.

In recognition of the continuing importance of jobs for returning Iraq and Afghanistan soldiers and their families, the Veterans Braintrust and Disney once again teamed up for a special breakout session highlighting Disney's Veterans Institute's unique ''10 STEPS'' for creating a Veterans Hiring Program; in addition to discussing strategies, tactics and interviewing techniques for bringing on-board veterans.

Now, despite the fact that there are no longer any U.S. veterans left from World War I, there were a number of World War I descendants and relatives, institutions, organizations, historic places and groups. To name a few, such as the Kenneth Hawkins American Legion Post #61 of Atlantic City, New Jersey that contributed to linking the past with the present. At the family level, there were descendants Rev. Dr. Grainger Brown, Jr., the Grandson of Cpl. Clifton Merimon, 372nd, who earned the Distinguished Service Cross (DSC), Croix de Guerre and Medaille Miltiare; Tara Johnson, Granddaughter and Sgt. DeMarqus Townsend, USMC, disabled Iraq soldier and Great-Grandson of Sgt. Henry Johnson of the 369th; Charles Hamilton Houston, Jr., aging son of Lt. Charles Hamilton Houston, Sr., WWI Officer, Harvard Law School Graduate Class of 1923, and Civil Rights Hero; Roger Morris, Grandson of Lt. James Morris, Sr., a native of Georgia and Graduate of the U.S. Army's first Class of Black Officers in 1917, Jerry Bowman, Grandson of Ira Bowman, who served with the 369th, and Clarence 'Tiger' Davis, who's Aunt, Louvenia Bradley-Harper, traveled to Paris in 1918 to retrieve her son Melvin Harper's body. She came home without his remains, saying, ''that he was in a much better place.'' He is buried in Manheim, Germany.

Equally important, all this served as the broader context for our pre-centennial WWI Forum discussion, which was instructive and insightful. First, many parallels were drawn between WWI and Iraq and Afghanistan returnees, particularly injuries (e.g. PTSD, TBI, suicides and domestic violence), and war's impact on families, both military and civilians.

Second, in answering a couple of historical and philosophical questions such as did WWI end all wars and Save the World for Democracy, and (2) do we learn from history, or repeat it—given that the WWI Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916, or Middle East boundaries continue to fuel conflict, and geo-political fighting in the region today (along sectarian, tribal and ethnic lines on the ground)—we would answer a resounding 'no!' Which leads many of us to believe, or say, ''the more things change, the more they stay the same.''

Third, a long overdue bill (S. 2793) to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to Sgt. Henry Johnson was introduced and passed the Senate on September 18, 2014, with a related bill (HR5459) being referred to the House Armed Service Committee. However, the process is Congress must pass a separate authorization due to the time period for awarding has passed. But, once the legislation is passed it goes to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for verification, and afterward to the President's desk for signing.

Fourth, Dr. Adriane Lentz-Smith says, ''there's actually a deeper and longer story, or view of the origins of the Civil Rights Movement, than that of the 50's Brown v. Board of Education decision of 1954 & 60's successful passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.'' New scholarship lends a sense of a longer and harder civil rights struggle, one that dates back to the World War One era (U.S. Supreme Court's Plessy v. Ferguson decision of 1896) and the aftermath of the Civil War. Leading Dr. Pellom McDaniel's to call for, or recommend the creation of a Consortium for the Study of African Americans in World War One with the support of the Veterans Braintrust of the Congressional Black Caucus to leverage and/or attract filmmakers, scholars, supporters, etc.

Finally, the 26th annual gala reception and awards ceremony hosted by Hon. CORRINE BROWN was held in the Veterans' Committee Hearing Room of the Cannon House Office Building. This year's awards were presented by Ron Armstead before a full house to Linwood Alford, Gregory Cooke, Sgt. Patricia Harris, Col. Conway Jones, USAF, Ret., Will 'It Takes a Village' Smith, Robert 'Bobby' White, Ellis Ray Williams, Come Home Baltimore, Eastern Seals Dixon Military and Veterans Community Service Center, Fulton County Veterans Court and Mentorship Program, Open Door Resource Center, Inc., Stone of Hope Program, Student Veterans of America, Negro Leagues Baseball Museum, Inc., Westside All Wars Memorial Building, the ''Parting Way'' Museum of African American and Cape Verdean American Ethnohistory, Inc., the film 'Choc'Late Soldiers from the USA,' and World War I soldiers Ira Bowman, Lt. Charles Hamilton Houston, Sr., and Sgt. Henry Johnson posthumously. The Rep. BROWN closed the awards segment with a rousing rendition of 'God Bless America.'

Special thanks goes to our historians, families, friends, supporters and staff—Profs. Adrian Lentz-Smith, Joel Beeson, Pellom McDaniels, Journalist Yvonne Latty and Dr. Linda Lagemann; Rev. Dr. Grainger Browning, Jr., Tara Johnson, Sgt. DeMarqus Townsend, USMC, Jerry Bowman, Robert Morris and Clarence 'Tiger' Davis; Dr. Frank Smith, Jr., Prof. Maria Hoehn and Dr. Krewasky Salter; Ralph Cooper, Morocco Coleman, Carmen Wilson II, Robert Blackwell, Elaine Sacks, Mildred Kidd Smith, Tom Harris, Dr. Dorothy Simpson-Taylor, Howard Jefferson, and Dr. Davine Reed; Dr. Richard Lipsky, Education Corporation of America, Smithsonian Channel, National Archives and Records Administration; Austin Brock, Col. Kevin Preston, USA, Ret., and the Walt Disney Veterans Initiative; and Sydney Renwick, Lee Footer, Stephanie Anim-Yankah, Jonathan Halpern, Vernita Stevens, Hannah Kim, Reba Raffaelli, Ronnie Simmons and Shantrel Brown.

HONORING PROFESSOR DAVID HILLYER VOORHEES

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Professor David Hillyer Voorhees and his election as an Education Section Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Mr. Voorhees is an associate professor of earth science and geology at Waubonsee Community College, which has campuses in Sugar Grove and Aurora, Illinois. He is being honored for his contributions as an educator and for his role in creating Geo2YC, a national organization for geoscience faculty at two-year colleges. Geo2YC, a division of the National Association of Geoscience Teachers, brings professors from two-year institutions together for networking, support, and research into geoscience education.

I would like to thank Mr. Voorhees for his commitment to science and quality education in our community.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, January 24, marks the 50th anniversary of the death of Sir Winston Churchill. Few leaders in history made such a mark during their lives, and very few have attracted such study and admiration after their deaths.

Even now, 50 years after his passing at age 90 and 75 years after his ''finest hour'' when Britain and Churchill stood alone against the Nazi menace, new books and articles about his life and leadership pour forth.

The Churchill Centre is a growing international organization with a mission to ''foster leadership, statesmanship, vision, courage and boldness among democratic and freedom loving peoples worldwide, through the thoughts, words, works and deeds of Winston Spencer Churchill.''

The Churchill Centre and The George Washington University here in Washington are building a National Churchill Library and Center. Hillsdale College is publishing all remaining volumes of The Churchill Documents.

The list of activities related to Churchill is long, even 50 years after his death. And, as one measure of popular interest, there are few historical figures who are more regularly misquoted or falsely quoted on the Internet than he.

I think there are many reasons that Sir Winston continues to fascinate and inspire.

In part, there are his monumental achievements, for few statesmen did as much to shape the world in which we live. Were it not for his vision and his willingness to stand up to the conventional wisdom of his day, history could have had a far different outcome.

In part, it is his oratory. Just as his words inspired his nation and the world to stand up to evil then, they still inspire us today.

In part, there are his writings, which continue to be studied and referenced as Churchill the politician was a leading figure throughout the first half of the twentieth century, and Churchill the author helped shape our understanding of those momentous times.

I also believe that the continuing interest in Winston Churchill stems in substantial measure from the many ups and downs of his career. We all draw inspiration from someone who perseveres through higher accolades and lower derision than us will ever experience.

Finally, Churchill the person remains a dazzling personality, fully of humor and eccentricities adding to the interest of new admirers.

The qualities that he exhibited are timeless—qualities such as courage, patriotism, hard work, loyalty, and love of family.

And, many of the principles for which he stood and fought are timeless as well, such as the need to recognize and confront evil and to nurture and protect freedom.

He believed that the values of Western Civilization are a force for good and that the English-speaking peoples had unique contributions to offer the rest of the world on freedom, democracy, and the rule of law.

As one who was half American by blood, he appreciated America.

That appreciation has been returned by millions of Americans over the generations.

His bust has been added to the U.S. Capitol's Freedom Foyer, where it continues to inspire visitors and those of us who work here, thereby continuing to serve as a major link in the ''special relationship'' between the United States and the United Kingdom.

The lives of great leaders are always worth remembering and studying, and as long as freedom is cherished, I am confident that Sir Winston Churchill will be studied long into the future.

CONGRATULATING THE 2014–2015 ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2014–2015 Illinois State University football team on an outstanding season.

The Redbirds made it to the FCS National Championship game for the first time in school history.

While they ultimately fell short with a heart wrenching 37 seconds to go, they made us very proud.

The team captured their first conference title since 1999 and broke 16 school records. Those included most points in a season, total offense, rushing touchdowns, passing touchdowns, and most wins in a season.

A number of individual Redbirds also received Missouri Valley Football Conference recognition. Head coach Brock Spack was named Coach of the Year, Marshaun Coprich was named Offensive Player of the Year, and Tre Roberson was named Newcomer of the Year.

As a future Illinois State University Redbird dad, I look forward to the opportunity to watch these young players continue in their careers.

Bloomington-Normal and all of Illinois are proud of the effort the team put forth this season. We look forward to their success next year. Go Birds!

HONORING BILL KORTUM

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we rise today in honor of William (Bill) Kortum, who passed away on December 20, 2014, following a battle with cancer. As a pioneering conservationist, Mr. Kortum championed many successful campaigns and brought lasting environmental protections to Sonoma County and the State of California, and his passing leaves a void that won't soon be filled. Considered by many to be the father of the environmental movement in Sonoma County, Mr. Kortum was known for his strength of conviction and tenacity for protecting the environment. Always kind, always polite, Mr. Kortum knew how to motivate others towards positive change, and he is singularly responsible for instituting many lasting environmental protections, though he would never claim responsibility for them.

As a native of Petaluma, California, Bill Kortum grew up on his father's poultry ranch at a time when Sonoma County's open spaces were unmarred by urban development. Mr. Kortum went on to graduate from the University of California at Davis Veterinary School, serve his country in the U.S. Army Veterinary Corps, and establish the successful Cotati Veterinary Hospital.

By the early 1960's, Bill Kortum saw how a rapidly growing population would increasingly threaten the natural landscape of Sonoma County. He and his wife, Lucy, opposed unregulated development and fought to pioneer an alternative path. One of the first of many significant environmental victories that Bill Kortum and his allies achieved in Sonoma County was to prevent the planned development of PG&E's nuclear power plant at Bodega Head.

In 1972, Mr. Kortum fought to pass Proposition 20, a measure that established the California Coastal Commission, which continues to guarantee public access to the California coastline. As a visionary leader, he went on to establish Sonoma County Conservation Action, an organization that mobilized voters to secure urban growth limits around all nine cities in the county. He helped to create the Sonoma County Open Space District and championed other key institutions and causes, such as the Sonoma Land Trust, the SMART train, and public access to Lafferty Ranch.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Kortum's many accomplishments and dedication to preserving our nation's natural resources for future generations illustrates the substantial impact that one individual can have on making the world a better place. Mr. Kortum will not soon be forgotten, and his legacy in Sonoma County and along California's rugged coast will continue for years to come. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to him today and express our deepest condolences to his wife, Lucy; children, Frank, Julie Groves, and Sam; grandchildren, Mark Kortum, Holden and Dylan Groves, Will and Grace Kortum; and many nieces and nephews.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR RONALD H. ROBERTS

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to California and the City of Temecula are exceptional. Temecula has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent to make their communities a better place to live and work. Mayor Ronald H. Roberts is one of these individuals. At a celebration on January 27, 2015, Mayor Roberts will be honored as he retires after many years of City Council service to the Temecula community.

About one month after the City of Temecula's incorporation, Ronald began working on the city's first ''Traffic Committee'' in January of 1990. In October of the same year, Ronald was selected to serve on the city's first

Traffic Commission. In November of 1992, Ronald began his service on the Temecula City Council, dedicating his time, talents and efforts to his local community. Throughout his tenure, the main objective of Mayor Roberts was to ensure the quality of life for all Temecula citizens continued to thrive, an objective he continued to champion throughout his twenty two years on City Council. Additionally, during his time as Mayor, he has played a pivotal role in the political landscape of the Temecula community, region and state.

Prior to his work on the City Council, Ronald served his community during his time with the California Highway Patrol, retiring after twenty nine years of valiant service. Ronald also freely gives his leadership and experience to many organizations, serving and chairing many boards at the community, regional, and state levels. These organizations include Habitat for Humanity Inland Valley Board of Directors, Temecula Balloon and Wine Festival, City of Temecula Traffic & Transportation Commission, Western Riverside Council of Government Executive Committee, Southern California Association of Governments, Southern California Association of Governments Transportation & Communications Committee, Riverside County Transportation Commission, Riverside County Transportation Commission Budget & Implementation Committee, Southern California Regional Rail Authority, Southern California Regional Rail Authority/Metrolink Operations Oversight Committee, SCAQMD Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee and National League of Cities Transportation Infrastructure & Services Committee.

As the longest standing City Council Member for the City of Temecula and as a man who has devoted over two decades to this great city, it is only fitting that he be honored as he retires from public service. Mayor Roberts' tireless passion for public service has contributed immensely to the betterment of our region and the state and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for his service and salute him as he retires and moves onto the next phase of his life.

COMMUNITY LEADERS: URBAN LEAGUE OF MORRIS COUNTY AND WILLIAM D. PRIMUS

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Urban League of Morris County, located in Morristown, New Jersey, and to remember the life of its founder, William D. Primus, and his many achievements.

The Urban League of Morris County is one of 110 affiliates of the National Urban League, and one of the most active branches in the country. Having served over 4000 families each year, the multi-racial League's self-expressed mission is to ''enable African Americans and other minorities to secure economic self-reliance, parity and power, and civil rights; and to provide assistance to any resident desirous of improving their quality of life.''

In 1910, Morristown native Ruth Standish Baldwin and Dr. George Edmund Haynes founded the Committee on Urban Conditions among Negroes, which would grow exponentially to become what is known today as the National Urban League. As early as 1919, various organizations in Morris County embraced the National Urban League's mission of social justice for African Americans, and by 1944 a multi-racial group of concerned citizens formed a local affiliate, the Urban League of Morris County.

As the first organization of its kind in Morris County, the Urban League set the standard for serving minorities in the community. It was the first organization in the Morris County community to act as a liaison between African Americans and industry, securing employment opportunities with major corporations for minorities. The League's efforts paved the way for the hiring of qualified minorities into management positions at these corporations. It was also first to coordinate with local high school guidance departments, encouraging African American students to pursue higher education. Moreover, the League was the first to advocate the need for low-income housing in Morristown, resulting in a project for affordable family housing now known as Manahan Village.

Today, the Urban League of Morris County continues to serve citizens of the community in multiple areas, with programs ranging from corporate internships to housing advocacy, from computer training to English as a Second Language classes.

This past week, this incredible organization suffered a great loss, as William Primus, former chairman and CEO of the Urban League of Morris County, passed away. Over the course of his life, Bill Primus, a longtime friend of mine, was instrumental in various accomplishments for the advancement of social services to minorities in the region.

In 1970, Mr. Primus became the first African American member of the Madison Volunteer Fire Department and in 1980, he was the first African American elected to the Madison Borough Council. During his term, Mr. Primus served as vice chairman of the Board of Health and chaired Madison's Housing Authority. As chair, Mr. Primus implemented policies that would lead to the construction of the Rex Tucker Senior Housing Complex in Madison and the town's first affordable public housing.

Over his 14 years of working with the Urban League, Mr. Primus was instrumental in transforming the Urban League into one of Morris County's most active and influential organizations. When Mr. Primus first began working with the organization, it had a budget of $95,000 and only one full time employee. By the time he retired, it had a budget over $1 million and 14 full time employees.

Mr. Primus constantly focused on providing affordable housing for the Morris County community. In 2001, he took control of the Morris County Fair Housing Council and transformed it into the Urban League's Fair Housing and Assistance Program. Through this program, the Urban League was able to improve the county's efforts by addressing discrimination and promoting fair practices for housing.

Additionally, Mr. Primus established the Urban League's youth program, offering both educational and employment services. He created the Summer Work and Youth School Outreach Programs and facilitated the awarding of over 90 academic scholarships during his tenure with the League. Furthermore, Mr. Primus helped me establish the Urban League's Washington intern program that has given so many young men and women from Morris County an opportunity to learn firsthand how Congress works. The Urban League of Morris County handpicks these students and sends them to the Capitol in the summer to serve as interns in my Capitol Hill office.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Urban League of Morris County and celebrating the life of William D. Primus.

RECOGNIZING FORMER IOWA STATE REPRESENTATIVE ED SKINNER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of former Iowa State Representative Ed Skinner who passed away on January 12, 2015 in Des Moines at the age of 78.

Mr. Skinner served the people of Iowa and Polk County as State Representative from 1968–1972 and spent many years as the Altoona and Pleasant Hill city attorney. During his time in the legislature, Ed was instrumental in the creation of one of Des Moines' biggest tourist attractions, Living History Farms.

Throughout his life Ed demonstrated a constant and legendary commitment of service to his family, community, state, and nation. He graciously volunteered his time to a number of organizations including the Altoona Lions, the Altoona Chamber of Commerce, and The Iowa Democratic Party, which recognized Ed with their Outstanding Supporter Award in 2013.

''He has been a strong advocate for eastern Polk County and has helped mentor generations of Democratic leaders throughout his life,'' the party said in a news release at the time.

Mr. Skinner was dedicated to mentoring and helping generations of leaders in Iowa and our nation because he believed in, and lived his life, serving others and working tirelessly for what he believed in.

It was a great honour to have known Ed and worked with him. I know that my colleagues in the House join me in honoring the accomplished life of Ed Skinner and offer our thoughts and prayers to his family and friends.

HONORING ANTHONY HO

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office's Deputy Director of the Congressional Liaison Division, Anthony Ho. Anthony has served in that important office for more than 10 years. He has played a large role in promoting friendship between the people of our two great nations during his two tours here in Washington, DC.

Anthony earned his B.A. at the National Taiwan University and his Master's degree in

Public Administration at the Kennedy School of Harvard University. That education prepared him for the challenges he faces on behalf of one of America's most important allies.

Mr. Speaker, Anthony impressed Members of the House of Representatives and Senate with his diligence, his honesty and his dedication to keeping the friendship between our countries strong.

Deputy Director Ho has been a great help to me, by keeping me informed on issues relating to Taiwan and to the entire Pacific Rim. He will be greatly missed. I wish him, his wife Anne and his son, Anwell all the best. I also want to send a special goodbye to his eldest son Andrew, who did such an excellent job as an intern in my office.

Washington's loss is Taipei's gain and I am sure that Anthony and his family will have a successful and happy time in their homeland. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in wishing the Ho family goodbye and good fortune.

ANAND SHANTAM

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Anand Shantam. Anand joined me as my guest at the State of the Union.

Anand's story is all too familiar. She was unemployed and struggled in poverty.

Four years ago all that changed. She was introduced to DC Central Kitchen, an innovative program to combat hunger and train unemployed adults for culinary careers.

She enrolled in the Culinary Job Training Program and received her food handler's license.

But she also received so much more. She received the support she needed to discover her own confidence. She reignited her passion for cooking.

Upon graduation, Anand re-entered the workforce as the Lead at Kelly Miller Middle School, preparing nutritious, homemade meals for kids. Today, she is a culinary instructor for the very same program that helped her turn her life around.

She has health insurance. She is self-sufficient.

Anand's experience at DC Central Kitchen is an incredible success story of how job training programs help people get back on their feet.

Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to call Anand my friend. And I can't wait to try her kale salad.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLACK JANUARY

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, few Americans have heard the term ''Black January,'' yet it is imbedded in the memory of all Azerbaijanis. Black January marks the evening of January 19, 1990, when at midnight Russian troops stormed the capital city of Baku. Armed with a state of emergency declared by the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet Presidium and signed by then President Mikhail Gorbachev, the invasion was intended to suppress a growing independence movement, but the result was the opposite. This violent incident inflamed Azerbaijani nationalism and contributed to the breakup of the Soviet Union.

Leading up to Black January, the national independence movement had gained momentum with growing demonstrations for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Emerging democratic groups were leading the political agenda and were projected to succeed in upcoming Parliamentary elections in March 1990. The Soviet Union sought to ''restore order'' by indiscriminately firing on peaceful demonstrators in Baku, including women and children. The protesters were calling for independence from the Soviet Union and the removal of Communist officials. More than 130 people died that night and in subsequent violence, over 700 were injured, 841 were arrested, and 5 went missing.

According to a report by Human Rights Watch entitled ''Black January in Azerbaijan,'' ''among the most heinous violations of human rights during the Baku incursion were the numerous attacks on medical personnel, ambulances and even hospitals.'' The report concluded that 'indeed the violence used by the Soviet Army on the night of January 19–20 constitutes an exercise in collective punishment. The punishment inflicted on Baku by Soviet soldiers may have been intended as a warning to nationalists, not only in Azerbaijan, but in other Republics of the Soviet Union.''

In the days after the invasion, thousands of Azerbaijanis surrounded Communist Party headquarters demanding the resignation of the republic's leadership. The Baku City Council demanded that Soviet troops be withdrawn. The Soviet legislature in Azerbaijan condemned the occupation as ''unconstitutional'' and threatened to call a referendum on secession unless Soviet troops were withdrawn within 48 hours.

Soviet troops were eventually withdrawn from Baku, but political control was maintained for almost another 2 years until Azerbaijan's parliament declared independence in October 1991. Today, Azerbaijan has developed into a thriving country with double digit growth, in large part due to a freely elected president and parliament, free market reforms led by the energy sector, and, most importantly, no foreign troops on its soil.

January 20 is the day on which Azerbaijani citizens stood up to Soviet soldiers and martyrs gave up their lives for freedom from communism and dictatorship. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the tragic events of Black January that precipitated the independent Republic of Azerbaijan and the fall of the USSR.

RECOGNIZING ALAMEDA COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY NANCY O'MALLEY

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Alameda County District Attorney Nancy O'Malley on being named by the Lions Club of Livermore as the ''2015 Alameda County Outstanding Citizen Of The Year.'' I look forward to speaking in honor of Nancy this Saturday when she receives her award.

I was privileged to work under Nancy for seven years as an Alameda County prosecutor. She is well deserving of this distinguished honor.

Nancy was born, grew up, went to college, and graduated from law school in the Bay Area. She rose through the ranks of the Alameda County District Attorney's Office after joining in 1984, becoming Chief Assistant District Attorney and then elected as the first female District Attorney in 2011.

Nancy is a stellar, tough, but fair prosecutor, putting countless dangerous criminals behind bars to help protect the Bay Area. In particular, she is nationally known for her work on issues surrounding violence against women, child abuse, domestic violence, and exploitation. She is also a tireless advocate on behalf of victims and their families.

Her work has been truly innovative. For example, Nancy created the Heat Exploitation and Trafficking (HEAT) unit, the first such division in the country dedicated to stopping child sex trafficking and punishing perpetrators. She also established the Alameda County Family Justice Center, a model way to achieve justice for and provide services to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, elder abuse, and human trafficking all under one roof.

In addition to enforcing the law, Nancy has fought to change it for the better and improve public policy. One of her recent efforts is to achieve an end to the unconscionable rape kit backlog, both nationally and in Alameda County.

Nancy has been recognized by many for her achievements. She was awarded the House Victims' Rights Caucus 2014 Lois Haight Award of Excellence and Innovation and was a 2004 inductee in the Alameda County Women's Hall of Fame, just to name a few of her honors.

I want to applaud Nancy for her latest award. The East Bay is truly fortunate to have her standing up for victims on our behalf.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE NEW MADRID COUNTY COURTHOUSE

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the centennial celebration of the New Madrid County Courthouse. As one of the five original counties in the state of Missouri, this courthouse is a landmark symbol for justice and peace serving its citizens for over 100 years.

The New Madrid County Courthouse relocated to its current location through the support of the community raising $20,000 to supplement the bond issue.

In the fall of 1934, President Truman gave his speech near the front steps of this courthouse for his second Senate campaign before becoming the first Missouri born president.

In celebration of the courthouse's longevity in service, the county has reinstated the 1821

county seal as the official seal. There will be 24 stars featured on this seal representing Missouri as the 24th state in the Union.

Today, the dedicated staff members of New Madrid County Courthouse continue to create a safe environment and provide peace and order for the community. It is my pleasure to recognize the centennial celebration of the New Madrid County Courthouse.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,086,048,044,499.39. We've added $7,459,170,995,586.31 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING TOM CAMERON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Tom Cameron for being selected to receive an Excellence in Mentoring Award, the highest award for a youth mentor in Iowa.

Tom volunteers his time to the Mentoring Advantage Program (MAP) at Community Youth Concepts. He has donated countless hours over the past 2 years to improving the lives of young people. Not only has he worked to improve the lives of his mentees, but he has also worked to increase awareness for the need and opportunities for youth mentors in the state of Iowa. Attending company volunteer fairs and connecting potential mentors to opportunities is another important aspect of Tom's volunteerism.

Tom Cameron has had a profound impact on the youth of Iowa and he deserves to be commended for his time and efforts. It's a great honor to represent Tom in the United States House of Representatives because he is a great living example of Iowa values that continue to make our state a great place to live and work.

HONORING EAST JOLIET FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the firefighters and paramedics of the East Joliet Fire Protection District and to recognize the past 75 years of service to the community of Joliet, Illinois.

Since the formation of the East Joliet Fire Protection District in 1940, the protection of our community has been in the hands of truly dedicated volunteers and professionals. With each alarm, the firefighters, paramedics and support staff of the East Joliet Fire Protection District perform heroic acts to save lives and protect property. If not for its service, many businesses, homes, and members of our community would not be here today.

I would like to thank the members of the East Joliet Fire Protection District for all that they do to protect the community they have set out to serve.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROBERT ROSS

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Robert Ross, a successful business owner, exceptional law enforcement officer and dedicated public servant who is retiring from the San Mateo City Council after five years of service. He was the Mayor in 2014 and Deputy Mayor in 2013. Robert is a genuine, hard-working and deeply committed city council member and will truly be missed.

Robert was first elected to the council in 2009 after a 27-year-career as a police officer in San Mateo. His experience in law enforcement made security and sustainability one of his priorities for the city. As a real estate agent for 25 years, Robert also brought substantial business experience to the Council, guiding the city toward financial stability.

While on the Council, Robert served on the City Council Audit and Budget Committee, the City Council Legislative Committee, the Community Development Department Audit Committee, the Grand Boulevard Task Force, the North B Street Improvement Initiative and the Planning Commission. In addition, he was very active in the Association of Bay Area Governments, the League of California Cities, San Mateo County Council of Cities, the San Mateo-Foster City Elementary School Board, the San Mateo Oversight Board, the San Mateo Union High School District Board, the Sister City Association and the South Bayside Waste Management Authority.

Robert received his Police Officers Standard & Training at the Modesto College Police Academy and his BSBA in Business Administration from the University of Phoenix. He started his law enforcement career as a police officer in Hayward in 1979 and transferred to the San Mateo Police Department in 1981 where he rose through the ranks to Police Lieutenant in 2003. His professionalism and proactive approach have been recognized and he has been commended on numerous occasions. For example, in the late 1980s, then Corporal Ross was in charge of setting up a task force to fight drug crimes in San Mateo. The group became known a ''Ross' Raiders'' and their effective anti-drug campaign was lauded by the City Council, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, the District Attorney, the San Mateo County Trial Lawyers Association and the late Congressman Tom Lantos.

Among the many awards Robert received was a Lieutenant's Commendation for proactive policing, the San Carlos/Belmont Exchange Club Officer of the Year Award, Employee of the Quarter by past Police Chief Don Phipps for ongoing leadership and proactive policing, the Trial Lawyers Association's Police Officer of the Year Award, the Peninsula Lions Club's Police Award for outstanding service to the community, the Gordon Joinville Special Merit Award for day-to-day excellence in policing, and the Medal of Honor, the Police Department's highest award for saving a life during a fire.

Whether in his capacity as a city council member, a peace officer, a small business owner or a San Mateo resident, Robert has always seized opportunities to help his community. He has given countless presentations at our schools to help troubled and underprivileged youths find a positive direction in their lives. He has visited homes of at-risk youth gang members during the holidays handing out presents. He has worked with the Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center and the Tongan Interfaith Council to prevent and solve conflicts. He has worked with Samaritan House to assist needy families. He is a member of the San Mateo Lion's Club which supports local and international charities.

It is obvious from this long list of accomplishments and engagements that Robert Ross has a heart of gold and an inexhaustible drive to help others. Because of his vision and commitment, San Mateo is a better place. I feel privileged to count Robert as a friend and colleague and wish him well as he shifts his focus to his personal and family life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to recognize the lasting contributions Robert Ross has made while serving as Mayor, City Councilmember and law enforcement officer. He will always be a role model and inspiration to his fellow San Mateo residents.

CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA PADRE PIO LODGE #2350

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Sons of Italy in America Padre Pio Lodge #2350, located in West Orange, New Jersey as it celebrates its 40th Anniversary.

The Sons of Italy in America, a Fraternal Organization created on June 22, 1905 by six Italian immigrants living in Little Italy, began as an organization seeking to establish homes and shelters for the elderly, lifer insurance and mortuary funds, and scholarship funds. The founding members of the Sons of Italy in America sought to form a support system for Italian immigrants, offering these people assistance in becoming American citizens and provide educational opportunities in assimilation into America culture. The organization continues this rich tradition through its various lodges across the country, including the Padre Pio Lodge #2350, located in West Orange.

Since 1975, the Sons of Italy in America Padre Pio Lodge #2350, has promoted Italian traditions and heritage in Essex County. The Padre Pio Lodge functions as an important aspect of society, especially through its partnership with multiple charities. The Padre Pio

Lodge avidly supports the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Fund, Cooley's Anemia Foundation, Alzheimer Association, Alicia Rose Teen Age Cancer Foundation, Doug Flutie Foundation for Autism, and Arthritis Foundation. The Lodge also assists two local food banks, donates toys and school supplies to schools and churches during the Christmas season, and supports our troops through Operation Shoebox.

The Padre Pio Lodge continues the Sons of Italy in America tradition of awarding students with scholarship opportunities. The Lodge holds education to be of utmost importance, and seeks to offer a helping hand to students in the area. In 2014 alone, Padre Pio Lodge gave scholarships to eleven qualified high school seniors.

This year, the Lodge announced that it would honor Sam Fumosa, a Charter member and Past State President of the Sons of Italy in America, with the Paul Ippolito Memorial Award. Sam participated in the Garibaldi-Meucci Museum on Staten Island and the Commission for Social Justice of OSIA. The Padre Pio Lodge will also honor Rosalind Aquino with the Angela DeNuzio Award for service to the Lodge and Anthony Benevento with the Michael D'Aries Award for dedication to the Lodge. Both Rosalind and Anthony worked tirelessly to ensure that the Lodge remained open during times of low membership. Because of their efforts, the Lodge now includes 125 members, with more joining every day.

To celebrate 40 successful years of promoting Italian heritage and supporting the local community, the Lodge will host a Carnevale celebration on Saturday, February 7th, 2015 at Hanover Manor, located at 16 Eagle Rock Avenue, East Hanover, New Jersey. Carnevale, a traditional Italian celebration dating back to the year 1268 A.D., includes music, food, and dance. The Lodge's Carnevale on February 7th will surely be a celebration not worth missing.

I commend the members of the Sons of Italy in America Padre Pio Lodge, especially committee chair, Dawn Giambattista, for their dedication to promoting the rich legacy of Italian heritage in America. The Lodge has consistently demonstrated a dedication and commitment to advancing the community of West Orange.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Sons of Italy in America, Padre Pio Lodge #2350 as it celebrates its 40th Anniversary.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S367–S445

Measures Introduced: Nineteen bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 231–249, and S. Res. 33–38. **Pages S420–21**

Measures Reported:

S. Res. 33, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

S. Res. 34, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Finance.

S. Res. 36, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary. **Page S420**

Measures Passed:

Death of former Senator Wendell H. Ford: Senate agreed to S. Res. 38, relative to the death of Wendell H. Ford, former United States Senator for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. **Page S445**

Measures Considered:

Keystone XL Pipeline—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S372–S408**

Adopted:

By 75 yeas to 23 nays (Vote No. 18), Murkowski Amendment No. 123 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of the Senate that all forms of unrefined and unprocessed petroleum should be subject to the nominal per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having achieved 60 affirmatives votes, be agreed to.) **Pages S377–82, S390, S394–95**

By 64 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. 21), Murkowski (for Cornyn) Modified Amendment No. 126 (to Amendment No. 2), to ensure private property is protected as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. **Pages S391, S396–97**

Rejected:

By 55 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 13), Boxer Amendment No. 113 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding federally protected land. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S391–92**

By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 14), Fischer Modified Amendment No. 18 (to Amendment No. 2), to provide limits on the designation of new federally protected land. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S377–82, S392**

Cantwell (for Manchin) Amendment No. 99 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding climate change. (By 53 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 15), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S391, S392–93**

Sanders Amendment No. 24 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding climate change. (By 56 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 16), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S375–77, S393–94**

By 51 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 17), Lee Amendment No. 71 (to Amendment No. 2), to require a procedure for issuing permits to drill. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S382–90, S394**

By 50 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 19), Wyden Amendment No. 27 (to Amendment No. 2), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S395–96**

By 51 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 20), Murkowski (for Blunt/Inhofe) Modified Amendment No. 78 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of the Senate regarding the conditions for the President entering into bilateral or other international agreements regarding greenhouse gas emissions without proper study of any adverse economic effects, including job losses and harm to the industrial sector, and without the approval of the Senate. (A unanimous-consent

agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.)

Pages S390–91, S396

By 43 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 22), Menendez/Cantwell Modified Amendment No. 72 (to Amendment No. 2), to ensure private property cannot be seized through condemnation or eminent domain for the private gain of a foreign-owned business entity.

Pages S391, S397–98

Markey Amendment No. 25 (to Amendment No. 2), to ensure that products derived from tar sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum. (By 53 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 24), Senate tabled the amendment.)

Pages S402–03, S406

Carper Amendment No. 121 (to Amendment No. 2), to impose a fee of 8 cents per barrel on oil transported through the pipeline. (By 57 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. 25), Senate tabled the amendment.)

Pages S402, S406

Whitehouse Amendment No. 28 (to Amendment No. 2), to require campaign finance disclosures for certain persons benefitting from tar sands development. (By 52 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 26), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S400–01, S406–07**

Leahy Amendment No. 30 (to Amendment No. 2), to strike a provision relating to judicial review. (By 53 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. 27), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S400, S407**

Reed Amendment No. 74 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of the Senate that the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program should be funded at not less than $4,700,000,000 annually. (By 49 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 28), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S399, S407**

Pending:

Murkowski Amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S372**

Vitter/Cassidy Modified Amendment No. 80 (to Amendment No. 2), to provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the outer Continental Shelf. **Page S372**

Murkowski (for Sullivan) Amendment No. 67 (to Amendment No. 2), to restrict the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to arm agency personnel. **Page S398**

Cardin Amendment No. 75 (to Amendment No. 2), to provide communities that rely on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the Keystone XL pipeline an analysis of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of the pipeline.

Page S398

Murkowski Amendment No. 98 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress relating to adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities. **Page S399**

Flake Amendment No. 103 (to Amendment No. 2), to require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs. **Pages S399–S400**

Cruz Amendment No. 15 (to Amendment No. 2), to promote economic growth and job creation by increasing exports. **Page S399**

Moran/Cruz Amendment No. 73 (to Amendment No. 2), to delist the lesser prairie-chicken as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. **Pages S401–02, S403–04**

Daines Amendment No. 132 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding the designation of National Monuments. **Page S402**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the Murkowski Amendment No. 2 (listed above), and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Monday, January 26, 2015.

Page S407

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 Murkowski Amendment No. 2 (listed above).

Pages S407–08

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 4:30 p.m., on Monday, January 26, 2015, Senate resume consideration of the bill, and that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, the filing deadline for first-degree amendments be at 3:00 p.m. and the filing deadline for second-degree amendments be at 5:00 p.m., on Monday, January 26, 2015. **Page S445**

Motion to Instruct the Sergeant at Arms: By 89 yeas to 5 nays (Vote No. 23), Senate agreed to the motion to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators. **Page S405**

Messages from the House: **Page S419**

Executive Communications: **Pages S419–20**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S420**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S421–22**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S422–27**

Additional Statements: **Pages S418–19**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S427–44**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S444–45**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S445**

Quorum Calls: Three quorum calls were taken today. (Total—4) **Pages S393, S405–06**

Record Votes: Sixteen record votes were taken today. (Total—28) **Pages S392–98, S405–07**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, January 22, 2015 and adjourned, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late former Senator Wendell H. Ford, in accordance with S. Res. 38, at 12:21 a.m. on Friday, January 23, 2015, until 4:30 p.m. on Monday, January 26, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S445.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SYRIAN OPPOSITION

Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on training and equipping the vetted Syrian opposition from Major General Michael K. Nagata, USA, Commander, Special Operations Command Central, and Matthew J. Spence, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Middle East Policy, both of the Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee for the 114th Congress.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution (S. Res. 34) authorizing expenditures by the Committee, and adopted its rules of procedure for the 114th Congress.

Also, Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight: Senators Crapo (Chair), Roberts, Enzi, Cornyn, Thune, Isakson, Portman, Toomey, Coats, Heller, Scott, Casey, Schumer, Nelson, Menendez, Carper, Cardin, Bennet, Warner, and Wyden.

Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness: Senators Cornyn (Chair), Grassley, Roberts, Thune, Isakson, Portman, Wyden, Schumer, Stabenow, and Nelson.

Subcommittee on Fiscal Responsibility and Economic Growth: Senators Portman (Chair), Crapo, Burr, and Warner.

Subcommittee on Health Care: Senators Toomey (Chair), Grassley, Roberts, Enzi, Burr, Coats, Heller, Scott, Stabenow, Cantwell, Menendez, Cardin, Brown, and Warner.

Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure: Senators Coats (Chair), Grassley, Crapo, Enzi, Cornyn, Thune, Burr, Bennet, Cantwell, Nelson, Carper, and Casey.

Subcommittee on Social Security, Pensions, and Family Policy: Senators Heller (Chair), Isakson, Toomey, Scott, Brown, and Schumer.

Senators Hatch and Wyden are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

JOBS AND A HEALTHY ECONOMY

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine jobs and a healthy economy after receiving testimony from John Engler, Business Roundtable, Washington, DC; Robert E. Hall, Stanford University Hoover Institution, Stanford, California; and Justin Wolfers, Peterson Institute for International Economics, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

An original resolution (S. Res. 33) authorizing expenditures by the Committee, and adopted its rules of procedure for the 114th Congress; and

The nominations of Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Management, and Earl L. Gay, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

JOB-BASED HEALTH INSURANCE

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine job-based health insurance and defining full-time work, after receiving testimony from Betsy M. Webb, Bangor School Department, Bangor, Maine; Andrew F. Puzder, CKE Restaurants Holdings, Inc., Carpinteria, California; Douglas Holtz-Eakin, The American Action Forum, Washington, DC; and Joe Fugere, Tutta Bella Neapolitan Pizzeria, Seattle, Washington.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

The nominations of Michael Greco, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York, and Ronald Lee Miller, to be United States Marshal for the District of Kansas, both of the Department of Justice; and

An original resolution (S. Res. 36) authorizing expenditures by the Committee, and adopted its rules of procedure for the 114th Congress.

Also, Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights: Senators Lee (Chair), Perdue, Tillis, Grassley, Hatch, Klobuchar, Coons, Franken, and Blumenthal.

Subcommittee on the Constitution: Senators Cornyn (Chair), Tillis, Graham, Cruz, Vitter, Durbin, Whitehouse, Coons, and Franken.

Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism: Senators Graham (Chair), Vitter, Sessions, Cornyn, Flake, Whitehouse, Schumer, Klobuchar, and Franken.

Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest: Senators Sessions (Chair), Vitter, Perdue, Grassley, Cornyn, Lee, Cruz, Tillis, Schumer, Leahy, Feinstein, Durbin, Klobuchar, Franken, and Blumenthal.

Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights and Federal Courts: Senators Cruz (Chair), Grassley, Hatch, Sessions, Flake, Graham, Lee, Vitter, Coons, Feinstein, Durbin, Schumer, Whitehouse, Klobuchar, and Blumenthal.

Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law: Senators Flake (Chair), Hatch, Perdue, Lee, Tillis, Graham, Franken, Feinstein, Schumer, Whitehouse, and Coons.

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: 59 public bills, H.R. 463–521; and 4 resolutions, H. Res. 44–47 were introduced. **Pages H530–34**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H534–35**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 7, to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, by a recorded vote of 242 ayes to 179 noes, Roll No. 45. **Pages H485–H511**

Rejected the Moore motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 177 yeas to 240 nays, Roll No. 44. **Pages H509–10**

H. Res. 42, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7), was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 242 yeas to 179 nays, Roll No. 43, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 239 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 42. **Pages H485–94**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, January 26th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H513**

Joint Economic Committee—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Economic Committee: Representatives Amash, Paulsen, Hanna, Schweikert, and Grothman. **Page H521**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H493, H493–94, H510 and H510–11. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 3:08 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress. The committee adopted its rules, staff list, and oversight plan.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress. The committee adopted its rules and oversight plan.

EPA'S 2014 FINAL RULE: DISPOSAL OF COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUALS FROM ELECTRIC UTILITIES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing entitled "EPA's 2014 Final Rule: Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electric Utilities". Testimony was heard from Mathy Stanislaus, Assistant Administrator for Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency; Thomas Easterly, Commissioner, Indiana Department of Environmental Management; and public witnesses.

A PERMANENT SOLUTION TO THE SGR: THE TIME IS NOW

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health concluded a hearing entitled ''A Permanent Solution to the SGR: The Time Is Now''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

VETERANS' DILEMMA: NAVIGATING THE APPEALS SYSTEM FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a hearing entitled ''Veterans' Dilemma: Navigating the Appeals System for Veterans Claims''. Testimony was heard from Beth McCoy, Deputy Under Secretary for Field Operations, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Laura H. Eskenazi, Executive-in-Charge and Vice Chairman, Board of Veterans' Appeals, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 23, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

4:30 p.m., Monday, January 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, Keystone XL Pipeline, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Murkowski Amendment No. 2 to the bill at 5:30 p.m. The filing deadline for first-degree amendments be at 3 p.m., and the filing deadline for second-degree amendments be at 5 p.m.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

12 p.m., Monday, January 26

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barton, Joe, Tex., E101
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E100
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E105
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E101
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E100
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E104
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E107
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E106
Davis, Rodney, Ill., E104
Dold, Robert J., Ill., E97
Farr, Sam, Calif., E98, E100
Foster, Bill, Ill., E103, E107
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E97, E99, E105, E107
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E101, E104
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E97, E98
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E100
McGovern, James P., Mass., E106
Pingree, Chellie, Me., E99
Poe, Ted, Tex., E98
Ratcliffe, John, Tex., E97
Smith, Jason, Mo., E106
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E99, E107
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E106
Thornberry, Mac, Tex., E104
Tiberi, Patrick J., Ohio, E100
Young, David, Iowa, E105, E107

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.